



PRLIĆ ET.AL



ISSUE 111

Head of Office: Dominic Kennedy
Assistants: Christiana Gojani
Contributors: Elisa Binon and James Jackson

FOLLOW US...



ICTY News

Prlić et.al (IT-04-74)

The Appeal Hearing in the *Prlić et al.* case was held between 20 March and 28 March 2017. The first six days were reserved for the Accused’s submissions and the Prosecution’s response to each respective Accused. On the last day of the hearings, the Prosecution presented its own appeal and each Accused responded. The Hearing ended with personal addresses to the Appeals Chamber by each of the Accused present. The Trial Chamber found that the Accused were members of a joint criminal enterprise (JCE) aimed at creating a Croatian entity in BiH that would facilitate the reunification of the Croatian people. It further found that the common criminal purpose of the JCE was the domination by Croats of the Croatian Community (later Republic) of Herceg-Bosna (HZ(R)HB) through the ethnic cleansing of the Muslim population implemented across several municipalities and detention centres between 1993 and 1994. On 29 May 2013, the Trial Chamber convicted the Accused of 21 war crimes and crimes against humanity arising from the alleged JCE to ethnically cleanse Muslims from the HZ(R)HB. All six Accused and the Prosecution appealed on multiple legal and factual grounds. In addition to their respective appeals, the parties were invited to answer a number of questions posed by the Appeals Chamber.

Contents

ICTY News..... Page 1

MICT News..... Page 5

News from International Courts... Page 7

News from the region..... Page 8

Looking Back..... Page 9

Articles and blogs..... Page 10

Events and Opportunities..... Page 11

Jadranko Prlić, President of the HZ(R)HB, received a 25-year sentence. Prlić shared the two hours allotted for submissions in chief with his Counsel. During his submissions, Prlić addressed, *inter alia*, the contextual situation in BiH at the time of the alleged crimes, which he claims the Trial Chamber failed to take into consideration adequately; that the Croatian Defence Council (HVO), the military component of the HZ(R)HB, was a temporary body established in self defence; and that the HVO was a legal component of the armed forces of BiH (ABiH).

Prlić's Defence Counsel described the "pattern of calculated neglect of evidence, abject disregard of context, and a reckless abandonment of fairness" in the Trial Judgement. Additionally, he asserted that Prlić's entire defence was ignored by the Trial Chamber as was relevant evidence that did not fit with the Trial Chamber's findings. This issue was raised by virtually all defence teams in various contexts.

The Prosecution Response focused on Prlić's power and authority, which they claim would have enabled him to further the common criminal purpose.

Bruno Stojić served in the HZHB as Head of the Department of Defence between July 1992 and November 1993. Stojić was sentenced to 20 years imprisonment. Among other arguments, the Defence contended that the aim of the HVO was to protect both Croatian and other peoples

within the community who were under attack. The Defence continued by highlighting the Chamber's disregard of the cooperation between the HVO and the ABiH, including via the means of supplying military arms support and logistic assistance, and showed documentary evidence indicating that this cooperation continued during the indictment period and the alleged JCE. The Defence moreover addressed the issue of Stojić's *mens rea* for JCE, arguing that the Trial Chamber failed to make the requisite findings on his shared intent or knowledge.

The Prosecution responded by stating that the Trial Chamber reasonably found that there was a state of occupation on the grounds of direct intervention of Croatia's armed forces and Croatia's overall control over the HVO. It further alleged that Stojić was in a position of power and that he knew of the crimes being committed by the HVO, and he allowed the victimisation of Muslims. They argued that Stojić had the material ability to prevent and punish those crimes.

Slobodan Praljak was the Commander of the Main Staff of the Croatian Defence between July and November 1993 and was sentenced to 20 years for his alleged role in the crimes. The Praljak Defence focussed on whether the conflict at the time was international in nature as found by the Trial Chamber. Counsel argued that the Trial Chamber established only limited and vague assistance from Croatia to the HVO and ABiH. Counsel further argued that the Trial Chamber failed to establish that all the

members of the JCE agreed to the alleged common criminal purpose.

