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Until rather recently, ‘complicity’ was a marginal concept and a neglected issue in international law. The long gestation of Article 16 of the International Law Commission’s Articles on State Responsibility of 2001 did not attract much attention. According to this provision, ‘A State which aids or assists another State in the commission of an internationally wrongful act by the latter, is internationally responsible.’ However, after the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001 and in connection with the invasion of Iraq in 2003, certain cooperative behaviour by States raised the general awareness of the possible responsibility of States for providing ‘aid and assistance’. This awareness, in turn, shed more light on other areas in which States cooperated in a way which raised questions about their implication in the internationally wrongful acts of other States. Today, barely ten years later, the possible responsibility for complicity is one of the most important and difficult issues which arise in the daily work of government legal departments.

This state of affairs alone would justify the timely publication of a monograph which carefully researches and analyses the relevant issues and practice. But the present book is much more than a solid synthesis of practice and the interpretation of an increasingly relevant rule of international law. Helmut Aust also situates this rule within the larger context of international law. He shows that the general prohibition of aid and assistance, as it is laid down in Article 16, is merely one element within a web of more specific primary rules. He also argues persuasively that this prohibition is an expression of a more general legal principle which would guide the interpretation of Article 16. Finally, he demonstrates that the position which international law adopts with respect to ‘aid and assistance’ is a highly significant symptom of
its own state of development, perhaps as important as the concept of peremptory norms. Helmut Aust’s perceptiveness for relevant practice, his mature sense of place and direction, and his talented erudition have contributed to making this book a felicitous example for the mutual enrichment of practice and theory. This is true both for what the book describes – the development of a norm from certain instances of practice which were successfully postulated by academic lawyers to be of more general significance – as well as for what the author does – developing prudent suggestions of how to interpret and conceive a rule within its wider political, historical and systematic context. The book shows that careful empirical analysis and historically informed systematic thinking with respect to a crucial rule of international law, if well done, are not only compatible with each other but ultimately interdependent. Their combination is necessary for the proper identification and development of international law. This book is a most valuable contribution to this end.

Georg Nolte
Humboldt University Berlin
15 November 2010
Preface

This book is a revised and updated version of the doctoral dissertation which I defended at the Faculty of Law of the Humboldt University Berlin in December 2009. As this is a book about complicity, it is only fair to gratefully acknowledge the 'aid and assistance' that I received from a number of people. It should very well be understood that this 'complicity' does not entail any responsibility for errors and misconceptions which can only be attributed to the author.

First of all, I would like to thank my academic teacher, Professor Georg Nolte. He supervised my work as a doctoral candidate. My way of thinking about international law has been deeply influenced by him. I am especially grateful for the academic guidance with which he has accompanied my work so far, as well as for his personal cordiality and warmth. He also initially directed my attention to the topic of this book.

I would also like to thank Professor Christian Tomuschat for being the second examiner of my thesis. I am very grateful to Professor James Crawford for his hospitality at the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law in Cambridge, for an important conversation about complicity in the work of the ILC as well as for the inclusion of this book in the Cambridge Studies in International and Comparative Law series.

Alejandro Rodiles was often the first person with whom I discussed ideas for this book. Our conversations about international law and other issues had a profound influence on this book. Dr Thomas Kleinlein and Dr Mindia Vashakmadze read the entire draft manuscript which benefited greatly from their constructive comments and criticism.

I received valuable feedback on and suggestions for my work from a great number of people, including Gebhard Bücheler, Dr Thomas Burri, Professor Michael Byers, Dr Alejandro Carballo, Christian Djeffal,
Preface

Professor Bardo Fassbender, Dr John Morss, Jörn Müller, Nina Naske, Judge Andreas Paulus, Judge Bruno Simma, Paulus Suh, Carla Thies, Mehmet Toral and Dr Annemarieke Vermeer-Künzli. I would also like to thank the participants in the Munich–Oxford seminar in international law of April 2007, the AjV workshop in Munich in October 2007, Andreas Paulus’ colloquy at Frauenchiemsee in August 2008 as well as the Visiting Fellows Roundtable in Cambridge in October 2008 where I had the chance to present parts of this work and received important feedback. Finally, two anonymous reviewers at Cambridge University Press provided helpful suggestions and constructive criticism. Nienke van Schaverbeke at Cambridge University Press was a great help in turning the manuscript into this book as well as a pleasure to work with.

