

(h) pending cases in which the indictments charge genocide and related crimes in Srebrenica: *Popović, Beara, Drago Nikolić, Borovčanin, Pandurević and Trbić* (IT-05-88/1) and *Tolimir* (IT-05-88/2).

375. In the cases of a number of accused, relating to events in July 1995 in Srebrenica, charges of genocide or its related acts have not been brought: *Erdemović* (IT-96-22) (completed), *Jokić* (IT-02-60) (on appeal), *Miletić and Gvero* (IT-05-88, part of the *Popović et al.* proceeding referred to in paragraph 374 (h) above), *Perišić* (IT-04-81) (pending) and *Stanišić and Simatović* (IT-03-69) (pending).

376. The Court has already concluded above that — save in the case of Srebrenica — the Applicant has not established that any of the widespread and serious atrocities, complained of as constituting violations of Article II, paragraphs (a) to (e), of the Genocide Convention, were accompanied by the necessary specific intent (*dolus specialis*) on the part of the perpetrators. It also finds that the Applicant has not established the existence of that intent on the part of the Respondent, either on the basis of a concerted plan, or on the basis that the events reviewed above reveal a consistent pattern of conduct which could only point to the existence of such intent. Having however concluded (paragraph 297 above), in the specific case of the massacres at Srebrenica in July 1995, that acts of genocide were committed in operations led by members of the VRS, the Court now turns to the question whether those acts are attributable to the Respondent.

\* \* \*

## VII. THE QUESTION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR EVENTS AT SREBRENICA UNDER ARTICLE III, PARAGRAPH (a), OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION



### (1) *The Alleged Admission*

377. The Court first notes that the Applicant contends that the Respondent has in fact recognized that genocide was committed at Srebrenica, and has accepted legal responsibility for it. The Applicant called attention to the following official declaration made by the Council of Ministers of the Respondent on 15 June 2005, following the showing on a Belgrade television channel on 2 June 2005 of a video-recording of the murder by a paramilitary unit of six Bosnian Muslim prisoners near Srebrenica (paragraph 289 above). The statement reads as follows:

“Those who committed the killings in Srebrenica, as well as those who ordered and organized that massacre represented neither Serbia

nor Montenegro, but an undemocratic regime of terror and death, against whom the majority of citizens of Serbia and Montenegro put up the strongest resistance.

Our condemnation of crimes in Srebrenica does not end with the direct perpetrators. We demand the criminal responsibility of all who committed war crimes, organized them or ordered them, and not only in Srebrenica.

Criminals must not be heroes. Any protection of the war criminals, for whatever reason, is also a crime.”

The Applicant requests the Court to declare that this declaration “be regarded as a form of admission and as having decisive probative force regarding the attributability to the Yugoslav State of the Srebrenica massacre”.

378. It is for the Court to determine whether the Respondent is responsible for any acts of genocide which may be established. For purposes of a finding of this kind the Court may take into account any statements made by either party that appear to bear upon the matters in issue, and have been brought to its attention (cf. *Nuclear Tests (Australia v. France)*, *Judgment*, *I.C.J. Reports 1974*, pp. 263 ff., paras. 32 ff., and *Nuclear Tests (New Zealand v. France)*, *Judgment*, *I.C.J. Reports 1974*, pp. 465 ff., paras. 27 ff.; *Frontier Dispute (Burkina Faso/Republic of Mali)*, *Judgment*, *I.C.J. Reports 1986*, pp. 573-574, paras. 38-39), and may accord to them such legal effect as may be appropriate. However, in the present case, it appears to the Court that the declaration of 15 June 2005 was of a political nature; it was clearly not intended as an admission, which would have had a legal effect in complete contradiction to the submissions made by the Respondent before this Court, both at the time of the declaration and subsequently. The Court therefore does not find the statement of 15 June 2005 of assistance to it in determining the issues before it in the case.

\* \*

#### (2) *The Test of Responsibility*

379. In view of the foregoing conclusions, the Court now must ascertain whether the international responsibility of the Respondent can have been incurred, on whatever basis, in connection with the massacres committed in the Srebrenica area during the period in question. For the reasons set out above, those massacres constituted the crime of genocide within the meaning of the Convention. For this purpose, the Court may be required to consider the following three issues in turn. First, it needs to be determined whether the acts of genocide could be attributed to the Respondent under the rules of customary international law of State responsibility; this means ascertaining whether the acts were committed by persons or organs whose conduct is attributable, specifically in the case of the events at Srebrenica, to the Respondent. Second, the Court

will need to ascertain whether acts of the kind referred to in Article III of the Convention, other than genocide itself, were committed by persons or organs whose conduct is attributable to the Respondent under those same rules of State responsibility: that is to say, the acts referred to in Article III, paragraphs *(b)* to *(e)*, one of these being complicity in genocide. Finally, it will be for the Court to rule on the issue as to whether the Respondent complied with its twofold obligation deriving from Article I of the Convention to prevent and punish genocide.

