

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	viii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	x
1 Introduction	1
1.A Research question	4
1.B Research design	5
1.C Methodology	6
1.D Clarifications and limitations	9
2 From impartiality to complicity? The evolution of UN peace operations	11
2.A Preliminary remarks	12
2.A.1 UN Peacekeeping: Conception and Legal Framework under the UN Charter	12
2.A.2 Overview of Command and Control Arrangements	18
2.B The evolution of UN peace operations	21
2.B.1 Traditional Peacekeeping	23
2.B.2 Post-Cold War Multidimensional Peace Operations	24
2.B.3 Rwanda, Srebrenica, and other Contemporary Failures	28
2.B.4 The Birth of Robust Peacekeeping	33
2.C The demise of impartiality	35
2.D Conclusions and typology of potential complicity scenarios	41
3 Legal regime of the responsibility of international organizations	42
3.A International legal personality of international organizations	43
3.B Main points of criticism leveled against ARIO	47
3.B.1 Extensive Borrowing from Articles on Responsibility of States	48
3.B.2 Scarce Practice and (Dis)regard to the Principle of Speciality	49

3.B.3	Distinction between Primary and Secondary Rules	51
3.C	Key principles of ARIO	52
3.C.1	Breach of an International Obligation by an IO	54
3.C.2	Rules of Attribution	61
3.C.3	The Concept of Derivative Responsibility	69
3.C.4	Tentative Conclusions on ARIO	70
3.D	Challenges of enforcing the UN's responsibility	71
4	Responsibility for complicity in public international law	78
4.A	Complicity in public international law: an analytical framework	79
4.A.1	<i>Sui Generis</i> Meaning of Complicity in the Law of International Responsibility	82
4.A.2	Survey of Subject-specific Complicity Norms in the Era of Collective Security	90
4.B	Responsibility for aid or assistance under ARS and ARIO	92
4.B.1	General Complicity Rule	93
4.B.2	Obligation of Non-assistance	112
4.B.3	Conclusions on Responsibility for Aiding or Assisting in ARS and ARIO	127
4.C	A case for the aggravated complicity rule	129
4.C.1	Systemic Integration of the Aggravated Complicity Rule	132
4.C.2	Normative Environment: The Deductive Approach	135
4.C.3	Analysis of State/IO Practice and <i>Opinio Juris</i> : The Inductive Method	151
4.C.4	Conclusions on the Aggravated Complicity Rule	163
5	Due diligence and responsibility for complicity: the quest for clarification	168
5.A	Due diligence in public international law: an overview	169
5.A.1	Preliminary Remarks	169
5.A.2	Evolution of the Notion of Due Diligence	172
5.A.3	Analytical Clarifications	177
5.B	No harm rule versus general complicity rule	179
5.B.1	Relevance of the No Harm Rule in the Realm of IO Responsibility	180

5.B.2	Complicity and No Harm Rule: A Conceptual Demarcation	181
5.B.3	Tentative Conclusions	189
5.C	The standard of due diligence and the aggravated complicity rule	190
5.C.1	Treaty-based Obligations to Prevent: A More Manageable Alternative to the Aggravated Complicity Rule?	190
5.C.2	Taking Acceptance Seriously: Rationale for Augmenting the International Legal System with the Aggravated Complicity Rule	194
5.C.3	Incorporation of Due Diligence Standard into Aggravated Complicity Rule	199
5.D	Conclusions	206
6	Responsibility for complicity and the plurality of responsible actors	209
6.A	Plurality of responsible actors: contemporary state of art	210
6.A.1	Analytical Toolbox	211
6.A.2	Refining the Question: Responsibility for ‘Joint Complicity’	215
6.B	Allocation of responsibility for joint complicity	217
6.B.1	Evolving Modalities of the Effective Control Test	217
6.B.2	Proposed Scheme of Responsibility for the UN Peacekeepers’ Complicit Conduct	226
6.C	The implementation of dual responsibility of the UN and TCC for peacekeepers’ complicit conduct	238
6.C.1	Invocation of Responsibility	238
6.C.2	Consequences of the Responsibility for Aid or Assistance	242
6.D	Concluding remarks	248
7	General conclusions	249
7.A	Results	249
7.B	Discussion and Conclusions	254
	<i>Index</i>	258