The Defence addressed the events in Duša, arguing that the presence of members of the BiH army in the village provides legitimacy to the military actions of the HVO, demonstrating that these actions were not directed against the civilian population. Praljak addressed the Appeals Chamber briefly at the end of his counsel's submissions.

The Prosecution contended that Praljak was one of the most important members of the JCE, alleging that he promoted ethnic separation and the reconstitution of the borders of the 1939 Banovina. The Prosecution further argued that Praljak contributed to the crimes committed in Gornji Vakuf, Prozor, and Mostar, that he did nothing to stop or prevent crimes by his subordinates, and that he intended to spread terror amongst the population in East Mostar.

Milivoj Petković was the Chief of the HVO Main Staff between April 1992 and July 1993. He was sentenced to 20 years imprisonment. Defence Counsel argued that his conviction for crimes committed in Gornji Vakuf as part of the JCE III should be reversed as the events that occurred could not have led to the conclusion that the HVO actions in the municipality amounted to the furthering of the common criminal plan of ethnic cleansing. Moreover, the Defence maintained that there were no Muslims removed from Jablanica or Prozor and that

the ethnic composition of those areas remained unchanged.

The Defence addressed the issue that the ABiH launched an offensive in June 1993 and that Muslim soldiers within the HVO had deserted to join the ABiH, leading to the loss of control over certain areas in the Mostar region. The Defence argued that Petković warned that clashes between the HVO and ABiH should be avoided and that the common enemy should be fought instead. The Defence further asserted that Petković was highly involved in peace negotiations, and ordered cease-fires.

The Prosecution in their response stated, amongst other arguments, that Petković was one of the most important members of the JCE, and that in his position he significantly contributed to the ethnic cleansing campaign via planning and directing attacks to drive out Muslims. They further alleged that he ordered and authorised the use of Muslims for illegal forced labour, and that he had authority over the HVO detention centres.

Valentin Ćorić served in the government of the HZ(R)HB as Chief of the Military Police Administration in 1992 and 1993. He was sentenced to 16 years imprisonment. Ćorić's Defence addressed the Trial Chamber's finding that there was a clear pattern of conduct of the HVO attacks, arguing that no such conclusion can be drawn from the evidence at hand. The Defence also addressed the shelling of the house with civilians in Duša, and argued that the Trial Chamber erred in making a general categorisation of shells as inherently indiscriminate weapons without doing a proper analysis.

Moreover, the Defence noted that Ćorić did not receive combat reports nor have command authority over military operations, nor even over the Military Police when participating in those operations, and that he was not present in the combat zone in Gornji Vakuf. According to the Defence, Ćorić was never part of any JCE or common criminal purpose. It was submitted that Ćorić reprimanded, dismissed and criminally reported in certain instances perpetrators or crimes within the military police.

The Prosecution alleged that Ćorić was a willing and significant participant in the JCE. The Prosecution further argued that Ćorić was shielding HVO perpetrators from criminal responsibility for brutal expulsions of civilians from West Mostar. The Military police, according to the Prosecution, participated in evicting Muslims in Gornji Vakuf, Stolac and Čapljina, as well as abused detainees in the detention centres and expelled thousands of them.

Berislav Pušić held various posts within the military police of the Croatian Defence Council until July 1993, and in August 1993 he became the Head of the Commission for HVO prisoners and detention centres. Pušić was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment. His Defence stated that there is no evidence of a JCE in this case. Furthermore, they noted that the Banovina reunification theory is a non-criminal and political plan. The Defence highlighted that the Trial Chamber made no finding that Pušić had any direct authority over prisoners, prison wardens, or prison staff in any facility, and that no finding was made that he had any power over military personnel stationed at the detention centres.

The Prosecution responded that Pušić was a trusted implementer of the common criminal plan. As head of the exchange service, Pušić is alleged to have played an important role in the JCE. They further contended that Pušić's contribution to the common plan was through the authorisation of the use of Muslim detainees for dangerous unlawful forced labour, using his powers over the detainees to remove them from Herceg-Bosna.