380. These three issues must be addressed in the order set out above, because they are so interrelated that the answer on one point may affect the relevance or significance of the others. Thus, if and to the extent that consideration of the first issue were to lead to the conclusion that some acts of genocide are attributable to the Respondent, it would be unnecessary to determine whether it may also have incurred responsibility under Article III, paragraphs *(b)* to *(e)*, of the Convention for the same acts. Even though it is theoretically possible for the same acts to result in the attribution to a State of acts of genocide (contemplated by Art. III, para. *(a)*), conspiracy to commit genocide (Art. III, para. *(b)*), and direct and public incitement to commit genocide (Art. III, para. *(c)*), there would be little point, where the requirements for attribution are fulfilled under *(a)*, in making a judicial finding that they are also satisfied under *(b)* and *(c)*, since responsibility under *(a)* absorbs that under the other two. The idea of holding the same State responsible by attributing to it acts of “genocide” (Art. III, para. *(a)*), “attempt to commit genocide” (Art. III, para. *(d)*), and “complicity in genocide” (Art. III, para. *(e)*), in relation to the same actions, must be rejected as untenable both logically and legally.

381. On the other hand, there is no doubt that a finding by the Court that no acts that constitute genocide, within the meaning of Article II and Article III, paragraph *(a)*, of the Convention, can be attributed to the Respondent will not free the Court from the obligation to determine whether the Respondent’s responsibility may nevertheless have been incurred through the attribution to it of the acts, or some of the acts, referred to in Article III, paragraphs *(b)* to *(e)*. In particular, it is clear that acts of complicity in genocide can be attributed to a State to which no act of genocide could be attributed under the rules of State responsibility, the content of which will be considered below.

382. Furthermore, the question whether the Respondent has complied with its obligations to prevent and punish genocide arises in different terms, depending on the replies to the two preceding questions. It is only if the Court answers the first two questions in the negative that it will have to consider whether the Respondent fulfilled its obligation of pre-

vention, in relation to the whole accumulation of facts constituting genocide. If a State is held responsible for an act of genocide (because it was committed by a person or organ whose conduct is attributable to the State), or for one of the other acts referred to in Article III of the Convention (for the same reason), then there is no point in asking whether it complied with its obligation of prevention in respect of the same acts, because logic dictates that a State cannot have satisfied an obligation to prevent genocide in which it actively participated. On the other hand, it is self-evident, as the Parties recognize, that if a State is not responsible for any of the acts referred to in Article III, paragraphs (a) to (e), of the Convention, this does not mean that its responsibility cannot be sought for a violation of the obligation to prevent genocide and the other acts referred to in Article III.

383. Finally, it should be made clear that, while, as noted above, a State's responsibility deriving from any of those acts renders moot the question whether it satisfied its obligation of prevention in respect of the same conduct, it does not necessarily render superfluous the question whether the State complied with its obligation to punish the perpetrators of the acts in question. It is perfectly possible for a State to incur responsibility at once for an act of genocide (or complicity in genocide, incitement to commit genocide, or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III) committed by a person or organ whose conduct is attributable to it, and for the breach by the State of its obligation to punish the perpetrator of the act: these are two distinct internationally wrongful acts attributable to the State, and both can be asserted against it as bases for its international responsibility.

384. Having thus explained the interrelationship among the three issues set out above (paragraph 379), the Court will now proceed to consider the first of them. This is the question whether the massacres committed at Srebrenica during the period in question, which constitute the crime of genocide within the meaning of Articles II and III, paragraph (a), of the Convention, are attributable, in whole or in part, to the Respondent. This question has in fact two aspects, which the Court must consider separately. First, it should be ascertained whether the acts committed at Srebrenica were perpetrated by organs of the Respondent, i.e., by persons or entities whose conduct is necessarily attributable to it, because they are in fact the instruments of its action. Next, if the preceding question is answered in the negative, it should be ascertained whether the acts in question were committed by persons who, while not organs of the Respondent, did nevertheless act on the instructions of, or under the direction or control of, the Respondent.

\* \*

(3) *The Question of Attribution of the Srebrenica Genocide to the Respondent on the Basis of the Conduct of Its Organs*

385. The first of these two questions relates to the well-established rule, one of the cornerstones of the law of State responsibility, that the conduct of any State organ is to be considered an act of the State under international law, and therefore gives rise to the responsibility of the State if it constitutes a breach of an international obligation of the State. This rule, which is one of customary international law, is reflected in Article 4 of the ILC Articles on State Responsibility as follows:

*“Article 4*

*Conduct of organs of a State*

1. The conduct of any State organ shall be considered an act of that State under international law, whether the organ exercises legislative, executive, judicial or any other functions, whatever position it holds in the organization of the State, and whatever its character as an organ of the central Government or of a territorial unit of the State.

