

Overview

Abbreviations	21
1. Introduction and scope of inquiry	25
1.1. Motives	25
1.2. An inter-disciplinary and multi-language approach	28
1.3. The Corrie case example	29
1.4. References	30
2. The commission of crimes by business actors	33
2.1. Preliminary remarks: Interpreting the Rome Statute	34
2.2. Commission in Article 25 (3) RS in ICC jurisprudence and scholarship	39
2.2.1. ICC jurisprudence on commission and Article 25 (3) RS	40
2.2.2. Commission and Article 25 (3) RS in scholarly contributions	48
2.2.3. Results and outlook: Implications for the scope of individual business actors' responsibility under the Rome Statute	54
2.3. Review of perspectives on commission in ICC jurisprudence and scholarship	56
2.3.1. The ambivalent text of the Rome Statute	56
2.3.2. The legal certainty perspective: More ambivalence	62
2.3.3. The punishment perspective: A superior expressive capacity of modes of participation as degrees of responsibility?	64
2.3.4. Commission and attribution: A comparative perspective under Article 21 (1) (c) RS?	66
2.3.5. Results and outlook: Towards overcoming ambivalence	75

2.4. Law and reality structures: Re-conceiving commission	75
2.4.1. Commission and the law's subject matter: A typological approach to perpetration	76
2.4.2. The type of commission under the Rome Statute	94
2.4.3. The subject-matter's influence on attribution, criminality, and individual degrees of responsibility	128
2.4.4. Commission and Article 25 (3) RS: Re-visiting the text from a typological perspective	150
2.4.5. Commission and joint criminal enterprise: Lessons learned?	157
2.4.6. Results and outlook: Business actors' individual criminal responsibility for commission	168
2.5. Social value of conduct, Article 21 (3) RS and the ICC as a just global institution	171
2.5.1. The notions of proximity and remoteness	172
2.5.2. Focusing on intent: The Rome Statute's alleged underinclusiveness vis-à-vis acts of business exchange	173
2.5.3. The emergence of the risk standard	201
2.5.4. Risk permissions from a human rights perspective: Liberty vs. security and business activity	212
2.5.5. Results	296
2.5.6. Excursus: A customary law perspective on risk permissions? Business activity post-Nuremberg under Article 21 (1) (b) RS	297
2.6. Conclusion	299
2.7. References	300
3. Business actors as civilian superiors	326
3.1. Civilian «effective authority and control» in scholarship and jurisprudence	326
3.1.1. Scholarly views on business actors as civilian superiors	327
3.1.2. The Bemba case and ad hoc jurisprudence: A critical prognosis	330
3.1.3. Results and outlook	342
3.2. Omission as a type and business actors as civilian superiors	343
3.2.1. Schünemann's typological perspective on omission	343

3.2.2. A typological perspective on omission under the Rome Statute: The genesis of Article 28 RS and the Rome Statute's omission type	344
3.2.3. Results and outlook: Business leaders as civilian superiors and the question of social desirability	359
3.3. A risk permission for civilian superiors?	360
3.3.1. Scholarship on conscious disregard	361
3.3.2. Balancing human rights as principles	362
3.3.3. Result: No risk permission for business leaders as civilian superiors	363
3.4. Conclusion	364
3.5. References	364
4. Corporate criminal responsibility de lege ferenda?	369
4.1. The Rome Conference proposal and its discussion in scholarship	370
4.2. Corporate criminal responsibility under the constraints of reality	372
4.2.1. Criminal sanctions against corporate actors: A disjunction between burden and responsibility?	374
4.2.2. Non-criminal sanctions against corporate actors under the Rome Statute: The Rome Statute as criminal law?	381
4.3. Excursus: The corporate organization as a black box?	384
4.3.1. The «corporate veil»	385
4.3.2. ...and how to lift it	386
4.3.3. Domestic experiences	387
4.3.4. Result	387
4.4. Conclusion	388
4.5. References	389
5. Closing remarks	396
6. Annex: Abstract and Theses	397