International Justice v. Local Peace?

# Case Study of the Impact of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia on the Reconciliation Process in the Balkans.

The Reality of International Criminal Justice's Achievements with regard to Peace Building.

Pauline KIENLEN 2009/2010 Supervisor: Prof. Wolfgang Benedek European Training and Research Centre for Human Rights and Democracy University of Graz.

#### Abstract

In the last 60 years, international criminal justice has emerged with the declared objective of contributing to peace and reconciliation. While their social inputs were largely theorized, few empirical studies were conducted to ensure that international tribunals genuinely achieve these social objectives in the field. In the midst of the bloodshed that accompanied the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's dissolution, the United Nations Security Council decided to set up the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in order to contribute to the restoration and to the maintenance of peace in the region throughout accountability. Now that the "Hague Tribunal" is at the edge of its completion, it is the objective of this thesis to assess whether the Tribunal managed to positively influence dynamics of reconciliation in the territory of the former Yugoslavia.

### Acknowledgements

In the last five months, many people proved to be a great support to my thesis. While thanking my supervisor, Pr. Wolfgang Benedek, for his overall assistance; I wish to thank particularly Lisa Heschl, his assistant, who has been an extraordinary patient and exigent reader of my work. Also, I am particularly grateful to Florence Hartmann, whose detailed and energetic comments helped me to address the most complex parts of my developments. As well, I wish to thank Pr. Robert Austin and Pr. Joseph Marko for their feedback on the final version of my work.

Besides, I am thankful to my parents and particularly to my father, who has been a precious ear when I needed support. Also, I wish to thank my friends: Marilyn Belanger, for providing me with fruitful advises; Barbora Vágnerová, for encouraging me in the difficult moments; and Adam Trumbour for his great assistance at the final stage of my thesis.

Ultimately, I want to dedicate this thesis to all my interviewees in Bosnia, Austria and Kosovo, whose great responsiveness, time and help have been the pillar in the realization of my research.