2. An organ includes any person or entity which has that status in accordance with the internal law of the State.”

386. When applied to the present case, this rule first calls for a determination whether the acts of genocide committed in Srebrenica were perpetrated by “persons or entities” having the status of organs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (as the Respondent was known at the time) under its internal law, as then in force. It must be said that there is nothing which could justify an affirmative response to this question. It has not been shown that the FRY army took part in the massacres, nor that the political leaders of the FRY had a hand in preparing, planning or in any way carrying out the massacres. It is true that there is much evidence of direct or indirect participation by the official army of the FRY, along with the Bosnian Serb armed forces, in military operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the years prior to the events at Srebrenica. That participation was repeatedly condemned by the political organs of the United Nations, which demanded that the FRY put an end to it (see, for example, Security Council resolutions 752 (1992), 757 (1992), 762 (1992), 819 (1993), 838 (1993)). It has however not been shown that there was any such participation in relation to the massacres committed at Srebrenica (see also paragraphs 278 to 297 above). Further, neither the Republika Srpska, nor the VRS were *de jure* organs of the FRY, since none of them had the status of organ of that State under its internal law.

387. The Applicant has however claimed that all officers in the VRS, including General Mladić, remained under FRY military administration, and that their salaries were paid from Belgrade right up to 2002, and

accordingly contends that these officers “were *de jure* organs of [the FRY], intended by their superiors to serve in Bosnia and Herzegovina with the VRS”. On this basis it has been alleged by the Applicant that those officers, in addition to being officers of the VRS, remained officers of the VJ, and were thus *de jure* organs of the Respondent (paragraph 238 above). The Respondent however asserts that only some of the VRS officers were being “administered” by the 30th Personnel Centre in Belgrade, so that matters like their payment, promotion, pension, etc., were being handled from the FRY (paragraph 238 above); and that it has not been clearly established whether General Mladić was one of them. The Applicant has shown that the promotion of Mladić to the rank of Colonel General on 24 June 1994 was handled in Belgrade, but the Respondent emphasizes that this was merely a verification for administrative purposes of a promotion decided by the authorities of the Republika Srpska.

388. The Court notes first that no evidence has been presented that either General Mladić or any of the other officers whose affairs were handled by the 30th Personnel Centre were, according to the internal law of the Respondent, officers of the army of the Respondent — a *de jure* organ of the Respondent. Nor has it been conclusively established that General Mladić was one of those officers; and even on the basis that he might have been, the Court does not consider that he would, for that reason alone, have to be treated as an organ of the FRY for the purposes of the application of the rules of State responsibility. There is no doubt that the FRY was providing substantial support, *inter alia*, financial support, to the Republika Srpska (cf. paragraph 241 above), and that one of the forms that support took was payment of salaries and other benefits to some officers of the VRS, but this did not automatically make them organs of the FRY. Those officers were appointed to their commands by the President of the Republika Srpska, and were subordinated to the political leadership of the Republika Srpska. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, those officers must be taken to have received their orders from the Republika Srpska or the VRS, not from the FRY. The expression “State organ”, as used in customary international law and in Article 4 of the ILC Articles, applies to one or other of the individual or collective entities which make up the organization of the State and act on its behalf (cf. ILC Commentary to Art. 4, para. (1)). The functions of the VRS officers, including General Mladić, were however to act on behalf of the Bosnian Serb authorities, in particular the Republika Srpska, not on behalf of the FRY; they exercised elements of the public authority of the Republika Srpska. The particular situation of General Mladić, or of any other VRS officer present at Srebrenica who may have been being “administered” from Belgrade, is not therefore such as to lead the Court to modify the conclusion reached in the previous paragraph.

389. The issue also arises as to whether the Respondent might bear responsibility for the acts of the “Scorpions” in the Srebrenica area. In this connection, the Court will consider whether it has been proved that the Scorpions were a *de jure* organ of the Respondent. It is in dispute between the Parties as to when the “Scorpions” became incorporated into the forces of the Respondent. The Applicant has claimed that incorporation occurred by a decree of 1991 (which has not been produced as an Annex). The Respondent states that “these regulations [were] relevant exclusively for the war in Croatia in 1991” and that there is no evidence that they remained in force in 1992 in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Court observes that, while the single State of Yugoslavia was disintegrating at that time, it is the status of the “Scorpions” in mid-1995 that is of relevance to the present case. In two of the intercepted documents presented by the Applicant (the authenticity of which was queried — see paragraph 289 above), there is reference to the “Scorpions” as “MUP of Serbia” and “a unit of Ministry of Interiors of Serbia”. The Respondent identified the senders of these communications, Ljubiša Borovčanin and Savo Cvjetinović, as being “officials of the police forces of Republika Srpska”. The Court observes that neither of these communications was addressed to Belgrade. Judging on the basis of these materials, the Court is unable to find that the “Scorpions” were, in mid-1995, *de jure* organs of the Respondent. Furthermore, the Court notes that in any event the act of an organ placed by a State at the disposal of another public authority shall not be considered an act of that State if the organ was acting on behalf of the public authority at whose disposal it had been placed.