This book was written at three splendid institutions. Most parts originated at the Institute for International Law, University of Munich. I would like to thank all members and staff of the Institute for being such a warm and generous community, in particular Christine Schuhbeck-Schmidt. I would also like to express my gratitude to the librarians at the Peace Palace Library in The Hague where I had the privilege to work for two periods of three weeks each. The Lauterpacht Centre for International Law at the University of Cambridge proved to be every bit the inspiring place for an intense period of research and writing I expected it to be. My stays in Cambridge and The Hague were supported by scholarships from the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). The doctoral dissertation underlying this book received the Thesis Prize of the Absolventen und Freunde der Juristischen Fakultät der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin – Bibliotheksgesellschaft e.V.

Finally, I would like to thank my family: my parents supported me generously throughout my studies for which I cannot thank them enough. My brother Martin has been an important influence for me as well as a good friend in all times. My wife Johanna is a constant source of love and inspiration. Without her, I would not know what would become of me.
Table of cases

**Permanent Court of International Justice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Paragraph/Article</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article 3, paragraph 2 of the Treaty of Lausanne (Frontier between Turkey and Iraq)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory at Chorzów Case, Jurisdiction, Poland v. Germany</td>
<td>26 July 1927</td>
<td>Series A, No. 9</td>
<td>84, 286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory at Chorzów Case, Merits, Germany v. Polish Republic</td>
<td>13 September 1928</td>
<td>Series A, No. 17</td>
<td>277-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Zones of Upper Savoy and the District of Gex, France v. Switzerland</td>
<td>7 June 1932</td>
<td>Series A/B, No. 46</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Interests in Polish Upper Silesia, Merits, Germany v. Poland</td>
<td>Judgment of 25 May 1926</td>
<td>Series A, No. 7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotus Case, France v. Turkey</td>
<td>Judgment of 7 September 1927</td>
<td>Series A, No. 10</td>
<td>6, 51, 60, 92, 247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphates in Morocco, Italy v. France</td>
<td>Preliminary Objections, Judgment of 14 June 1938</td>
<td>Series A/B, No. 74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of Eastern Carelia, Advisory Opinion of 23 July 1923</td>
<td>Series B, No. 5</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**International Court of Justice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Paragraph/Article</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accordance with International Law of the Unilateral Declaration of Independence in Respect of Kosovo</td>
<td>Advisory Opinion of 22 July 2010</td>
<td>6, 68, 273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table of Cases

| Asylum Case, Colombia v. Peru, Judgment of 20 November 1950, ICJ Rep. 1950, 266 | 81 |
| Conditions of Admission of a State to Membership of the United Nations (Article 4 of the Charter), Advisory Opinion of 28 May 1948, ICJ Rep. 1948, 57 | 71 |
### TABLE OF CASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ICJ Reports</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elettronica Sicula SpA (ELSI), United States of America v. Italy</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>81, 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Case, United Kingdom v. Norway</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>67, 74, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional Immunities of the State, Germany v. Italy, Order of</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>42, 44, 279, 309, 343-4, 387, 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military and Paramilitary Activities In and Against Nicaragua</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>99, 297, 300, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military and Paramilitary Activities In and Against Nicaragua,</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>84, 106, 221, 244, 263, 387, 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Gold Removed from Rome in 1943, Preliminary Question</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8, 245, 298, 300, 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservations to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>390-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
xvi   TABLE OF CASES


