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Abstract

Heads of State represent not only their respective country whenever they are traveling abroad but they also reflect the sovereignty of their respective state. This is because Heads of State are said to be the ‘shadow’ of the state in the eyes of international law. Since the outbreak of World War I, a number of Heads of State have been investigated and prosecuted before national and international tribunals to end impunity of international crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity and the crime of aggression and to provide justice to the victims of the crimes. To do so, those who involved directly and indirectly to the commission of these crimes must be held responsible regardless of their positions. Based on doctrinal analysis, this paper analyses the position of the immunity of Heads of State under international law and concludes that immunity attached to Heads of State has to be set aside in order to end the impunity of the alleged crimes and to uphold justice to the victims of international crimes as a binding international law rule.
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INTRODUCTION

Before the outbreak of World War I, the ruler and State were considered as one and treated alike while enjoying absolute immunity or sovereign immunity75 under the principle of par in parem imperium non habet imperium.76 It reflects the principle of

sovereignty of States and subjecting States to a foreign court’s jurisdiction amounting to a violation of the principle of State sovereignty or equality.\textsuperscript{77}

However, this sovereign immunity was no longer applied after the outbreak of World War where many rulers or the Head of State have been using their immunity for the impunity in committing crimes. Still, customary international law provides the Head of State with immunity \textit{ratione personae} (personal or private immunity) and immunity \textit{ratione materiae} (official immunity).\textsuperscript{78}

This customary rule was crystallised and codified into the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations 1961 (VCDR)\textsuperscript{79} and ratified by almost all UN Member States.\textsuperscript{80} Thus, this paper briefly discusses the position of immunity of Heads of State under customary international law which is binding on states, regardless.

**CUSTOMARY INTERNATIONAL LAW RULE ON IMMUNITY**

Articles 29 and 31 of the VCDR provides that the diplomats shall be inviolable, not subject to arrest and enjoy an absolute immunity from criminal prosecution. Even though immunity under the VCDR only covers diplomats, their staffs and family, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in both the \textit{Arrest Warrant} Case\textsuperscript{81} and \textit{Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters} Case\textsuperscript{82} extended its application.

The ICJ in the above cases ruled that immunity under the VCDR should also be extended to State high-ranking officials. These high-ranking officials are the Head of State, Head of Government and Minister of Foreign Affairs, also known as the troika.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{77} Charter of the United Nations (24 October 1945) 1 UNTS XVI, art 2(1).
\textsuperscript{80} Almost all UN Member States are Parties to the VCDR where there are currently 192 States are Parties to the VCDR. See United Nations Treaty Collection, ‘Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations’ <https://treaties.un.org/pages/viewdetails.aspx?src=treaty&mtdsg_no=iii-3&chapter=3&lang=en> accessed 9 October 2020.
\textsuperscript{81} *Case Concerning the Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of Congo v Belgium)* (Judgment) [2002] ICJ Rep 3 [51].
\textsuperscript{82} *Case Concerning Certain Questions of Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters (Djibouti v France)* (Judgment) [2008] ICJ Rep 177 [170].
However, their immunities are temporal, belong to the State and can be waived by the State at any time pursuant to Article 32 of the VCDR.

Immunity *ratione personae* is applied to the sitting Head of State, whether he is travelling abroad or not and also covers both his official and private acts as long as he is in the office even he has committed international crimes. Once the reasonable period of time comes to an end, either when he leaves the receiving State or at the expiry of his tenure or appointment as the diplomatic agent, the Head of State is no longer protected under immunity *ratione personae*. Still, immunity *ratione materiae*, takes over but only limited to all official acts or conducts performed while he or she being the sitting Head of State.

**CASES ON IMMUNITY OF HEADS OF STATES**

**I. Domestic Court and ad hoc Tribunals’ Cases**

The UK House of Lords in the *Pinochet* Case held that the Head of State will not be protected under immunity *ratione materiae* if he has performed certain acts, in this case the act of torture which is outside his official duty while being the Head of State. In other words, States are bound to protect the inviolability and immunity of the Head of State as long as he has acted or performed official acts while being in the office as upheld by the ICJ in the *Diplomatic and Consular Staff Case*.

Furthermore, in order to prevent impunity, the Head of State will not be protected under both *ratione personae* and *ratione materiae* if he is allegedly to have committed international crimes, such as genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity as ruled by the ICJ in the *Arrest Warrant* Case. This practice is not new and has been

---


86 VCDR, art 39(2).

87 Ex Parte Pinochet; R v Evans and Another and the Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis and Others; Ex Parte Pinochet; R v Bartle and the Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis and Others [1999] 2 All ER 97; Andrea Bianchi, ‘Immunity Versus Human Rights: The Pinochet Case’ (1999) 10 EJIL 237, 243.


exercised by the *ad hoc* international tribunals after the outbreak of World War I and II,\(^9^0\) such as before the International Military Tribunal (IMT) at Nuremberg, Germany.