390. The argument of the Applicant however goes beyond mere contemplation of the status, under the Respondent’s internal law, of the persons who committed the acts of genocide; it argues that Republika Srpska and the VRS, as well as the paramilitary militias known as the “Scorpions”, the “Red Berets”, the “Tigers” and the “White Eagles” must be deemed, notwithstanding their apparent status, to have been “*de facto* organs” of the FRY, in particular at the time in question, so that all of their acts, and specifically the massacres at Srebrenica, must be considered attributable to the FRY, just as if they had been organs of that State under its internal law; reality must prevail over appearances. The Respondent rejects this contention, and maintains that these were not *de facto* organs of the FRY.

391. The first issue raised by this argument is whether it is possible in principle to attribute to a State conduct of persons — or groups of persons — who, while they do not have the legal status of State organs, in fact act under such strict control by the State that they must be treated as its organs for purposes of the necessary attribution leading to the State’s responsibility for an internationally wrongful act. The Court has in fact already addressed this question, and given an answer to it in principle, in

its Judgment of 27 June 1986 in the case concerning *Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America)* (*Merits, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1986*, pp. 62-64). In paragraph 109 of that Judgment the Court stated that it had to

“determine . . . whether or not the relationship of the *contras* to the United States Government was so much one of dependence on the one side and control on the other that it would be right to equate the *contras*, for legal purposes, with an organ of the United States Government, or as acting on behalf of that Government” (p. 62).

Then, examining the facts in the light of the information in its possession, the Court observed that “there is no clear evidence of the United States having actually exercised such a degree of control in all fields as to justify treating the *contras* as acting on its behalf” (para. 109), and went on to conclude that “the evidence available to the Court . . . is insufficient to demonstrate [the *contras*] complete dependence on United States aid”, so that the Court was “unable to determine that the *contra* force may be equated for legal purposes with the forces of the United States” (pp. 62-63, para. 110).

392. The passages quoted show that, according to the Court’s jurisprudence, persons, groups of persons or entities may, for purposes of international responsibility, be equated with State organs even if that status does not follow from internal law, provided that in fact the persons, groups or entities act in “complete dependence” on the State, of which they are ultimately merely the instrument. In such a case, it is appropriate to look beyond legal status alone, in order to grasp the reality of the relationship between the person taking action, and the State to which he is so closely attached as to appear to be nothing more than its agent: any other solution would allow States to escape their international responsibility by choosing to act through persons or entities whose supposed independence would be purely fictitious.

393. However, so to equate persons or entities with State organs when they do not have that status under internal law must be exceptional, for it requires proof of a particularly great degree of State control over them, a relationship which the Court’s Judgment quoted above expressly described as “complete dependence”. It remains to be determined in the present case whether, at the time in question, the persons or entities that committed the acts of genocide at Srebrenica had such ties with the FRY that they can be deemed to have been completely dependent on it; it is only if this condition is met that they can be equated with organs of the Respondent for the purposes of its international responsibility.

394. The Court can only answer this question in the negative. At the relevant time, July 1995, neither the Republika Srpska nor the VRS could

be regarded as mere instruments through which the FRY was acting, and as lacking any real autonomy. While the political, military and logistical relations between the federal authorities in Belgrade and the authorities in Pale, between the Yugoslav army and the VRS, had been strong and close in previous years (see paragraph 238 above), and these ties undoubtedly remained powerful, they were, at least at the relevant time, not such that the Bosnian Serbs' political and military organizations should be equated with organs of the FRY. It is even true that differences over strategic options emerged at the time between Yugoslav authorities and Bosnian Serb leaders; at the very least, these are evidence that the latter had some qualified, but real, margin of independence. Nor, notwithstanding the very important support given by the Respondent to the Republika Srpska, without which it could not have "conduct[ed] its crucial or most significant military and paramilitary activities" (*I.C.J. Reports 1986*, p. 63, para. 111), did this signify a total dependence of the Republika Srpska upon the Respondent.

395. The Court now turns to the question whether the "Scorpions" were in fact acting in complete dependence on the Respondent. The Court has not been presented with materials to indicate this. The Court also notes that, in giving his evidence, General Dannatt, when asked under whose control or whose authority the paramilitary groups coming from Serbia were operating, replied, "they would have been under the command of Mladić and part of the chain of the command of the VRS". The Parties referred the Court to the *Stanišić and Simatović* case (IT-03-69, pending); notwithstanding that the defendants are not charged with genocide in that case, it could have its relevance for illuminating the status of the "Scorpions" as Serbian MUP or otherwise. However, the Court cannot draw further conclusions as this case remains at the indictment stage. In this respect, the Court recalls that it can only form its opinion on the basis of the information which has been brought to its notice at the time when it gives its decision, and which emerges from the pleadings and documents in the case file, and the arguments of the Parties made during the oral exchanges.