In its appeal, the Prosecution identified four grounds of appeal. The first ground concerns various factual and legal issues related to the Trial Chambers adjudication of JCE III crimes. The second ground related to the failure of the Trial Chamber to completely adjudicate by not adjudicating all the modes of responsibility charged in the indictment. The third ground concerned the alleged technical oversight in the Chamber's misapplication of the cumulative convictions rules. Lastly, the prosecution appealed the sentences issued by the Trial Chamber. The Prosecution asked in their appeal for 40 years imprisonment for Prlić, Stojić, Praljak and Peković, 35 year for Ćorić, and 25 years for Pušić.

At the end of the Hearing, each Accused present made brief statements to the Appeals Chamber. The Accused expressed sympathy for the victims of war, endeavoured to explain the harsh realities and confusion on the ground at the time, and their best attempts in a difficult situation to ameliorate or mitigate the consequences of the conflict.

The Appeals Judgment is set to be delivered by November 2017.

Prosecutor v. Mladić (IT-09-92-T)

On 20 March 2017, the Defence for Ratko Mladić filed an '[Emergency and Urgent Motion for Provisional Release of Ratko Mladić based on Humanitarian and Medical Grounds](#)'. The motion states that there are serious medical grounds why Mladić should be provisionally released to Russia for medical treatment. It states that Mladić's health is gravely endangered by both chronic and new, emergent complaints which are exacerbated by continued detention.

Mladić has been previously treated in the UN Detention Unit (UNDU) and also the Bronovo hospital in The Hague but the Defence states that these complaints have not been sufficiently treated as various available testing and therapy that is

recognised and commonly accepted within the medical community have not been pursued.

Russia has given assurances that should the provisional release be granted then they would ensure that all conditions set by the Tribunal are adhered to, this was confirmed by a [Press Release](#) which was issued by the Russian Embassy.

The medical records of Mladić have only been recently released to the Accused, his family and his counsel for review. It is stated that serious concerns have been raised by no fewer than three medical professionals, two of whom are certified court medical experts. Three Russian doctors have recommended

an immediate and thorough clinical and laboratory control and a series of instrumental examinations at their institute to properly treat Mladić and preserve his health.

The Defence state that Mladić is not a flight risk as the treatment he requires is incompatible with a 'life on the run'. In their *Note Verbale*, Russia has also confirmed that they will ensure that all conditions set by the Trial Chamber are followed to ensure Mladić does not abscond.

The Defence request Mladić's provisional release and state that the conditions for release have been met and that it is the only just, humane and medically sound course of action that can ensure that Mladić will see the trial judgment.

Jojić et al (IT-03-67-R77.5)

On 14 February 2017, Trial Chamber I issued an order to the Registry to address Interpol seeking the distribution of a red notice in relation to the Accused on the basis of the previously issued Arrest Warrants.

Petar Jojić, Jovo Ostojić and Vjerica Radeta were charged with contempt of the Tribunal in December 2014 and arrest warrants were issued in January 2015. The Chamber has stated that Serbia's lack of adherence can only be interpreted as harbouring an unwillingness to execute the arrest warrants and therefore they have issued this request for the assistance of Interpol. Red notices were issued by Interpol on 24 March 2017.



Vjerica Radeta, Petar Jojić and Jovo Ostojić

MICT News

Prosecutor v. Stanišić & Simatović (MICT-15-96-PT)

On 17 March, the Defence filed a motion for partial reconsideration of the Trial Chamber's decision on Stanišić's Request for stay of proceedings. The request relates to the dismissal of the Defence requests to recognize Stanišić's acquittals on counts relating to the planning and ordering modes of liability. The Defence raises this issue for reconsideration as the Chamber failed to appreciate the distinction between the Appeals Chamber's approach to joint criminal enterprise and aiding and abetting modes of liability with the approach taken to the planning and ordering modes of liability. The Appeals Chamber quashed the verdicts reached in the first modes of liability but did not in the latter one. In the case there are multiple modes of liability alleged under the same count and the Trial Chamber considered each one separately and came to an individualised verdict.

