

War Crimes and the Principle of Complementarity: Balancing National Prosecutions with International Tribunals



Faiza Chaudhary	Lecturer, Department of Law, University of Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan faiza.choudhary@uskt.edu.pk
Saqiba Saleem	PhD scholar (Law), TIMES Institute, Multan, Pakistan saqiba.saleem@uskt.edu.pk
Anum Shahid	Lecturer, Department of Law, University of Sialkot, Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan. anamshahid.iiui@yahoo.com

Abstract: *This comprehensive law article delves into the historical evolution of war crimes, the establishment of international tribunals, and the pivotal Principle of Complementarity embedded in the Rome Statute. Focused on maintaining a delicate equilibrium between national prosecutions and international tribunals, the article explores the benefits and challenges associated with each approach. Through case studies and an analysis of the Principle of Complementarity in action, the article provides insights into the complexities of achieving justice for war crimes. Recommendations for enhancing complementarity are presented, emphasizing the need for collaborative efforts to address challenges faced by both national and international judicial systems. As the global community continues its pursuit of accountability for war crimes, the article underscores the ongoing importance of the Principle of Complementarity in fostering a comprehensive and effective legal framework.*

Keywords: International Criminal Court (ICC), International Tribunals, National Prosecutions, Principle of Complementarity, War Crimes

Introduction

The international community has worked to create systems for justice, accountability, and the prevention of punishment for the most horrific crimes against humanity in the wake of the terrible conflicts that have scarred humanity across history. In this effort, the idea of war crimes—which includes serious violations of the laws and traditions of war—has taken center stage. In order to achieve fair and impartial accountability, national prosecutors and international tribunals must carefully balance each other given the seriousness and scope of these crimes beyond state boundaries. The formation of international criminal tribunals, including the Nuremberg and Tokyo Trials after World War II, provided the groundwork for addressing war crimes on a worldwide scale. The establishment of the International Criminal

Court (ICC) in 2002 marked a significant turning point in the fight for justice for the worst international crimes, such as war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. Nonetheless, the Rome Statute, which created the ICC, emphasizes the importance of national jurisdictions in pursuing those guilty of such crimes, as does the complementarity idea (Stigen, 2008).

The complementarity principle is based on the notion that national legal systems are inherently accountable for and able to bring criminal charges against individuals who commit international crimes inside their boundaries. International courts, such as the ICC, ought to step in only in cases when governments are incapable or unwilling to bring serious charges against offenders. This idea emphasizes the need for global accountability while respecting state

sovereignty. In order to better understand the concept of complementarity and its practical applications in the fight for war crime justice, this paper explores its complex dynamics. This debate seeks to critically evaluate the potential and problems that this principle presents by examining significant situations that have pushed the bounds of complementarity. Additionally, it aims to clarify the ongoing discussion regarding whether complementarity unintentionally establishes a hierarchy of justice or successfully promotes a cordial relationship between national jurisdictions and international tribunals (Perrin, 2006).

The study will examine the historical background that influenced the complementarity principle, explore its jurisprudential evolution, and closely examine its implementation in a few chosen cases. As we begin this investigation, it becomes clear that maintaining a delicate balance between national prosecutions and international tribunals is crucial for promoting an international culture of accountability that protects victims' rights and advances justice.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The focus of qualitative research approach is on delving into and comprehending the richness and intricacy of human experiences, perceptions, and behaviors in relation to particular contexts. Using an inductive methodology, researchers collect detailed and complex data via observations, interviews, focus groups, and content analysis. In order to guarantee that participants have a variety of viewpoints pertinent to the research subject, deliberate or snowball sampling is sometimes given priority in sampling procedures. Finding patterns, themes, and meanings in data requires applying techniques like coding, classification, and ongoing comparison. The role of the researcher is frequently reflexive and participatory, which enables close interaction with participants and ongoing research question refining as new information becomes available throughout the study. Triangulation, member verification, and keeping thorough reflexivity journals are some of the techniques used in qualitative research to maintain rigor and guarantee the validity and transparency of the

