

Contents

1 Introduction	1
1.1 Definitions of International Crimes, State Sovereignty and Cosmopolitanism	2
1.2 Why Do We Need a Definition for Terrorism?	7
1.3 Terrorism and the ICC: Why Terrorism Was Not Included into the Rome Statute	9
1.3.1 Efforts to Include Terrorism into the Rome Statute	9
1.3.2 Why Terrorism Was Not Included into the Rome Statute	12
1.4 State Sovereignty Theories and International Law	16
1.4.1 State-Centric Theory and Cosmopolitanism in International Law	16
1.4.2 Procedural and Substantive Issues of the Relationship Between State Sovereignty and International Criminal Law	19
1.5 The Architecture of the Book: The Interplay Between State Sovereignty Theories and Cosmopolitanism on the Process of Criminalisation and Definition of Aggression and Terrorism	22
References	24
2 State Sovereignty, Cosmopolitanism and the International Criminal Court	27
2.1 Introduction	28
2.2 The Two Theories	29
2.2.1 The Traditional State-Centric Theory About the Relationship Between Sovereignty and International Law	29
2.2.2 Cosmopolitan Theory and International Law	31
2.3 Sovereignty and International Law: The UN Charter Provisions	34

2.4	Sovereignty and International Law: The Rome Statute and the Principle of Complementarity	39
2.4.1	Complementarity in Principle	40
2.4.2	Complementarity in Practice	47
2.4.3	The Applicability of the Complementarity Regime on Cases of Aggression.	51
2.5	Conclusion	57
	References	58
3	The Paradigm of Aggression: State-Centric and Cosmopolitan Approaches in the Effort to Outlaw and Criminalise Aggression.	63
3.1	Introduction	64
3.2	The Covenant of the League of Nations: A Cosmopolitan Idea with a State-Centric Application	65
3.3	A Cosmopolitan Approach: ‘Crimes Against Peace’ Under the Nuremberg and Tokyo Charters.	69
3.4	A State-Centric Approach: ‘Act of Aggression’ Under the UN Charter and UNGA Resolution 3314	72
3.4.1	The Discretionary Powers of the Security Council Under UN Charter Article 39.	72
3.4.2	The UNGA Resolution 3314: A Poor Legal Precedent	75
3.5	Conclusion	77
	References	78
4	The Paradigm of Aggression: The Kampala Definition and Lessons Learnt for the Purpose of Defining International Terrorism	81
4.1	Introduction	82
4.2	The ‘Leadership Requirement’ Clause	85
4.3	Act of Aggression: The Threshold Clause	88
4.4	Sovereignty Versus Cosmopolitan Dynamics in the Context of the ICC’s Jurisdiction Over the Crime of Aggression	92
4.4.1	The Issue of Consistency with the UN Charter and the Role of the Security Council	92
4.4.2	Article 15 <i>bis</i> : A Fair Compromise?.	95
4.5	Lessons Learnt from the Paradigm of Aggression	97
4.5.1	How the ‘Leadership Requirement’ Clause of the Definition of Aggression Serves Cosmopolitan Purposes in the Context of Criminalising Terrorism	98
4.5.2	Why the ‘Manifest Violation’ Threshold in the Definition of Aggression Does Not Effectively Address the Issue of Balancing State-Centric and Cosmopolitan Concerns and Should Be Abandoned in the Context of Criminalising Terrorism.	100

4.5.3	How Article 15 <i>bis</i> is a Manifestation of Some Pragmatic Limitations to Cosmopolitan Aspirations in the Context of the ICC's Exercise of Jurisdiction.	102
4.6	Conclusion	105
	References	106
5	The Paradigm of Terrorism: State-Centric and Cosmopolitan Approaches in Some Current Efforts Towards Its Criminalisation	109
5.1	Introduction	110
5.2	Why Terrorism Should Be Introduced into the Article 5 Crimes of the Rome Statute	112
5.2.1	A Brief Historical Account of the Efforts to Criminalise Terrorism	112
5.2.2	International Jurisdiction Over Terrorism as a More Effective Response to Terrorist Acts	115
5.2.3	The Question of the Inclusion of Treaty Crimes into the Rome Statute	121
5.3	How State Sovereignty Concerns Have Influenced the Process of Criminalising International Terrorism in Prominent Anti-Terrorist Security Council Resolutions	125
5.3.1	'Threat to the Peace', 'Armed Attack' or Both? The Pro-State Sovereignty Ambiguity of Resolution 1368	126
5.3.2	Resolution 1373: Security Council Legislation Without UN Definition	130
5.4	Pro-Cosmopolitan Efforts to Define and Criminalise International Terrorism	135
5.4.1	Judicial Activism Versus State Sovereignty: A Customary Law Definition of International Terrorism?	135
5.4.2	The UNGA Draft Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism: A Road to Balance?	138
5.5	Conclusion	140
	References	141
6	A Definition of Terrorism in the Making: Balancing State Interests with Cosmopolitan Ideals	145
6.1	Analysing Existing Definitions for Terrorism in International and Regional Instruments: Common Ground and Points of Contention	146
6.1.1	A Comparative Analysis of the Definition of the Financing of Terrorism Convention and Definitions in Regional and Domestic Law Instruments	147

6.1.2	The Definition of the UN Draft Comprehensive Convention on Terrorism.	153
6.1.3	The Appeal's Chamber Decision of the UN Special Tribunal for Lebanon	156
6.2	Reaching the Required Balance: How the Consented, Contested and the 'Internationality' Elements Can Contribute to the Creation of Due Balance Between State-Centric and Cosmopolitan Concerns in Defining Terrorism.	161
6.2.1	'Creation of a State of Terror', the Intention to Influence Politics and the Political/Ideological Motive Requirement	161
6.2.2	Exemption of Activities of Particular Groups or Individuals.	166
6.2.3	The International Element of a Terrorist Act	168
	References	174
7	Conclusion	177
7.1	Putting the Pieces Together	178
	Reference	184
	Index	185



<http://www.springer.com/978-94-6265-203-3>

Defining International Terrorism
Between State Sovereignty and Cosmopolitanism

Margariti, S.

2017, XI, 186 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-94-6265-203-3

A product of T.M.C. Asser Press