The absence of any verdict quashing the acquittal raises two legal consequences namely that in the Chamber's interpretation of the *non bis in idem* principle, the Court lacks jurisdiction to hear a prosecution on these causes of action; and the Prosecution's pursuit of convictions for those causes of action amount to an abuse of process. For these reasons the Defence argues that there is a clear error of reasoning and that this error may lead to *ultra vires* convictions. The Defence therefore submits that the planning

and ordering modes of liability should be removed from the indictment.

The Defence argues that the threshold for reconsideration is satisfied as it is appropriate to reconsider where there is a clear error of reasoning which has been demonstrated or in circumstances where it is necessary to prevent an injustice. In the Stanišić case the Defence argues that injustice arose in the Prosecution's charges of grave crimes under direct participation; and the reasoning which led to the failure to recognise the significance of the absence of any ruling quashing the verdicts of acquittal is a clear error.

Prosecutor v. Karadžić (MICT-13-55)

On 16 March 2017, Radovan Karadžić filed his Response Brief in answer to the Prosecution Appeal Brief filed on 5 December 2016. Karadžić agreed with the Prosecution that the Trial Chamber's Judgment was "flawed" and that it "warrants careful scrutiny". However, notwithstanding the numerous deficiencies within the Trial Judgment, Karadžić submitted that the Prosecution Appeal is bound to fail.

In his Response to Prosecution Ground 1, Karadžić demonstrated that the Prosecution has been categorically unable to locate any findings to support the conclusion that the JCE III 'Excluded' Crimes came within the scope of the common criminal purpose at any time. Karadžić further stated that the

Prosecution has failed to show that the Trial Chamber's identification of another reasonable inference, inconsistent with the guilt of the Accused beyond a reasonable doubt under JCE I, was a legal or factual error. In addition, Karadžić responded that Prosecution assertions regarding individual and shared criminal intent are misconceived, and that there is no impact on the Trial Chamber's analysis of genocidal intent in the Municipalities of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

In his Response to Prosecution Ground 2, Karadžić agreed with the Prosecution that the Trial Chamber failed to provide a reasoned opinion. However, a careful analysis revealed that the *Actus Reus* of genocide had not been established, that the correct interpretation of the Geneva conventions is that intent to destroy a group, rather than the individuals, is required, and that intent had not been demonstrated in any event.

In his Response to Prosecution Ground 3, Karadžić observed that any attempt to establish genocidal intent on his part in the municipalities as a whole or in Prijedor specifically is unsustainable, and notes that any such finding would be inconsistent with decades of findings at the Tribunal, and within international customary law, regarding this issue.

In his Response to Prosecution Ground 4, Karadžić refutes the Prosecution contention that a sentence of life imprisonment was required.



Radovan Karadžić

Karadžić further stated that, without prejudice to his Appeal, which demonstrates that his sentence was manifestly excessive, the Trial Chamber was within its discretion not to impose life imprisonment.

Prosecutor v. Ngirabatware (MICT-12-29)

On 6 March, President of the MICT, Theodor Meron, issued a decision on the non-compliance of the Republic of Turkey of its obligation to cooperate with the Mechanism. Judge Aydin Sefa Akay, a member of the bench of the Appeals Chamber has been detained in the Turkey on or around 21 September 2016 in relation to allegations connected with the events of July 2016 directed against the constitutional order of Turkey. Meron, ordered the Government of the Turkey on 31 January 2017, to cease all legal proceedings against Judge Akay and take all necessary measures to ensure his release as soon as practicable but not later than 14 February 2017 in order for Judge Akay to continue with his judicial functions in the case. The Appeals Chamber has concluded that the Turkey has failed to comply with the orders given as they have

not released Judge Akay from his detention and the deadline of 14 February has long passed. Meron has furthermore not received any information indicating that the legal proceedings are ceased and that the Judge has been released. The Republic of Turkey has also failed to communicate with the Mechanism in relation to this case.

Meron concluded that the Turkey failed to comply with its obligation to cooperate with the Mechanism in relation to the proceedings in the case and to comply without undue delay with a judicial order issued by the Mechanism. The matter shall be reported to the United Nations Security Council. Meron reported the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the Security Council on 9 March for its failure to take action to comply with the order send on 31 January 2017.