results.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF WAR CRIMES

The international community realized that regulations controlling the conduct of armed conflicts were necessary in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, which is when the current attempts to combat war crimes first emerged. An important turning point was reached with the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, which established the framework for the detection and prosecution of war crimes. These historic agreements, which came about as a result of the unstable geopolitical environment of the day, aimed to lessen the horrors of war by adopting humanitarian standards and restrictions on the tactics and weapons of war. On the other hand, the international response to war crimes underwent a radical change following World War II. Historical turning points were the Nuremberg Trials, which took place in 1945–1946, and the Tokyo Trials, which took place in 1946–1948. People were held accountable for crimes against humanity and peace in addition to conventional war crimes for the first time. The trials created a precedent that emphasized the accountability of people for heinous acts done during times of conflict, so influencing the future course of international justice (El Zeidy, M. M. 2001).

The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) are two ad hoc international criminal tribunals that were established in the late 20th century, building on the legacies of Nuremberg and Tokyo. These tribunals, which addressed the crimes carried out during the Rwandan genocide and the war in the Balkans, respectively, emphasized the determination of the international community to end war criminal impunity worldwide. Pioneers in the application of international criminal law, the ICTY and ICTR provided trial systems for those convicted of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. The International Criminal Court (ICC), a permanent organization tasked with investigating these crimes on a larger scale, was made possible by the effective operation of these tribunals (Khan, A., & Jiliani,

M. A. H. S. 2023). An enormous advancement in the struggle against impunity for the gravest international crimes was made with the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 2002. The International Criminal Court (ICC) represents the apex of a historical trajectory that started with the Hague Conventions and developed through the trials at Nuremberg and Tokyo, as well as the ad hoc tribunals for Yugoslavia and Rwanda. The ICC has jurisdiction over war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide, and the crime of aggression. The concept of war crimes has developed historically, and the subsequent creation of international institutions for accountability is indicative of the growing realization that a strong framework is required to deal with the most serious transgressions of international humanitarian law. Understanding the historical legacy of resolving war crimes offers important insights into the continued pursuit of justice in the face of conflict, particularly as the international community grapples with current issues (Carter, L. E. 2013).

THE ROME STATUTE AND THE PRINCIPLE OF COMPLEMENTARITY

The Rome Statute, which established the groundwork for the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC), was adopted in 1998, marking a watershed in the development of international criminal justice. The fundamental idea of this ground-breaking convention is the Principle of Complementarity, which is codified in Article 17 and represents a careful balance between the International Criminal Court (ICC) and national legal systems in the pursuit of war criminal punishment. The Rome Statute, which was adopted following extensive diplomatic talks and the unwavering efforts of the international community, is a testament to the commitment made to end impunity for the most serious crimes committed abroad. The statute envisioned the ICC as an independent, permanent body that could look into and bring cases against people for crimes against humanity, war crimes, genocide, and crimes of aggression. Article 17 of the Rome Statute states that the Principle of Complementarity is fundamental. This notion represents an essential

recognition of the centrality of national legal systems in national prosecutions of people accountable for transnational crimes. It states that the International Criminal Court (ICC) will only step in when national jurisdictions are really unable or unwilling to prosecute those who are accused of committing such crimes (Kleffner, J. K. 2003).

The acceptance of national sovereignty and the idea that nations have an inherent right and obligation to punish crimes committed inside their borders form the foundation of the principle of complementarity. The International Criminal Court (ICC) functions as a court of last resort, intervening only in cases when nations are incapable or unwilling to carry out their legal obligations. This strategy aims to achieve a harmonic balance between upholding state authority and making sure that justice is not compromised in the face of impunity. The Rome Statute attempts to promote cooperation between the International Criminal Court (ICC) and national legal systems by highlighting the complementarity principle. In order to guarantee the efficient investigation and punishment of transnational crimes, it pushes states to fortify their internal legal systems (Khan, A., Hussain, N., & Oad, S. 2023). In the worldwide struggle against impunity, the ICC serves as a catalyst for strengthening states' ability and desire to prosecute such crimes, therefore reiterating the idea of shared responsibility. Furthermore, the Rome Statute is a historic development in the area of international criminal law, particularly with regard to the Principle of Complementarity. The principle of complementarity serves as a guiding principle for the International Criminal Court (ICC) as it pursues justice for crimes against humanity, war crimes, genocide, and crimes of aggression. It ensures that the pursuit of accountability is a cooperative endeavor that upholds state sovereignty and the imperative of justice on the international scene (Carter, L. E. 2010).

