

Crimes Against Humanity

Posted at: 21/12/2024

Crimes Against Humanity: Strengthening Justice and Accountability

Context

- The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) recently adopted a resolution approving a proposed treaty to prevent and punish crimes against humanity (CAH).
- This marks significant progress in closing a crucial gap in international criminal law.
- The journey began in **2019** when the **International Law Commission** submitted the draft text to the UNGA's Sixth Committee.

Gap in International Legal Framework

1. Absence of a Dedicated Treaty:

- Unlike the Genocide Convention (1948) and Geneva Conventions (1949), CAH lacks a specific treaty.
- Current enforcement is limited under the **Rome Statute (1998)** of the International Criminal Court (ICC).
- A dedicated treaty is essential for a clear and comprehensive legal framework to prevent and prosecute CAH.

2. Limitations of the Rome Statute:

- Focuses on individual criminal responsibility but lacks provisions for state accountability.
- Limited jurisdiction, covering only member states or cases referred by the UN Security Council (UNSC).
- These gaps hinder efforts to address crimes against humanity effectively.

Accountability Challenges

1. Jurisdictional Issues:

- Non-member states and major global players are often beyond the ICC's reach, creating a jurisdictional void.
- Broader state cooperation is needed to address unprosecuted CAH cases.

• Without global jurisdiction, many perpetrators escape accountability.

2. Individual vs. State Responsibility:

- The Genocide Convention allows state-level accountability, enabling cases like The Gambia vs. Myanmar (2019).
- A CAH treaty could empower similar actions, reinforcing shared responsibility for human rights.
- State-level accountability ensures broader mechanisms to prevent and punish crimes.

India's Position on the CAH Treaty

1. Scepticism About the ICC:

- India is a non-signatory to the Rome Statute, citing concerns about jurisdictional overreach and UNSC influence.
- Criticizes discretionary powers of ICC prosecutors, fearing selective or politically motivated cases.
- India's concerns highlight the tension between global governance and national sovereignty.

2. **Disagreements on Scope**:

- Opposes inclusion of enforced disappearance in CAH definitions, citing lack of universal applicability.
- Strongly advocates for inclusion of terrorism and criticizes the exclusion of nuclear weapons.
- India's views emphasize the need for a more inclusive and balanced treaty.

3. Preference for National Jurisdiction:

- Argues **domestic courts** are better equipped for justice, considering social and political contexts.
- However, India lacks comprehensive domestic laws addressing CAH.
- This contradiction weakens India's position in the global arena.

Way Forward for India

1. Incorporating CAH into Domestic Law:

- Developing comprehensive legislation to address international crimes, including CAH.
- This would align national laws with global expectations and enhance India's credibility.
- A robust domestic framework is vital for India to uphold human rights

commitments.

2. Proactive Engagement in Treaty Negotiations:

- India could push for inclusion of issues like terrorism and nuclear weapons while shaping the treaty.
- Active participation reinforces India's commitment to justice and human rights.
- Engagement in negotiations enables India to influence the treaty constructively.

Conclusion

- The CAH treaty is a pivotal step in combating impunity for crimes against humanity.
- India's legitimate concerns, while important, are undermined by the absence of **domestic** legislation.
- By addressing these gaps, India can emerge as a global leader in justice and human rights advocacy.
- India must seize this opportunity to lead the global fight against crimes against humanity.