Arbitral awards

Air Service Agreement of 27 March 1946 Between the United States of America and France, Arbitral Award of 9 December 1978, RIAA XVIII, 417   287
Dispute Concerning Filleting within the Gulf of St Lawrence (‘La Bretagne’) (Canada v. France), Arbitral Award of 17 July 1986 (De Visscher, Chairman, Pharand and Quéneudec, Members), ILR 82, 590   74
Gold Looted by Germany from Rome in 1943, Arbitral Advice of 20 February 1953, ILR 20, 441   299
Island of Palmas Case, Netherlands v. United States of America, Arbitral Award of Max Huber, April 1928, RIAA II, 829   94, 187, 381
Naulilaa Incident Arbitration, Portugal v. Germany, Arbitral Award of 31 July 1928, RIAA II, 1011   288, 366
Rainbow Warrior (New Zealand v. France), Arbitral Award of 30 April 1990, ILR 82, 499 286

**ICTY and ICTR**
Prosecutor v. Blaskic, IT-95-14-A, Judgment of 29 July 2004 214
Prosecutor v. Furundžija, IT-95-17/1, Decision of the Appeals Chamber of 21 July 2000, ILR 121, 213 213, 346, 398
Prosecutor v. Tadic, IT-94-1-A, Judgment of 15 July 1999 93, 214

**European Court/Commission of Human Rights**
Agim Behrami and Bekir Behrami v. France and Ruzhdi Saramati v. France, Germany and Norway, Application Nos. 71412/01 and 78166/01, Grand Chamber, Decision on Admissibility of 2 May 2007, ILR 133, 1 223–4, 411
Al-Saadoon and Mufdhi v. United Kingdom, Decision on Admissibility of 30 June 2009, Application No. 61498/08, not yet reported 412
Al-Saadoon and Mufdhi v. United Kingdom, Merits and Just Satisfaction, Judgment of 2 March 2010, Application No. 61498/08, not yet reported 314, 400
Assanidze v. Georgia, Grand Chamber, Judgment of 8 April 2004, ECHR 2004-II, 221 412
Bankovic v. Belgium and others, Grand Chamber, Decision of 12 December 2001, ECHR 2001-XII, 334 409
Chahal v. United Kingdom, Judgment of 15 November 1996, ECHR 1996-V, 1831 400
Cyprus v. Turkey, Grand Chamber, Judgment of 10 May 2001, ECHR 2001-IV, 1 406
**TABLE OF CASES**


Golder Case, Judgment of 21 February 1975, Series A, No. 18 58


Issa v. Turkey, Application No. 31812/96, Judgment of 16 November 2004, not reported 412


Loizidou v. Turkey, Merits, Judgment of 18 December 1996, ECHR 1996-VI, 2216 408

Mamatkulov and Askarov v. Turkey, Grand Chamber, Judgment of 4 February 2005, ECHR 2005-II, 293 314, 401

Medvedyev v. France, Judgment of the Grand Chamber of 29 March 2010, Application No. 3394/03, not yet reported 314

Rasheed Haje Tugar v. Italy, Application No. 22869/93, Decision on Admissibility of 18 October 1995, unpublished 130

Ribitsch v. Austria, Judgment of 4 December 1995, Series A, No. 336 218

Saadi v. Italy, Grand Chamber, Judgment of 28 February 2008, Application No. 37201/06, not yet reported 394, 400, 403

Saddam Hussein v. Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom, Application No. 23276/04, Decision of Admissibility of 14 March 2006, unpublished 207, 314, 413


**Inter-American Court of Human Rights**

## Table of Cases

| Velásquez Rodríguez v. Honduras, Judgment of 29 July 1988, Series C, No. 4 | 246 |

### GATT/WTO

- **Mexico** – Tax Measures on Soft Drinks and Other Beverages, WT/DS308/AB/R (6 March 2006) | 152
- **Turkey** – Restrictions on Imports of Textile and Clothing Products, WT/DS34/R (31 May 1999) | 152, 313
- **United States** – Import Prohibition of Certain Shrimp and Shrimp Products (Complaint by the United States), Decision of 12 October 1998, WT/DS58/AB/4 | 71, 75