The Court therefore finds that the acts of genocide at Srebrenica cannot be attributed to the Respondent as having been committed by its organs or by persons or entities wholly dependent upon it, and thus do not on this basis entail the Respondent's international responsibility.

\* \*

(4) *The Question of Attribution of the Srebrenica Genocide to the Respondent on the Basis of Direction or Control*

396. As noted above (paragraph 384), the Court must now determine whether the massacres at Srebrenica were committed by persons who,

though not having the status of organs of the Respondent, nevertheless acted on its instructions or under its direction or control, as the Applicant argues in the alternative; the Respondent denies that such was the case.

397. The Court must emphasize, at this stage in its reasoning, that the question just stated is not the same as those dealt with thus far. It is obvious that it is different from the question whether the persons who committed the acts of genocide had the status of organs of the Respondent under its internal law; nor however, and despite some appearance to the contrary, is it the same as the question whether those persons should be equated with State organs *de facto*, even though not enjoying that status under internal law. The answer to the latter question depends, as previously explained, on whether those persons were in a relationship of such complete dependence on the State that they cannot be considered otherwise than as organs of the State, so that all their actions performed in such capacity would be attributable to the State for purposes of international responsibility. Having answered that question in the negative, the Court now addresses a completely separate issue: whether, in the specific circumstances surrounding the events at Srebrenica the perpetrators of genocide were acting on the Respondent's instructions, or under its direction or control. An affirmative answer to this question would in no way imply that the perpetrators should be characterized as organs of the FRY, or equated with such organs. It would merely mean that the FRY's international responsibility would be incurred owing to the conduct of those of its own organs which gave the instructions or exercised the control resulting in the commission of acts in breach of its international obligations. In other words, it is no longer a question of ascertaining whether the persons who directly committed the genocide were acting as organs of the FRY, or could be equated with those organs — this question having already been answered in the negative. What must be determined is whether FRY organs — incontestably having that status under the FRY's internal law — originated the genocide by issuing instructions to the perpetrators or exercising direction or control, and whether, as a result, the conduct of organs of the Respondent, having been the cause of the commission of acts in breach of its international obligations, constituted a violation of those obligations.

398. On this subject the applicable rule, which is one of customary law of international responsibility, is laid down in Article 8 of the ILC Articles on State Responsibility as follows:

*“Article 8*

*Conduct directed or controlled by a State*

The conduct of a person or group of persons shall be considered an act of a State under international law if the person or group of

persons is in fact acting on the instructions of, or under the direction or control of, that State in carrying out the conduct.”

399. This provision must be understood in the light of the Court’s jurisprudence on the subject, particularly that of the 1986 Judgment in the case concerning *Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America)* referred to above (paragraph 391). In that Judgment the Court, as noted above, after having rejected the argument that the *contras* were to be equated with organs of the United States because they were “completely dependent” on it, added that the responsibility of the Respondent could still arise if it were proved that it had itself “directed or enforced the perpetration of the acts contrary to human rights and humanitarian law alleged by the applicant State” (*I.C.J. Reports 1986*, p. 64, para. 115); this led to the following significant conclusion:

“For this conduct to give rise to legal responsibility of the United States, it would in principle have to be proved that that State had effective control of the military or paramilitary operations in the course of which the alleged violations were committed.” (*Ibid.*, p. 65.)

400. The test thus formulated differs in two respects from the test — described above — to determine whether a person or entity may be equated with a State organ even if not having that status under internal law. First, in this context it is not necessary to show that the persons who performed the acts alleged to have violated international law were in general in a relationship of “complete dependence” on the respondent State; it has to be proved that they acted in accordance with that State’s instructions or under its “effective control”. It must however be shown that this “effective control” was exercised, or that the State’s instructions were given, in respect of each operation in which the alleged violations occurred, not generally in respect of the overall actions taken by the persons or groups of persons having committed the violations.

401. The Applicant has, it is true, contended that the crime of genocide has a particular nature, in that it may be composed of a considerable number of specific acts separate, to a greater or lesser extent, in time and space. According to the Applicant, this particular nature would justify, among other consequences, assessing the “effective control” of the State allegedly responsible, not in relation to each of these specific acts, but in relation to the whole body of operations carried out by the direct perpetrators of the genocide. The Court is however of the view that the particular characteristics of genocide do not justify the Court in departing from the criterion elaborated in the Judgment in the case concerning *Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America)* (see paragraph 399 above). The rules

for attributing alleged internationally wrongful conduct to a State do not vary with the nature of the wrongful act in question in the absence of a clearly expressed *lex specialis*. Genocide will be considered as attributable to a State if and to the extent that the physical acts constitutive of genocide that have been committed by organs or persons other than the State's own agents were carried out, wholly or in part, on the instructions or directions of the State, or under its effective control. This is the state of customary international law, as reflected in the ILC Articles on State Responsibility.