BENEFITS OF NATIONAL PROSECUTIONS

A keystone of international humanitarian law enforcement, national prosecutions play a major role in achieving the overriding objective of

preventing war crimes from going unpunished. States are naturally well-positioned to investigate and prosecute crimes committed within their boundaries since they are the main actors in the protection of their inhabitants and territory. The advantages of national prosecutions are not limited to legal proceedings; rather, they embrace a wider range of benefits that are essential to the pursuit of justice and accountability (Kleffner, J. K. 2008).

Proximity and Contextual Familiarity

Given their close proximity to crime locations and knowledge of the surrounding context, national courts enjoy a distinct advantage. Local legal systems, languages, and cultures are often better known to judges, prosecutors, and investigators. Because of this familiarity, the legal procedure is more effective and nuanced, allowing for a greater comprehension of the sociopolitical circumstances surrounding the accused crimes (Clark, 2005).

Efficiency and Timeliness

More efficiency and promptness are typically attributes of national prosecutions. Local authorities are frequently better suited to look into and decide matters quickly, reducing the amount of time that international legal processes inevitably take. In addition to advancing the goals of justice, this prompt case processing helps resolve victims' complaints and preserve social order.

Development of Domestic Legal Frameworks

The creation and fortification of domestic legal frameworks are greatly aided by national prosecutions. States are better able to handle the complexity of war crimes when national laws are modified to conform to international legal norms. This development promotes a stronger and more extensive judicial system that can address a variety of transnational offenses (Hussain, N., Khan, A., Chandio, L. A., & Oad, S. 2023).

Sense of Ownership and Responsibility

States that aggressively pursue war crimes cultivate a sense of accountability and ownership for redressing the horrors perpetrated

within their borders. This supports the notion that states have a responsibility to protect the rights of their citizens and is also consistent with sovereignty ideas. This kind of ownership is essential to establishing a long-lasting culture of accountability and halting the recurrence of related crimes (Khan, A. S., Bibi, A., Khan, A., & Ahmad, I. 2023).

Building Trust and Reconciliation

National prosecutions play a role in fostering trust in conflict-affected communities. Justice that is carried out locally may be seen as more legitimate and sensitive to the requirements of the impacted community. This legitimacy increases the likelihood of societal cohesion and reconciliation, two important outcomes in the wake of massive violence.

Moreover, national prosecutions have advantages that go well beyond their direct legal results. They represent a comprehensive strategy for dealing with war crimes that includes aspects of effectiveness, cultural sensitivity, legislative advancement, and social reconstruction. Establishing a comprehensive and long-lasting system for accountability in the face of serious international crimes requires acknowledging and valuing national prosecutions, even as international institutions such as the International Criminal Court play a crucial role (Burke-White, W. W. 2008).

CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING NATIONAL PROSECUTIONS

National prosecutions are a promising tool for bringing war criminals to justice, but there are several obstacles in the way of their successful execution. The investigation and prosecution of foreign crimes inside national legal systems can provide a number of intricate challenges that could prevent responsibility from being realized. The following difficulties demonstrate the complexities involved in obtaining successful national prosecutions.

Political Will and Impartiality

The political will of certain regimes to conduct unbiased investigations and prosecutions of war crimes presents a significant obstacle. The integrity of the legal process may be jeopardized

in circumstances where conflicts of interest exist or where political factors take precedence over judicial neutrality. The impartial pursuit of justice by national legal systems may be impeded by political meddling (Khan, A., Javed, K., Khan, A. S., & Rizwi, A. 2022).

Capacity and Resources

Many states might not have the necessary resources or ability to carry out thorough investigations and prosecutions, especially those that are emerging from conflict. A lack of experienced workers, restricted access to specialized training, and inadequate budget can make it difficult for national court systems to handle complicated war crimes cases (Minow, M. 2019).