# Table of contents

<ul> <li>The General Debate on Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Conflict S</li> <li>Wo Competitive or Complementary Interests?</li> <li>A. Definition of Concepts</li> <li>1. Justice and Accountability</li> </ul>	
A. Definition of Concepts	
-	
2. Peace and Reconciliation	
B. The Competitive Vision: Justice v. Peace	
1. Accountability and Prosecutions, a Threat for Peace talks?	12
2. The Risks of Jeopardizing a Fragile Peace	
3. The Limits of Victors' Justice	13
4. The Irrelevance of Law and Trial to Bring Reconciliation	14
C. The Complementary Vision: No Peace without Justice	
1. The Creation of a Culture of Accountability	
2. A Dissuasive Effect for the Commission of International Crimes	
3. The Settlement of Historical Injustice	
<ol> <li>A Relief for Victims</li> <li>The Establishment of a Historical Record Necessary For a Common T</li> </ol>	
<ul> <li>I. The International Legal Framework Regarding Justice, Accountability a prosecution of International Crimes</li> <li>A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecution</li> <li>1. The Definition of International Crimes</li> </ul>	19 ute 19 19
A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecu	19 ute 19 19 20 21
<ul> <li>A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosect</li> <li>1. The Definition of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosect</li> <li>2. Obligation to Prosecute: Who is Responsible?</li></ul>	19 ute 19 19 20 21 22 lization of
<ul> <li>A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>1. The Definition of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>2. Obligation to Prosecute: Who is Responsible?</li></ul>	19 ute 19 19 20 21 22 lization of 22
<ul> <li>A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>1. The Definition of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>2. Obligation to Prosecute: Who is Responsible?</li></ul>	19 ute 19 20 21 22 lization of 22 e and
<ul> <li>A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>1. The Definition of International Crimes</li></ul>	19 ute 19 19 20 21 22 lization of 22 e and 24
<ul> <li>A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>1. The Definition of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>2. Obligation to Prosecute: Who is Responsible?</li> <li>3. The (Quasi)Absence of Immunity for Official Agents</li> <li>B. The Development of International Criminal Justice</li> <li>1. From Nuremberg to the International Criminal Court: the Institutional International Criminal Justice</li> <li>2. The Ambition of International Criminal Justice: Accountability, Peace Reconciliation</li> <li>II. An Essential Aspect to Reconciliation: The Quality of Justice</li> </ul>	19 ute 19 20 21 22 lization of 22 e and 24 25
<ul> <li>A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>1. The Definition of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>2. Obligation to Prosecute: Who is Responsible?</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>1. The Definition of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>2. Obligation to Prosecute: Who is Responsible?</li> <li>3. The (Quasi)Absence of Immunity for Official Agents</li></ul>	19 ute 19 19 20 21 22 lization of 22 e and 24 25 25 25 25
<ul> <li>A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>1. The Definition of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>2. Obligation to Prosecute: Who is Responsible?</li> <li>3. The (Quasi)Absence of Immunity for Official Agents</li> <li>B. The Development of International Criminal Justice</li> <li>1. From Nuremberg to the International Criminal Court: the Institutional International Criminal Justice</li> <li>2. The Ambition of International Criminal Justice: Accountability, Peace Reconciliation.</li> <li>II. An Essential Aspect to Reconciliation: The Quality of Justice.</li> <li>A. Limits of Current International Criminal Justice</li> <li>1. The Retributive Approach</li> <li>2. A Common Law System</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>1. The Definition of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>2. Obligation to Prosecute: Who is Responsible?</li> <li>3. The (Quasi)Absence of Immunity for Official Agents</li> <li>B. The Development of International Criminal Justice</li> <li>1. From Nuremberg to the International Criminal Court: the Institutional International Criminal Justice</li> <li>2. The Ambition of International Criminal Justice: Accountability, Peace Reconciliation.</li> <li>II. An Essential Aspect to Reconciliation: The Quality of Justice.</li> <li>A. Limits of Current International Criminal Justice</li> <li>1. The Retributive Approach</li> <li>2. A Common Law System</li> <li>B. The Needs of Justice in Post conflict Societies</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>A. The Establishment of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>1. The Definition of International Crimes and the Obligation to Prosecut</li> <li>2. Obligation to Prosecute: Who is Responsible?</li> <li>3. The (Quasi)Absence of Immunity for Official Agents</li> <li>B. The Development of International Criminal Justice</li> <li>1. From Nuremberg to the International Criminal Court: the Institutional International Criminal Justice</li> <li>2. The Ambition of International Criminal Justice: Accountability, Peace Reconciliation.</li> <li>II. An Essential Aspect to Reconciliation: The Quality of Justice.</li> <li>A. Limits of Current International Criminal Justice</li> <li>1. The Retributive Approach</li> <li>2. A Common Law System</li> </ul>	19 ute 19 19 20 21 22 lization of 22 e and 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 27 27

A. The Context of its Creation : Secession of the Former Socialist Federal Republic of
Yugoslavia 31 -
B. The ICTY Establishment 32 -
C. The ICTY Mandate 33 -
1. The Tribunal's Competence 34 -
2. The Tribunal's Work 35 -
3. The Tribunal's Objectives 37 -
II. The Impact of the ICTY on the Reconciliation Process in the Balkans: its
Achievements and Failures 38 -
A. Positive Achievements of the ICTY with Regard to Reconciliation 39 -
1. An International Tribunal Indispensable for the Emergence of a Culture of
Accountability in the Former Yugoslavia 40 -
2. The Creation of a Legal Heritage and its Potential Impact on the Reconciliation
Process 42 -
B. Ongoing Failures of the ICTY with Regard to Reconciliation 44 -
1. General Disillusion due to Great Expectations 45 -
2. Frustrations due to the Tribunal's Functioning 46 -
3. The Lack of Outreach as an Aggravating Factor 69 -
4. The Limits of Individual Criminal Responsibility to Address Collective Violence
in the Balkans 76 -

## CHAPTER FOUR. COMPLEMENTARY ACTORS TO RECONCILIATION ...... - 88 -

I.	Other Judicial Actors	88 -
A.	The Potential of the International Court of Justice	88 -
В.	The Role of National Courts	91 -
II.	The Role of Non Judicial Actors	93 -
A.	Role of Politics	94 -
1.	. The Role of National Politicians in the Former Yugoslavia	94 -
2	. The Role of Foreign Governments	96 -
В.	The Role of Civil Society	97 -
1.	-	
2	•	
3		
C.		
1	C C	
2	. The Particular Role of the European Union	105 -
D.	A Crucial Factor for Changes: the Will of the People.	

## CHAPTER FIVE. CONCLUSION..... - 109 -

Bibliography	· 11	13 -
Annex 1. Questions for Interviews		