402. The Court notes however that the Applicant has further questioned the validity of applying, in the present case, the criterion adopted in the *Military and Paramilitary Activities* Judgment. It has drawn attention to the Judgment of the ICTY Appeals Chamber in the *Tadić* case (IT-94-1-A, Judgment, 15 July 1999). In that case the Chamber did not follow the jurisprudence of the Court in the *Military and Paramilitary Activities* case: it held that the appropriate criterion, applicable in its view both to the characterization of the armed conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina as international, and to imputing the acts committed by Bosnian Serbs to the FRY under the law of State responsibility, was that of the "overall control" exercised over the Bosnian Serbs by the FRY; and further that that criterion was satisfied in the case (on this point, *ibid.*, para. 145). In other words, the Appeals Chamber took the view that acts committed by Bosnian Serbs could give rise to international responsibility of the FRY on the basis of the overall control exercised by the FRY over the Republika Srpska and the VRS, without there being any need to prove that each operation during which acts were committed in breach of international law was carried out on the FRY's instructions, or under its effective control.

403. The Court has given careful consideration to the Appeals Chamber's reasoning in support of the foregoing conclusion, but finds itself unable to subscribe to the Chamber's view. First, the Court observes that the ICTY was not called upon in the *Tadić* case, nor is it in general called upon, to rule on questions of State responsibility, since its jurisdiction is criminal and extends over persons only. Thus, in that Judgment the Tribunal addressed an issue which was not indispensable for the exercise of its jurisdiction. As stated above, the Court attaches the utmost importance to the factual and legal findings made by the ICTY in ruling on the criminal liability of the accused before it and, in the present case, the Court takes fullest account of the ICTY's trial and appellate judgments dealing with the events underlying the dispute. The situation is not the same for positions adopted by the ICTY on issues of general international law which do not lie within the specific purview of its jurisdiction and, moreover, the resolution of which is not always necessary for deciding the criminal cases before it.

404. This is the case of the doctrine laid down in the *Tadić* Judgment. Insofar as the “overall control” test is employed to determine whether or not an armed conflict is international, which was the sole question which the Appeals Chamber was called upon to decide, it may well be that the test is applicable and suitable; the Court does not however think it appropriate to take a position on the point in the present case, as there is no need to resolve it for purposes of the present Judgment. On the other hand, the ICTY presented the “overall control” test as equally applicable under the law of State responsibility for the purpose of determining — as the Court is required to do in the present case — when a State is responsible for acts committed by paramilitary units, armed forces which are not among its official organs. In this context, the argument in favour of that test is unpersuasive.

405. It should first be observed that logic does not require the same test to be adopted in resolving the two issues, which are very different in nature: the degree and nature of a State’s involvement in an armed conflict on another State’s territory which is required for the conflict to be characterized as international, can very well, and without logical inconsistency, differ from the degree and nature of involvement required to give rise to that State’s responsibility for a specific act committed in the course of the conflict.

406. It must next be noted that the “overall control” test has the major drawback of broadening the scope of State responsibility well beyond the fundamental principle governing the law of international responsibility: a State is responsible only for its own conduct, that is to say the conduct of persons acting, on whatever basis, on its behalf. That is true of acts carried out by its official organs, and also by persons or entities which are not formally recognized as official organs under internal law but which must nevertheless be equated with State organs because they are in a relationship of complete dependence on the State. Apart from these cases, a State’s responsibility can be incurred for acts committed by persons or groups of persons — neither State organs nor to be equated with such organs — only if, assuming those acts to be internationally wrongful, they are attributable to it under the rule of customary international law reflected in Article 8 cited above (paragraph 398). This is so where an organ of the State gave the instructions or provided the direction pursuant to which the perpetrators of the wrongful act acted or where it exercised effective control over the action during which the wrong was committed. In this regard the “overall control” test is unsuitable, for it stretches too far, almost to breaking point, the connection which must exist between the conduct of a State’s organs and its international responsibility.

407. Thus it is on the basis of its settled jurisprudence that the Court will determine whether the Respondent has incurred responsibility under

the rule of customary international law set out in Article 8 of the ILC Articles on State Responsibility.

\*

408. The Respondent has emphasized that in the final judgments of the Chambers of the ICTY relating to genocide in Srebrenica, none of its leaders have been found to have been implicated. The Applicant does not challenge that reading, but makes the point that that issue has not been before the ICTY for decision. The Court observes that the ICTY has indeed not up to the present been directly concerned in final judgments with the question whether those leaders might bear responsibility in that respect. The Court notes the fact that the report of the United Nations Secretary-General does not establish any direct involvement by President Milošević with the massacre. The Court has already recorded the contacts between Milošević and the United Nations on 10 and 11 July (paragraph 285). On 14 July, as recorded in the Secretary-General's Report,

