The Rise and Fall of War Crimes Trials

This book is the first comprehensive analysis of the politics of war crimes trials. It provides a systematic and theoretically rigorous examination of whether these trials are used as tools for political consolidation or whether justice is their primary purpose. The consideration of cases begins with the trial of Charles I of England and goes through the presidency of George W. Bush, including the trials of Saddam Hussein and those arising from the War on Terror. The book concludes that political consolidation is the primary concern of these trials — a point that runs contrary to the popular perception of the trials and their stated justification. Through the consideration of war crimes trials, this book makes a contribution to our understanding of power and conflict resolution and illuminates the developmental path of war crimes tribunals.
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As a practicing lawyer prior to my academic career, I sat in one of my conference rooms with my law partners and watched the return of the verdict in the O. J. Simpson murder trial. The press had taken to referring to the trial as “The Trial of the Century.” This case displaced the many previous claimants to the title “Trial of the Century” from the murder trial of Fatty Arbuckle to the Lindbergh kidnapping and the Manson Family murder prosecutions. While the other lawyers in the room discussed the nuance of the evidence that had failed to convict (we all had predicted an acquittal), I could not help but think that this hyperbolic categorization of this sensational murder trial put the Nuremberg Trials in a peculiar perspective. This led me to read, for the first time, the transcripts from Nuremberg because I realized I knew very little about what was surely the true Trial of the
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Century. To this day I suggest any student that aspires to practice law read Robert Jackson's opening statement from Nuremberg as an example of litigation at its very finest. This book is an attempt to present the story of the systematic evolution of war crimes trials. Although this volume originated as a concept in a room mostly reserved for depositions, it has come to press through the assistance, guidance, and insight of those in the halls of the academy, and I owe those many people a tremendous debt.

The generosity of friends and scholars who have taken the time to comment on this manuscript and lend their guidance to me as I moved the project forward is remarkable. Specifically, the faculty at Utah State University and the University of California, San Diego, were incredible, insightful, and supportive. In particular, this volume would not have happened without the early guidance and insight and perpetual mentoring of David Goetze. I also owe a great deal to Amy Bridges, Harry Hirsch, Gary Jacobson, and Martin Shapiro for their collective and individual insights and wisdom. I am very grateful for the thorough research assistance from Zak Gershman, Josh Russ, Adam Shniderman, Josh Vrotsos, and Curt Brown. I am deeply grateful for the professionalism and helpfulness of the employees at the archives located in the National Prisoner of War Museum at Andersonville Prison in Georgia and at the International Criminal Court at The Hague. As I presented portions of the manuscript at conferences, including
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the annual conferences held by Law & Society, the Midwest Political Science Association, RC 09 of the International Political Science Association, and the American Political Science Association, I had the great fortune to receive terrific feedback from various chairs, discussants, co-panelists, and audience members. I owe a particularly important debt to Leslie Goldstein, Mary Volcansek, Michael Tolley, the late Neil Tate, Jim Gibson, Jim Kelly, Roy Flemming, and Rich Hiskes, who each contributed to my understanding of how best to approach the project. In the later stages of the project, Alison Brysk, Rachel Cichowski, Russ Dalton, Bernie Grofman, Tony McGann, Mark Petracca, Marek Kaminski, Dan Pinello, and Wayne Sandholtz were generous with their insights and thoughts and proved invaluable in the final stretch of navigation. I am also grateful for the financial support of the Center for the Study of Democracy at UCI. I owe a special thanks to Latha Varadarajan for her detailed comments on the manuscript which, without question, improved the project. I would be remiss if I did not single out Heather Smith-Cannoy and Ben Bishin for recognition for their contributions. They each embody everything that could be hoped for in a colleague or friend and demonstrated limitless generosity with their time, insights, and assistance. I am also extremely grateful to the anonymous external reviewers as well as the editorial team at Cambridge. The insights from the reviewers improved the manuscript in both obvious and nuanced ways. John Berger
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and the entire editorial team made this a remarkable experience through their professionalism, thoroughness, and commitment to the project. Finally, like everything else in my life since my very first conversation with him, Julio Rodriguez made this better through sharing his wisdom, insight, and clarity of vision.