Corruption and Judicial Independence

The existence of corruption in legal systems presents a noteworthy obstacle to equitable and unbiased processes. Corruption undermines public confidence and calls into question the legitimacy of national prosecutions when it permeates the judicial system. Overcoming these obstacles depends on maintaining the independence and integrity of the judiciary (Khan, A., Khan, A. S., & Khan, I. 2022).

Security Concerns

Safeguarding the judicial process participants, such as judges, prosecutors, and witnesses, can be a significant issue in conflict-affected areas. Threats, coercion, and physical harm directed towards individuals involved in national prosecutions have the potential to impede the pursuit of justice and discourage prospective witnesses from coming forward.

Incomplete or Weak Legal Frameworks

It's possible that certain states don't have complete legal systems that follow international guidelines for war crime prosecution. Legal reforms and capacity-building initiatives may be necessary in order to handle complex international crimes that national courts may find difficult to prosecute due to incomplete or inadequate legal frameworks (Khan, A., Bhatti, S. H., & Jillani, M. A. H. S. 2021).

Intentional Shielding of Perpetrators

States may, in certain circumstances, purposefully prevent offenders from facing consequences because of political ties, ethnic concerns, or other tactical factors. The effective prosecution of war crimes at the federal level is severely hampered by this intentional hindrance.

Transitional Justice Challenges

States making the shift from war to peace frequently encounter particular difficulties when putting comprehensive transitional justice institutions into place. The successful implementation of national prosecutions may be hampered by the need to carefully navigate the demands of justice, truth, and reconciliation in the absence of a comprehensive strategy.

Impunity and Lack of Deterrence

The deterrence impact of national prosecutions may be compromised by the continued impunity for war crimes. The idea that one can avoid responsibility for one's acts lessens the deterrent effect of the legal system and may encourage the commission of comparable crimes again (Khan, A., & Hussain Shah Jillani, M. A. 2019).

Given these obstacles, it is clear that effective national prosecutions need coordinated measures to correct institutional flaws, advance judicial independence, and create an atmosphere that encourages accountability. When national barriers become insurmountable, the International Criminal Court and other complementing international organizations play a crucial role in ensuring that victims of war crimes receive justice (Newton, M. A. 2001).

THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS

When national systems fail, international tribunals—such as the International Criminal Court (ICC)—become essential in tackling the difficulties involved in bringing war criminals to justice. These tribunals function as an international system of accountability, deterrent, and advancement of justice for all. But there are a number of obstacles that come with being effective, from lack of resources and restricted

jurisdiction to problems with enforcement.

1. **Addressing Impunity:** International tribunals are intended to handle cases in which national legal systems are unable or unwilling to bring war crime cases against the perpetrators. These tribunals prevent impunity by making people accountable on an international scale. One of the strongest incentives for adhering to international humanitarian law is the possibility of facing international prosecution.
2. **Universality of Justice:** International tribunals highlight the universality of justice by offering a venue where war criminals, regardless of nationality, can be brought to justice. This aids in the creation of an international legal framework that cuts across national boundaries and highlights the community's collective obligation to address the most serious international crimes.
3. **Filling Jurisdictional Gaps:** International tribunals fill in the gaps in national courts' jurisdiction when they cannot pursue specific crimes or lack jurisdiction. This is especially important when crimes are committed across state lines or when states refuse to prosecute certain people for political reasons.
4. **Ensuring Impartiality and Independence:** International tribunals are intended to function free from political pressure at the national level, fostering objectivity in the search for justice. These tribunals work to promote fair and impartial proceedings by deciding cases without taking into account national interests, which enhances the legitimacy of the international judicial system.
5. **Setting Legal Precedents:** International tribunal rulings set legal precedents that influence the development of international criminal law and serve as a roadmap for upcoming prosecutions. These precedents aid in the creation of a logical and consistent legal framework that addresses crimes against humanity, genocide, and war crimes (Jones, A. 2015).