In a newspaper article written on 15 March, it became clear that Judge Akay was brought before the Ankara Criminal Court. He is charged with being a member of a terror group with links to the organisation of Fethullah Gulen, the US-based preacher allegedly blamed for the July coup. He specifically stands accused by Turkish authorities of downloading and using a messaging app which is allegedly used by plotters to prepare the coup. In his statement, Judge Akay denied the charges saying he is not a member of the Gulen's group. He admitted downloading the app but had not used any password to access the system. The lawyers for Judge Akay called for his release as he enjoys immunity due to his status but the Court denied his release

and kept him under arrest setting a next hearing for 13 April.

Judge Akay has been appointed as a member of the Bench of the Appeals Chamber in the case of Ngirabatware who is seeking review of his judgment. Ngirabatware seeks modifications to his conditions of detention as a result of the continuing detention of Judge Akay which delays his proceedings. His requests are that he be detained in a safe house in Arusha, or be detained at the UNDF but allowed to leave the UNDF for eleven hours each day, or, be detained at the United Nations Detention Unit in The Hague (UNDU). Meron ordered that all requests for modifications of the conditions of detentions should be made before him and that he will supervise the conditions of detention of detainees under the authority of the Mechanism at either the UNDF or the UNDU. The President has denied the motion as Ngirabatware has failed to demonstrate exceptional circumstances which would demand modifications of his conditions of detention. Ngirabatware can renew his application for modification by 9 June 2017.



Judge Aydin Sefa Akay

News from other International Courts



Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia

Alice Potin, AO An Defence Team

The views expressed herein are those of the author alone and do not reflect the views of the ECCC.

Nuon Chea Defence

Throughout February 2017, the Nuon Chea Defence Team has been preparing Nuon Chea's 550-page closing brief in Case 002/02, which due on 24 April 2017. The Defence Team's preparations include drafting, extensive case file review, and legal and factual research.

Khieu Samphân Defence

In February 2017, the KHIEU Samphân Defence Team was fully engaged in preparing its final brief in Case 002/02.

Meas Muth Defence

In February 2017, the Meas Muth Defence filed one Request to the Co-Investigating Judges and two Responses to Requests filed by the International Co-Prosecutor, which have all been classified as confidential. The Defence continues to review material on the

Case File and to prepare submissions to protect Mr. Meas Muth's fair trial rights and interests.

Im Chaem Defence

On 22 February, the IM Chaem Defence Team welcomed the decision of the Co-Investigating Judges to dismiss all charges against Ms. IM Chaem and as a consequence, to reject all civil party applications.

The Defence is currently preparing for a potential response to an appeal against the Closing Order and endeavours to safeguard Ms. IM Chaem's fair trial rights and interests throughout the remaining proceedings of the pre-trial stage of Case 004/1.

Ao An Defence

In February, the AO An Defence filed an Application to Annul Written Records of

Interview of Three Investigators to the Pre-Trial Chamber as well as a Reply to the International Co-Prosecutor's Response to AO An's Application of the same. The Defence also filed a Notice of Appeal against Notification on the Interpretation of 'Attack Against the Civilian Population' in the

Context of Crimes Against Humanity With Regard to a State's or Regime's Own Armed Forces. Finally, the Defence continues to review all materials on the Case File and prepare other filings to safeguard Mr. AO An's fair trial rights and interests.

Yim Tith Defence

The Yim Tith Defence continued to analyse the contents of the Case File in order to participate in the investigation, prepare Mr. Yim Tith's defence and endeavour to protect his fair trial rights.



Meas Muth



Ao An



Yim Tith

News from the Region

Bosnia and Herzegovina



Bosnian Ex-Soldier jailed in US for War Crimes Lies

A former Bosnian Army soldier was jailed for 18 months in the US and his citizenship was revoked for lying to the immigration officials about his role in crimes committed during the war. Slobodan Marić had been living in Jacksonville after becoming a US citizen

in 2002 but pleaded guilty to unlawful procurement of naturalization.

He admitted that he did not disclose the information that he was in the Bosnian Army and that he committed crimes during the

1992-95 war. According to his plea agreement he selected detainees for other guards to abuse, he directly participated in abusing several prisoners and sent prisoners on dangerous and deadly work on the front line of the conflict.