### UN Committee Against Torture

- Individual Complaint of Mr Ahmed Hussein Mustafa Kamil Agiza, Decision of 24 May 2005, UN Doc. CAT/C/34/D/233/2003 | 316, 401

### Domestic courts

#### Canada

- **Supreme Court**

- **Federal Court of Appeal**
xx  TABLE OF CASES

Germany

Federal Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht)

BVerfGE 75, 1  154, 278
BVerfGE 109, 13 = ILDC 10 (DE 2003)  165, 317
BVerfGE 112, 1 (an English translation is available at www.bverfg.de/en/decisions/rs20041026_2bvr095500en.html, last visited 1 November 2010)  154–5, 344

Federal Administrative Court (Bundesverwaltungsgericht)


Greece


Ireland


Italy

Federal Republic of Germany v. Giovanni Mantelli, Court of Cassation, Order No. 14201 = ILDC 1037 (IT 2008)  156, 352

New Zealand


Switzerland

**TABLE OF CASES**  


United Kingdom  

A (FC) and others (FC) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department and others, House of Lords [2005] UKHL 71 = ILDC 363 (UK 2005)  

R (on the Application of Binyan Mohammed) v. Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, High Court of Justice, Judgment of 21 August 2008 [2008] EWHC 2048 (Admin)  

United States  

Anglo-Chinese Shipping Company Ltd v. United States, Court of Claims, Decision of 11 January 1955, ILR 22, 982
Abbreviations

Note: all abbreviations used in the study are included here save those which are document symbols of the United Nations or other international organisations.

ACP  African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States
Add.  Addendum
APM  anti-personnel mines
ASR  Articles on State Responsibility
AWACS  Airborne Warning and Control System
BVerfG  Bundesverfassungsgericht (German Federal Constitutional Court)
BVerwG  Bundesverwaltungsgericht (German Federal Administrative Court)
CAT  UN Convention Against Torture
CCPR  Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
CFSP  Common Foreign and Security Policy (EU)
col.  column
CPA  Coalition Provisional Authority
CSIS  Canadian Security and Intelligence Service
CTS  Canadian Treaty Series
DARIO  Draft Articles on the Responsibility of International Organizations
DRC  Democratic Republic of the Congo
DSU  Dispute Settlement Understanding
ECHR  European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms / Reports of the European Court of Human Rights (only in footnotes)
ECOSOC  Economic and Social Council
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ECtHR European Court of Human Rights
ETS European Treaty Series
EuGRZ Europäische Grundrechte-Zeitschrift
EWHC England and Wales High Court
FAA Foreign Assistance Act (US)
FCO Foreign and Commonwealth Office (UK)
GATT General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
ICC International Criminal Court
ICCPR International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICJ International Court of Justice
ICRC International Committee of the Red Cross
ICTR International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
ICTY International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
ILC International Law Commission
ILDC Oxford Reports on International Law in Domestic Courts
ILM International Legal Materials
ILR International Law Reports
Inter-AmCtHR Inter-American Court of Human Rights
ITLOS International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea
JZ Juristen-Zeitung
MRT Moldovan Republic of Transdniestria
NATO North-Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO non-governmental organisation
NPT Non-Proliferation Treaty
OAS Organization of American States
OAU Organization of African Unity
OJ Official Journal
OPEC Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
PCIJ Permanent Court of International Justice
PRC People's Republic of China
R2P 'responsibility to protect'
Res. Resolution
RIAA Reports of International Arbitral Awards
SALW small arms and light weapons
SCC Supreme Court of Canada
SCR Reports of the Decisions of the Supreme Court (Canada)
sec. section
SOFA Status of Forces Agreement
### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTS</td>
<td>United Nations Treaty Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>United States Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol.</td>
<td>Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBILC</td>
<td>Yearbook of the International Law Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>