However, international tribunals encounter their own set of challenges:

- a. **Limited Jurisdiction:** International tribunals' jurisdiction is frequently restricted to particular temporal or geographic eras. This restriction can leave some cases out of its purview, rendering some of the offenders immune to international justice. It might be difficult to obtain international agreement and cooperation when extending jurisdiction.
- b. **Resource Constraints:** International tribunals are limited in their ability to operate by both financial resources and member state cooperation. These difficulties may affect the speed and effectiveness of the legal process, thus postponing victim justice.
- c. **Issues of Enforcement:** One major obstacle is the execution of verdicts and punishments rendered by international tribunals. States' assistance is necessary for tribunals to apprehend and transfer people charged with war crimes, but not all states may be willing to comply, especially if it goes against their national interests.
- d. **Political Influences:** Political considerations may have an impact on international tribunals' formation as well as how its proceedings are carried out. The willingness of states to collaborate with tribunals can be impacted by geopolitical factors and power relations, which could jeopardize the pursuit of justice.

International tribunals are essential for correcting national systems' flaws and promoting global accountability, but their efficacy depends on resolving certain obstacles. Ensuring that justice is not only served but also seen as fair, unbiased, and inclusive on a global scale requires striking a balance between the complementary functions of national prosecutors and international tribunals (Heller, K. J. 2012).

STRIKING A BALANCE: CASE STUDIES

Analyzing particular case studies provide insightful information on the practical

application of the Rome Statute's Principle of Complementarity. Examining the role played by the International Criminal Court (ICC) in the cases of Sudan, Libya, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) can help us comprehend the complex interactions between national and international attempts to bring war criminals to justice.

Sudan: The Case of Darfur

The circumstances in Sudan's Darfur region provide a striking illustration of the difficulties and nuances involved in applying the Principle of Complementarity. High-ranking Sudanese leaders, including the country's president Omar al-Bashir at the time, had arrest warrants issued by the ICC for suspected war crimes, crimes against humanity, and Darfur genocide. Sudan, however, argued that it had national jurisdiction over the issue and declined to cooperate with the ICC. Thus, the ICC's attempt to step in when the national legal system was thought to be incapable or unwilling to prosecute the accused offenders tested the Principle of Complementarity. This case highlights the conflict between state sovereignty and international justice, casting doubt on the ICC's efficacy in the face of the involved state's non-cooperation (Ryngaert, C. 2008).

Libya: The Fallout from the Arab Spring

The International Criminal Court (ICC) became involved in the Libyan crisis following the Arab Spring, issuing arrest warrants for individuals connected to Muammar Gaddafi's administration. The ICC encountered difficulties working with a divided national landscape as internal turmoil developed. In this case, the Principle of Complementarity required working with newly formed national authorities and striking a careful balance between foreign intervention and the development of a respectable domestic legal system. The Libyan story serves as a reminder of the difficulties in maintaining complementarity during unstable political transitions and the necessity of adjusting to changing national conditions (Krings, B. L. 2012).

Democratic Republic of the Congo: A Hybrid Approach

One example of a hybrid approach that combines national and international initiatives is the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). In the DRC, the ICC has been actively involved in the prosecution of persons for crimes against humanity and war crimes. But because the DRC is aware of the difficulties of depending just on international processes, it has also pursued domestic prosecutions. This hybrid strategy emphasizes cooperation between national and international systems to provide a thorough and efficient response to widespread atrocities, embodying the spirit of the Principle of Complementarity. The DRC case provides an illustration of how complementarity might be put into practice to support efforts at the national and international levels to achieve justice.

These case studies shed light on the complex dynamics that must be balanced between international and national efforts to prosecute war crimes. As they negotiate the complicated landscape of international justice and the Principle of Complementarity, policymakers, legal professionals, and the international community can learn a great deal from the struggles and victories experienced in Sudan, Libya, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Comprehending these dynamics is vital in order to enhance and improve the systems designed to guarantee responsibility for the gravest transnational offenses (Fish, E. S. 2009).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCING COMPLEMENTARITY

A diversified strategy is necessary to strengthen the Principle of Complementarity and guarantee more fruitful cooperation between national and international legal systems. The following suggestions aim to promote a cordial connection between national prosecutions and international tribunals by addressing issues that both levels of justice must deal with:

1. Technical and Financial help to States: To strengthen their ability to look into and prosecute war crimes, states—especially those with low resources—should receive focused technical and financial help. The

provision of resources required for carrying out in-depth investigations, help formulating and modifying local laws to conform to international standards, and training programs for legal professionals are a few examples of this support.