“the European Union negotiator, Mr. Bildt, travelled to Belgrade to meet with President Milošević. The meeting took place at Dobanovci, the hunting lodge outside Belgrade, where Mr. Bildt had met President Milošević and General Mladić one week earlier. According to Mr. Bildt's public account of that second meeting, he pressed the President to arrange immediate access for UNHCR to assist the people of Srebrenica, and for ICRC to start to register those who were being treated by the BSA as prisoners of war. He also insisted that the Netherlands soldiers be allowed to leave at will. Mr. Bildt added that the international community would not tolerate an attack on Goražde, and that a 'green light' would have to be secured for free and unimpeded access to the enclaves. He also demanded that the road between Kiseljak and Sarajevo ('Route Swan') be opened to all non-military transport. President Milošević apparently acceded to the various demands, but also claimed that he did not have control over the matter. Milošević had also apparently explained, earlier in the meeting, that the whole incident had been provoked by escalating Muslim attacks from the enclave, in violation of the 1993 demilitarization agreement.

A few hours into the meeting, General Mladić arrived at Dobanovci. Mr. Bildt noted that General Mladić readily agreed to most of the demands on Srebrenica, but remained opposed to some of the arrangements pertaining to the other enclaves, Sarajevo in particular. Eventually, with President Milošević's intervention, it appeared that an agreement in principle had been reached. It was decided that

another meeting would be held the next day in order to confirm the arrangements. Mr. Bildt had already arranged with Mr. Stoltenberg and Mr. Akashi [the Special Representative of the Secretary-General] that they would join him in Belgrade. He also requested that the UNPROFOR Commander also come to Belgrade in order to finalize some of the military details with Mladić.” (A/54/549, paras. 372-373.)

409. By 19 July, on the basis of the Belgrade meeting, Mr. Akashi was hopeful that both President Milošević and General Mladić might show some flexibility. The UNPROFOR Commander met with Mladić on 19 July and throughout the meeting kept in touch with Mr. Bildt who was holding parallel negotiations with President Milošević in Belgrade. Mladić gave his version of the events of the preceding days (his troops had “finished [it] in a correct way”; some “unfortunate small incidents” had occurred). The UNPROFOR Commander and Mladić then signed an agreement which provided for

“ICRC access to all ‘reception centres’ where the men and boys of Srebrenica were being held, by the next day;

UNHCR and humanitarian aid convoys to be given access to Srebrenica;

The evacuation of wounded from Potočari, as well as the hospital in Bratunac;

The return of Dutchbat weapons and equipment taken by the BSA;

The transfer of Dutchbat out of the enclave commencing on the afternoon of 21 July, following the evacuation of the remaining women, children and elderly who wished to leave.

Subsequent to the signing of this agreement, the Special Representative wrote to President Milošević, reminding him of the agreement, that had not yet been honoured, to allow ICRC access to Srebrenica. The Special Representative later also telephoned President Milošević to reiterate the same point.” (*Ibid.*, para. 392.)

410. The Court was referred to other evidence supporting or denying the Respondent’s effective control over, participation in, involvement in, or influence over the events in and around Srebrenica in July 1995. The Respondent quotes two substantial reports prepared seven years after the events, both of which are in the public domain, and readily accessible. The first, *Srebrenica — a “Safe” Area*, published in 2002 by the Netherlands Institute for War Documentation was prepared over a lengthy period by an expert team. The Respondent has drawn attention to the fact that this report contains no suggestion that the FRY leadership was involved in planning the attack or inciting the killing of non-Serbs; nor

any hard evidence of assistance by the Yugoslav army to the armed forces of the Republika Srpska before the attack; nor any suggestion that the Belgrade Government had advance knowledge of the attack. The Respondent also quotes this passage from point 10 of the Epilogue to the Report relating to the “mass slaughter” and “the executions” following the fall of Srebrenica: “There is no evidence to suggest any political or military liaison with Belgrade, and in the case of this mass murder such a liaison is highly improbable.” The Respondent further observes that the Applicant’s only response to this submission is to point out that “the report, by its own admission, is not exhaustive”, and that this Court has been referred to evidence not used by the authors.

411. The Court observes, in respect of the Respondent’s submissions, that the authors of the Report do conclude that Belgrade was aware of the intended attack on Srebrenica. They record that the Dutch Military Intelligence Service and another Western intelligence service concluded that the July 1995 operations were co-ordinated with Belgrade (Part III, Chap. 7, Sect. 7). More significantly for present purposes, however, the authors state that “there is no evidence to suggest participation in the preparations for executions on the part of Yugoslav military personnel or the security agency (RDB). In fact there is some evidence to support the opposite view . . .” (Part IV, Chap. 2, Sect. 20). That supports the passage from point 10 of the Epilogue quoted by the Respondent, which was preceded by the following sentence: “Everything points to a central decision by the General Staff of the VRS.”