The IMT was established through the London Agreement (LA)\(^9^1\) signed between the WWII Allied Powers in 1945 to prosecute German officials\(^9^2\) responsible for ordering and conspiring in the commission of aggressive wars,\(^9^3\) war crimes\(^9^4\) and crimes against humanity\(^9^5\) as crimes prohibited under customary international law.\(^9^6\) After Hitler committed suicide, Admiral Donitz, commander-in-chief of the German Navy, became the German Head of State.\(^9^7\) By virtue of his position, Donitz was indicted before the IMT along with 23 other Nazi leaders for the alleged crimes.\(^9^8\) Except for three who were acquitted,\(^9^9\) all of the accused were found guilty by the IMT, including Donitz.\(^1^0^0\) The judgments of the IMT, especially the principles from those judgments have been affirmed by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in Resolution 95(1).\(^1^0^1\)

---


\(^9^1\) Agreement by the Government of the United States of America, the Provisional Government of the French Republic, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the Prosecution and Punishment of the Major War Criminals of the European Axis, (signed at London on 8 August 1945, with Charter of the International Military Tribunal, entered into force 8 August 1945). Hereafter, LA. The Charter of the IMT (IMT Charter) will also be referred to or based on the LA.


\(^9^3\) IMT Charter, art 6(a).

\(^9^4\) ibid art 6(b).

\(^9^5\) ibid art 6(c).


\(^9^7\) Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal (Nuremberg 14 November 1945 -1 October 1946) vol I (Nuremberg 1947) 78, 310 and 311.

\(^9^8\) ibid 27-79, for list of the accused persons and the detail of the indictments.

\(^9^9\) ibid 310 and 367 (Schacht); 327 and 367 (Von Papen); 338 and 367 (Fritzsche).


\(^1^0^1\) UNGA Res 95(I) (11 December 1946) UN Doc A/RES/95(I).
Furthermore, both President Slobodan Milosevic\textsuperscript{102} of Serbia and Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and President Charles Taylor\textsuperscript{103} of Liberia were also been prosecuted before the \textit{ad hoc} International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY)\textsuperscript{104} and the \textit{ad hoc} Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL)\textsuperscript{105} respectively for committing war crimes and crimes against humanity even though both of them were the sitting Head of State at the time of their indictment.\textsuperscript{106}

II. \textbf{The Permanent International Criminal Court (ICC)}

The practice of the investigation and the prosecution of Heads of State before domestic and international tribunal have been incorporated into the Rome Statute\textsuperscript{107} the founding treaty to the International Criminal Court (ICC). As the permanent international criminal court, the ICC has jurisdiction to investigate and prosecute international crimes\textsuperscript{108} of genocide,\textsuperscript{109} crimes against humanity,\textsuperscript{110} war crimes\textsuperscript{111} and the crime of aggression or crimes against peace\textsuperscript{112} pursuant to Article 27 where immunity of the Heads of State shall not bar the ICC from exercising its jurisdiction over the alleged perpetrators.

This can be seen, among others, when the crimes of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity have been allegedly committed in Sudan. The situation in Sudan has been referred to the ICC by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) under

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{102} Prosecutor v Slobodan Milosevic et al (Second Amended Indictment) IT-02-54-T (28 July 2004).
\textsuperscript{103} Prosecutor v Charles Ghankay Taylor (Judgment) SCSL-03-01-A (26 September 2013); Prosecutor v Charles Ghankay Taylor (Judgment) SCSL-03-01-T T, Ch II (18 May 2012); Prosecutor v Charles Ghankay Taylor (Indictment) SCSL-03-01-I (7 March 2003).
\textsuperscript{104} The ICTY was established by the UNSC pursuant to UNSC Res 827 (25 May 1993) UN Doc S/RES/827.
\textsuperscript{105} The SCSL was established through an agreement between the Government of Sierra Leone and the UN pursuant to UNSC Res 1315 (14 August 2000) UN Doc S/RES/1315.
\textsuperscript{111} ibid art 8; Frits Kalshoven and Liesbeth Zegveld, \textit{Constraints on the Waging of War: An Introduction to International Humanitarian Law} (4th edn, CUP 2011) 247.
\end{flushleft}
Article 13(b) of the Rome Statute acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter pursuant to Resolution 1593.\textsuperscript{113} As one of the alleged perpetrators of these crimes, the ICC has issued two arrest warrants against the Sudanese President, even though he is the sitting Head of State.

CONCLUSION

It has been established that there will be no immunity to both the sitting and former Head of State for allegedly committed the crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of aggression or crimes against peace since these crimes have been prohibited under international law. As a binding international law rule, his immunity has to be set aside by the ICC in order to end the impunity of the alleged crimes and to uphold justice to the victims of international crimes.
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