Croatia

Bosnian Croat Veterans Demand Payment of Pensions

Bosnian Croat war veterans are demanding that they be paid their pensions by Croatia after many years of delay. They claim that they have not been paid the pensions they earned while fighting with the Croatian Defence Council in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The group of veterans' unions representing Croatian Defence Council fighters from the 1992-95 war in Bosnia and Herzegovina sent

an open letter on 29 March to the Croatian government asking when they will be told when they will receive their veterans' pensions.

They said they are due the pension payments under an agreement between Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina dating back to 2006. They are missing pensions from 2007, 2008

and 2009, and had been told these would be paid around Christmas 2016, the letter added.

"Waiting month after month is not acceptable to us, and we do not think a serious state should have this kind of attitude towards the wartime invalids of the Croatian Defence Council who were retired under a bilateral treaty," the letter said.



Serbia

Belgrade Prison Chief Acquitted of 'Kidnapping' Milošević

The former warden of Belgrade Central Prison, Dragisa Blanusa, was found not guilty of kidnapping Slobodan Milošević and sending him to The Hague. On 20 March, the Higher Court in Belgrade cleared Blanusa of kidnapping and abusing his position to take photographs. According to the charges,

Blanusa allowed unknown persons to move Milošević from Belgrade on 28 June 2001 to The Hague. The judge decided there was no proof that Blanusa had done anything without an order from the court. Blanusa stated that now he "will try and forget the past 16 years" and everything which had

happened to him and his family. After Milošević was transferred to The Hague, Blanusa was dismissed from his position by Justice Minister Vladan Batic. The family lawyer of Milošević said that they would be appealing the verdict.

Looking Back...

International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR)

Five years ago...

On 17 April 2012, the Appeals Chambers of the ICTR dismissed a motion filed by Jean Uwinkindi where he requested a stay for his transfer to Rwanda. Uwinkindi argued that he will not have a fair trial in the national court of Rwanda. The Defence argued that there was 'compelling evidence' that in an

earlier trial before the High court of Rwanda, the national prosecuting authority acted inconsistently with any respect for the defendant's right to a fair trial. The Appeals Chamber decided it was unlikely there would be violations of the right to fair trial especially with the monitoring by the ICTR

in place. Unwikindi was transferred to the national court system in Rwanda and was sentenced to life imprisonment in 2015 by the High Court of Rwanda. This was the first case where the ICTR transferred a case to a national court system.

International Criminal Court (ICC)

Ten years ago...

On 27 April 2007, The Pre-Trial Chamber issued arrest warrants against Ahmad Muhammad Harun and Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman. The warrant of arrest against Ahmad Harun lists 42 counts on the of crimes against humanity and war crimes. The warrant of arrest against Ali Kushayb lists 50 counts of crimes against humanity and war crimes. These crimes are alleged to have taken place in Darfur. Ahmad Harun

served from 2003 to 2005 as Minister of the State for the Interior of the Government of Sudan and allegedly in charge of the management of the "Darfur Security Desk" thereby coordinating the different bodies of the government involved in the counter-insurgency, including the Police, the Armed Forces, the National Security and Intelligence Service and the Janjaweed militia.

Ali Kushayb, one of the most senior leaders in the tribal hierarchy in the Wadi Salih locality and member of the Popular Defence Forces (PDF), allegedly commanded thousands of Janjaweed militia from on or about August 2003 until on or about He is alleged to have implemented the counter-insurgency strategy of the Government of Sudan that also resulted in the commission of war crimes and crimes against humanity.

International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY)

Fifteen years ago...

On 11 April 2002, the Trial Chamber of the ICTY ordered the release for Nenad Banović withdrawing the indictment against him. The order resulted from a Prosecution Motion to the Trial Chamber filed in March 2002 to withdraw the indictment against Banović.

The original indictment was confirmed in July 1995 where Banović was charged on the basis of individual criminal responsibility

with five counts of crimes against humanity (persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds; inhumane acts; murder and torture) and four counts of violations of the laws or customs of war (outrages upon personal dignity; murder; torture and cruel treatment).