2. **Global Collaboration and Arrangements:** Encourage improved coordination and collaboration between nations in the investigation and prosecution of transnational crimes. In order to exchange knowledge, data, and best practices, states should be urged to work with NGOs, other states, and international organizations. Create procedures for information sharing and reciprocal legal aid to enable smooth collaboration between domestic and foreign organizations.
3. **Building the International Criminal Court's Capacity:** Increase the ICC's ability to manage a growing caseload and get beyond financial limitations. This can entail getting member governments to provide consistent financial assistance, expediting procedures by simplifying internal procedures, and growing outreach initiatives to promote greater international cooperation.
4. **Supporting National Legislative Reforms:** Push for national legislative changes that fortify state legal systems and give them the tools they need to successfully prosecute war crimes. In order to lessen the need for foreign intervention, this may entail offering professional advice and technical support in the creation of complete legal frameworks that follow international standards.
5. **Awareness and Training Programs:** Start educating the public, law enforcement, and legal professionals about international humanitarian law through awareness and training programs. In order to cultivate a sense of accountability for addressing war crimes at the national level, it can be helpful to promote a fuller awareness of the tenets and obligations set forth in international treaties and conventions.
6. **Protection of Victims and Witnesses:** Boost protocols to safeguard witnesses and victims

engaged in federal cases. Strong witness protection initiatives should be established on a national and worldwide scale to promote the involvement of those who possess vital information while guaranteeing their safety and security.

7. **Transitional Justice Initiatives:** Include transitional justice programs in efforts to rebuild after a conflict. Acknowledging the significance of truth and reconciliation procedures in addition to legal actions, advocate for all-encompassing approaches that tackle the wider societal ramifications of war crimes and foster enduring peace.
8. **Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanisms:** Put in place strong monitoring and evaluation systems to judge how well national prosecutions are working and how closely international standards are being followed. Periodic evaluations, carried out by impartial entities or global associations, can facilitate the identification of opportunities for enhancement and guarantee continuous adherence to the Complementarity Principle.

The international community may help ensure that the Principle of Complementarity is implemented more effectively and cohesively by implementing these proposals. In the end, this cooperative strategy aims to boost the group's efforts to fight impunity and uphold justice for war crimes by addressing the difficulties that both national and international systems face (Jurdi, N. N. 2010).

CONCLUSION

To sum up, the Rome Statute, which founded the International Criminal Court (ICC), incorporates the Principle of Complementarity, which is an essential framework for attaining justice for victims of war crimes. This principle acknowledges that national legal systems have a fundamental role in trying those accountable for such horrible crimes, with the International Criminal Court acting as a court of last resort, stepping in only in cases where governments are genuinely incapable or unwilling to prosecute. Case studies from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan, and Libya show how

complex and multidimensional complementarity is operationalized. There are still difficulties on both the national and international levels, ranging from problems with enforcement and jurisdictional limits to political roadblocks and resource shortages. In order to improve the Principle of Complementarity, a thorough strategy that tackles these issues must be implemented. This entails giving governments financial and technical support, encouraging international collaboration, strengthening the ICC's capabilities, raising public knowledge of international humanitarian law, and pushing for national legislative changes. By putting these suggestions into practice, the international community can help ensure that national and international systems work together more smoothly, which will strengthen the effort to hold war criminals accountable. The basic objective is the same while striking a careful balance between national prosecutions and international tribunals: to end impunity, protect human rights, and work toward a future in which accountability for the most egregious international crimes is not only sought, but actually realized. The pursuit of justice is a team effort that calls for constant dedication, collaboration, and flexibility to meet the changing demands of our international environment. Justice can remain a pillar in the wake of conflict and atrocity if the international community persists in improving and fortifying the systems that support the Principle of Complementarity.

