

# Contents

<b>1 Introduction</b> . . . . .	1
1.1 Background to the Study . . . . .	2
1.1.1 Statement of the Problem. . . . .	4
1.1.2 Objectives of the Study . . . . .	7
1.1.3 Overview of Chapters . . . . .	7
<b>2 Comparative Analysis</b> . . . . .	9
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	10
2.2 Common Law Jurisdictions. . . . .	10
2.2.1 United Kingdom . . . . .	11
2.2.2 United States . . . . .	25
2.2.3 The Rationale of Conspiracy Law in Common Law Systems . . . . .	38
2.2.4 Summary . . . . .	42
2.2.5 Analysis. . . . .	43
2.3 Civil Law Countries. . . . .	46
2.3.1 Germany . . . . .	47
2.3.2 Spain . . . . .	58
2.3.3 France . . . . .	64
2.3.4 Italy . . . . .	69
2.3.5 Summary . . . . .	72
2.4 Evaluation . . . . .	74
2.5 Conclusion . . . . .	77
<b>3 Conspiracy in the Jurisprudence of the International Criminal Tribunals</b> . . . . .	79
3.1 Introduction . . . . .	80
3.2 The Nuremberg Tribunal . . . . .	81
3.2.1 The Charter . . . . .	81
3.2.2 The Trial . . . . .	83
3.2.3 Evaluation . . . . .	88
3.3 Subsequent Nuremberg Trials . . . . .	94
3.3.1 The United States of America v. Josef Altst�etter et al. (Justice Trial) . . . . .	95

3.3.2	The United States of America v. Karl Brandt et al. (Medical Case) . . . . .	101
3.3.3	The United States of America v. Oswald Pohl et al. . . . .	103
3.3.4	The United States of America v. Carl Krauch et al. (I.G. Farben Trial). . . . .	105
3.3.5	The United States of America v. Alfred Krupp et al. (Krupp Trial) . . . . .	107
3.3.6	The United States of America v. Ernst von Weizsäcker et al. (Ministries Trial) . . . . .	108
3.3.7	The United States of America v. Wilhelm von Leeb et al. (High Command Trial) . . . . .	109
3.3.8	Evaluation . . . . .	110
3.4	Conspiracy Before the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (IMTFE) . . . . .	113
3.4.1	The Charter . . . . .	114
3.4.2	The Trial and General Findings on Conspiracy. . . . .	115
3.4.3	Evaluation . . . . .	118
3.5	Comparison Between the Nuremberg and Tokyo Tribunals Conspiracy . . . . .	121
3.6	The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia . . . . .	122
3.6.1	Conspiracy . . . . .	122
3.6.2	Joint Criminal Enterprise . . . . .	124
3.7	The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. . . . .	128
3.7.1	The Statute. . . . .	128
3.7.2	Jurisprudence . . . . .	130
3.8	Evaluation of the Ad Hoc Tribunals . . . . .	139
3.8.1	Planning and Preparation . . . . .	141
3.9	Conclusion . . . . .	143
<b>4</b>	<b>Customary International Law.</b> . . . .	<b>147</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	147
4.2	Characteristics of Customary International Law . . . . .	148
4.2.1	State Practice . . . . .	149
4.2.2	Treaty Law and Practice of International Tribunals. . . . .	151
4.3	Evaluation . . . . .	153
4.4	Conclusion . . . . .	155
<b>5</b>	<b>Conspiracy in the Statute of the International Criminal Court . . .</b>	<b>157</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	158
5.2	Negotiations Surrounding the Conspiracy Doctrine . . . . .	159
5.3	Article 25 of the Rome Statute . . . . .	162
5.3.1	Commission . . . . .	163
5.3.2	Accomplice Liability. . . . .	167

- 5.3.3 Complicity in Group Crimes . . . . . 170
- 5.3.4 Attempt . . . . . 175
- 5.3.5 Evaluation . . . . . 175
- 5.4 Can Conspiracy be Punished Through a Purposive  
Construction of the Rome Statute? . . . . . 177
- 5.5 A Deliberate Decision or Inadvertent Omission: A Case  
for Conspiracy . . . . . 180
  - 5.5.1 Rationale for Punishing Conspiracy in International  
Criminal Law . . . . . 181
  - 5.5.2 Objections to Punishing Conspiracy . . . . . 186
  - 5.5.3 Evaluation . . . . . 187
  - 5.5.4 Recommendation . . . . . 193
- 6 General Conclusion . . . . . 195**
- Bibliography . . . . . 205**