412. The second report is *Balkan Battlegrounds*, prepared by the United States Central Intelligence Agency, also published in 2002. The first volume under the heading “The Possibility of Yugoslav involvement” arrives at the following conclusion:

“No basis has been established to implicate Belgrade’s military or security forces in the post-Srebrenica atrocities. While there are indications that the VJ or RDB [the Serbian State Security Department] may have contributed elements to the Srebrenica battle, there is no similar evidence that Belgrade-directed forces were involved in any of the subsequent massacres. Eyewitness accounts by survivors may be imperfect recollections of events, and details may have been overlooked. Narrations and other available evidence suggest that only Bosnian Serb troops were employed in the atrocities and executions that followed the military conquest of Srebrenica.” (*Balkan Battlegrounds*, p. 353.)

The response of the Applicant was to quote an earlier passage which refers to reports which “suggest” that VJ troops and possibly elements of the Serbian State Security Department may have been engaged in the battle in Srebrenica — as indeed the second sentence of the passage quoted by the Respondent indicates. It is a cautious passage, and significantly gives no indication of any involvement by the Respondent in the post-conflict atrocities which are the subject of genocide-related convictions. Counsel for the Respondent also quoted from the evidence of the Deputy Commander of Dutchbat, given in the *Milošević* trial, in which the accused put to the officer the point quoted earlier from the Epilogue to the Netherlands report. The officer responded:

“At least for me, I did not have any evidence that it was launched in co-operation with Belgrade. And again, I read all kinds of reports and opinions and papers where all kinds of scenarios were analysed, and so forth. Again, I do not have any proof that the action, being the attack on the enclave, was launched in co-operation with Belgrade.”

The other evidence on which the Applicant relied relates to the influence, rather than the control, that President Milošević had or did not have over the authorities in Pale. It mainly consists of the evidence given at the *Milošević* trial by Lord Owen and General Wesley Clark and also Lord Owen’s publications. It does not establish a factual basis for finding the Respondent responsible on a basis of direction or control.

\* \*

(5) *Conclusion as to Responsibility for Events at Srebrenica under Article III, Paragraph (a), of the Genocide Convention*

413. In the light of the information available to it, the Court finds, as indicated above, that it has not been established that the massacres at Srebrenica were committed by persons or entities ranking as organs of the Respondent (see paragraph 395 above). It finds also that it has not been established that those massacres were committed on the instructions or under the direction of organs of the respondent State, nor that the Respondent exercised effective control over the operations in the course of which those massacres, which, as indicated in paragraph 297 above, constituted the crime of genocide, were perpetrated.

The Applicant has not proved that instructions were issued by the federal authorities in Belgrade, or by any other organ of the FRY, to commit the massacres, still less that any such instructions were given with the specific intent (*dolus specialis*) characterizing the crime of genocide, which would have had to be present in order for the Respondent to be held responsible on this basis. All indications are to the contrary: that the

decision to kill the adult male population of the Muslim community in Srebrenica was taken by some members of the VRS Main Staff, but without instructions from or effective control by the FRY.

As for the killings committed by the “Scorpions” paramilitary militias, notably at Trnovo (paragraph 289 above), even if it were accepted that they were an element of the genocide committed in the Srebrenica area, which is not clearly established by the decisions thus far rendered by the ICTY (see, in particular, the Trial Chamber’s decision of 12 April 2006 in the *Stanišić and Simatović* case, IT-03-69), it has not been proved that they took place either on the instructions or under the control of organs of the FRY.

414. Finally, the Court observes that none of the situations, other than those referred to in Articles 4 and 8 of the ILC’s Articles on State Responsibility, in which specific conduct may be attributed to a State, matches the circumstances of the present case in regard to the possibility of attributing the genocide at Srebrenica to the Respondent. The Court does not see itself required to decide at this stage whether the ILC’s Articles dealing with attribution, apart from Articles 4 and 8, express present customary international law, it being clear that none of them apply in this case. The acts constituting genocide were not committed by persons or entities which, while not being organs of the FRY, were empowered by it to exercise elements of the governmental authority (Art. 5), nor by organs placed at the Respondent’s disposal by another State (Art. 6), nor by persons in fact exercising elements of the governmental authority in the absence or default of the official authorities of the Respondent (Art. 9); finally, the Respondent has not acknowledged and adopted the conduct of the perpetrators of the acts of genocide as its own (Art. 11).

415. The Court concludes from the foregoing that the acts of those who committed genocide at Srebrenica cannot be attributed to the Respondent under the rules of international law of State responsibility: thus, the international responsibility of the Respondent is not engaged on this basis.

\* \* \*



VIII. THE QUESTION OF RESPONSIBILITY, IN RESPECT OF SREBRENICA,  
FOR ACTS ENUMERATED IN ARTICLE III, PARAGRAPHS (b) TO (e), OF  
THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

416. The Court now comes to the second of the questions set out in paragraph 379 above, namely, that relating to the Respondent’s possible responsibility on the ground of one of the acts related to genocide enumerated in Article III of the Convention. These are: conspiracy to