REFERENCES

- Burke-White, W. W. (2008). Proactive complementarity: The International Criminal Court and national courts in the Rome system of international justice. *Harv. Int'l LJ*, 49, 53.
- Carter, L. E. (2010). The principle of complementarity and the International Criminal Court: the role of ne bis in idem. *Santa Clara J. Int'l L.*, 8, 165.
- Carter, L. E. (2013). The future of the international criminal court: complementarity as a strength or a weakness. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 12, 451.
- Clark, T. H. (2005). The Prosecutor of International Criminal Court, Amnesties, and the Interests of Justice: Striking a Delicate Balance. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 4, 389.
- El Zeidy, M. M. (2001). The principle of complementarity: A new machinery to implement international criminal law. *Mich. J. Int'l L.*, 23, 869.
- Fish, E. S. (2009). Peace through complementarity: solving the ex post problem in International Criminal Court prosecutions. *Yale LJ*, 119, 1703.
- Heller, K. J. (2012). A sentence-based theory of complementarity. *Harv. Int'l LJ*, 53, 85.
- Hussain, N., Khan, A., Chandio, L. A., & Oad, S. (2023). Individual Criminal Responsibility for the Crime of Aggression: The Role of the ICC's Leadership Clause. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(1), 223-232.
- Jones, A. (2015). Tailoring justice for mass atrocities: The constraints of international law and the ICC's complementarity regime. In *International Law and Post-Conflict Reconstruction Policy* (pp. 95-115). Routledge.
- Jurdi, N. N. (2010). The prosecutorial interpretation of the complementarity principle: Does it really contribute to ending impunity on the national level?. *International Criminal Law Review*, 10(1), 73-96.
- Khan, A. S., Bibi, A., Khan, A., & Ahmad, I. (2023). Responsibility of Sexual Violence Under International Law. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 3(1), 29-41.
- Khan, A., & Hussain Shah Jilani, M. A. (2019). Killer Robots and Their Compliance with the Principles of Law of War. *JL & Soc'y*, 50, 55.
- Khan, A., & Jilani, M. A. H. S. (2023). Expanding The Boundaries Of Jurisprudence In The Era Of

- Technological Advancements. *IJUM Law Journal*, 31(2), 393-426.
- Khan, A., Bhatti, S. H., & Jillani, M. A. H. S. (2021). An overview on individual criminal liability for crime of aggression. *Liberal Arts & Social Sciences International Journal (LASSIJ)*.
- Khan, A., Hussain, N., & Oad, S. (2023). THE ROME STATUTE: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE ROLE OF THE SWGCA IN DEFINING THE CRIME OF AGGRESSION. *Pakistan Journal of International Affairs*, 6(1).
- Khan, A., Javed, K., Khan, A. S., & Rizwi, A. (2022). Aggression and individual criminal responsibility in the perspective of Islamic law. *Competitive Social Science Research Journal*, 3(1), 35-48.
- Khan, A., Khan, A. S., & Khan, I. (2022). Responsibility Of Killer Robots For Causing Civilian Harm: A Critique Of Ai Application In Warfare Doctrine. *Pakistan Journal of International Affairs*, 5(1).
- Kleffner, J. K. (2003). The impact of complementarity on national implementation of substantive international criminal law. *Journal of international criminal justice*, 1(1), 86-113.
- Kleffner, J. K. (2008). *Complementarity in the Rome Statute and national criminal jurisdictions*. OUP Oxford.
- Krings, B. L. (2012). The Principles of Complementarity and Universal Jurisdiction in International Criminal Law: Antagonists or Perfect Match. *Goettingen J. Int'l L.*, 4, 737.
- Minow, M. (2019). Do Alternative Justice Mechanisms Deserve Recognition in International Criminal Law: Truth Commissions, Amnesties, and Complementarity at the International Criminal Court. *Harv. Int'l LJ*, 60, 1.
- Newton, M. A. (2001). Comparative Complementarity: Domestic Jurisdiction Consistent with the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. *Mil. L. Rev.*, 167, 20.
- Perrin, B. (2006). Making sense of complementarity: the relationship between the international criminal court and national jurisdictions. *Sri Lanka J. Int'l L.*, 18, 301.
- Ryngaert, C. (2008). Applying The Rome Statutes Complementarity Principle: Drawing Lessons From The Prosecution of Core Crimes by States Acting Under the Universality Principle. *Crim. LF*, 19, 153.
- Stigen, J. (2008). *The relationship between the International Criminal Court and national jurisdictions: the principle of complementarity* (Vol. 34). Brill.