The Office of the Prosecutor filed a motion to withdraw the indictment against Banović on the grounds that there was no sufficient

evidence to proceed to trial against Banović. The Defence motion supporting this was filed on behalf of Banović on 4 April 2002.

The Trial Chamber stated in their decision that it is in the interest of justice to restore Banović's right to liberty without delay and therefore granted the motion to withdraw the indictment and ordered his immediate release. Banović had been in custody from November 2001.

Blog Updates and Online Lectures

Blog Updates

The Round Up - European Court unveils controversial new ruling. Blog by Poppy Rimington-Pounder. Blog is available [here](#).

Hope for Justice in Syria from an Unlikely Source. Blog by David Tolbert. Blog is available [here](#).

The Evacuation of Eastern Aleppo: Humanitarian Obligation or War Crime? Blog by Elvina Pothelet. Blog is available [here](#).

Online Lectures and Videos

Lecture on Universal State Participation in the ICC by Helen Stacy. Lecture is available [here](#).

Military Intervention by Invitation in the 21st Century by Erika de Wet. Lecture is available [here](#).

Fair Trial in International Criminal Justice by Justice Hassan B. Jallow. Lecture is available [here](#).

Publications and Articles

Books

Steven R. Ratner **'The Thin Justice of International Law'** (2017). Oxford University Press

Cassandra Steer, **'Translating Guilt - Identifying Leadership Liability for Mass Atrocity Crimes'** (2017). Asser Press

Steven P. Remy, **'The Malmedy Massacre: The War Crimes Trial Controversy'** (2017). Amazon

Richard H. McAdams, **'The Expressive Powers of Law'** (2017). Harvard University Press

Articles

'Introduction to Symposium on Cybersecurity and the Changing International Law of Data' by Fleur Johns and Annelise Riles in the American Society of International Law, Volume 110, pp. 335-336

'There are not Enemies after Victory: The Law Against Killing the Wounded' by Matthew Milikowsky in the Georgetown Law Journal, Volume 47, Issue 4, pp. 1221-1269

'Citizens Attitudes toward Errors in Criminal Justice: Implications of the Declining Acceptance of Blackstone's Ratio' by M.Xiong, R. Greenleaf and J.Goldschmidt in the International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice. Volume 48, pp. 14-26

Calls for Papers

The Center for International Criminal Justice has issued a call for papers on the topic: 'Punishing International Crimes in Domestic Courts'. Deadline: 15 April 2017. For more information, click [here](#).

The Hague Justice Journal has issued a call for papers on the topic: 'ICTY Legacy'. Deadline: 28 April 2017. For more information, click [here](#).

Events

Crime, Justice and the Liberalism of Fear: an Ideological Appraisal

Date: 26 April 2017

Location: University of Southampton

For more information, click [here](#)

The Revival of Nuremberg: ICTY – a Milestone for the Fight against Impunity?

Date: 5-6 May 2017

Location: Nuremberg Academy

For more information, click [here](#).

The Birth of the ICC Office of the Prosecutor: Historicity, Model, Deterrence?

Date: 29 April 2017

Location: Nuremberg Academy

For more information, click [here](#).

Forensic and DNA Evidence Advocacy with Colleen Rohan

Date: 13 May 2017

Location: ADC-ICTY, The Hague

For more information, click [here](#).

Opportunities

Adviser/Researcher on Refugees, London

Amnesty International

Deadline: 6 April 2017

For more information, click [here](#).

Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer (Human Trafficking and Migrant Smuggling) (P-3), Vienna

Office on Drugs and Crime

Deadline: 13 April 2017

For more information, click [here](#).

Protection Associate, Brussels

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Deadline: 7 April 2017

For more information, click [here](#).

Law Clerk to Judges of the Court (Associate Legal Officer) (P-2), The Hague

International Court of Justice

Deadline: 15 April 2017

For more information, click [here](#).

JOIN US...

Full, Associate and Affiliate Membership available to practitioners, young professionals and students.

Benefits include:

- Monthly Opportunities Bulletin
- Reduced Training Fees
- Networking Opportunities www.adc-icty.org