

No. 06-1196

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

KHALED A.F. AL ODAH, *et al.*  
*Petitioners,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,  
*Respondents.*

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States  
Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE  
BRIEF AND BRIEF OF INTERNATIONAL LAW  
SCHOLARS AS *AMICI CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT OMAR KHADR**

SARAH H. PAOLETTI  
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA  
SCHOOL OF LAW  
3400 CHESTNUT STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104  
(215)898-8427

*Counsel of Record for Amici Curiae*

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

KHALED A.F. AL ODAH, *et al.*  
*Petitioners,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,  
*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ of Certiorari to the United States  
Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit**

---

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE  
BRIEF OF INTERNATIONAL LAW SCHOLARS  
AS AMICI CURIAE  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT OMAR KHADR**

---

Pursuant to Rule 37.3(b) of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States, International Law Scholars (listed in Appendix A) hereby request leave to file the accompanying *amicus curiae* brief. This brief is submitted in support of the petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Petitioners and Respondents Khadr and Khalid have consented to the filing of this brief. Counsel for Respondent President Bush has not consented.


As set forth in the accompanying brief, the International Law Scholars listed in Appendix A are committed to the respect for international humanitarian,

human rights and criminal law, and have a deep interest in seeing that said legal norms are followed.

The International Law Scholars seeking to appear as *Amici* do so because of their great concern alternative process to habeas corpus provided for under the Military Commissions Act is inadequate for preserving well-established principles of international law. Specifically, *Amici* urge this Court to consider that the United States' position regarding the detention and prosecution of Omar Khadr before the Combatant Status Review Tribunals is in stark contrast to well-established precedent under customary international law which prohibits the prosecution of children alleged to have engaged in combat except in extraordinary cases. In those cases where such prosecutions are allowed, international law requires children be treated with special protections and with an eye towards rehabilitation and reintegration, and not retribution. Accordingly, the International Law Scholars listed in Appendix A respectfully request leave to file the accompanying *amicus curiae* brief.

August 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

  
SARAH H. PAOLETTI\*

*Counsel of Record for*  
*International Law Scholars*  
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA  
SCHOOL OF LAW  
3400 Chestnut Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19104  
(215)898-8427

\* Application for Admission to the U.S. Supreme Court pending

TABI  
TABI  
INTE  
SUMI  
ARGU  
I.  
STA  
A C  
II.  
WH  
TO  
ILL  
A  
o  
B  
d  
sl  
III.  
POI  
PRC  
WA  
AS  
A  
nc  
is  
pr  
th

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... 1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... 2

INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE* ..... 7

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT ..... 7

ARGUMENT ..... 8

    I. THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD TO PROTECTED STATUS IN SITUATIONS OF ARMED CONFLICT IS A CUSTOMARY NORM OF INTERNATIONAL LAW 8

    II. INTERNATIONAL LAW PRESUMES A CHILD WHO HAS SERVED IN CIRCUMSTANCES SIMILAR TO THAT OF RESPONDENT WAS RECRUITED ILLEGALLY AND SERVED INVOLUNTARILY ..... 12

        A. International law restricts the recruitment and use of child soldiers in hostilities..... 12

        B. Children illegally recruited into armed conflict are deemed to have served involuntarily and therefore should be treated as victims, not perpetrators..... 15

    III. INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMARY LAW AND POLICY CLEARLY DISFAVOURS THE PROSECUTION OF CHILD SOLDIERS FOR THEIR WARLIKE ACTS, RECOGNIZING CHILD SOLDIERS AS VICTIMS AND NOT PERPETRATORS ..... 18

        A. International law presumes that child soldiers are not triable absent extraordinary circumstances, and there is no precedent under international law for the prosecution of individuals who engaged in conflict when they were under the age of eighteen. .... 18

is  
re  
ry  
ll-  
y,  
s'  
ar  
in  
ler  
he  
bat  
ch  
res  
eye  
not  
lars  
the

s  
'ANIA

t

B. The presumption that prosecutions against child soldiers should not be brought absent extraordinary circumstances is a corollary to the belief the child soldiers are themselves victims in need of rehabilitation and reintegration into society. ....24

C. International law requires that trials of child soldiers be subject to specific minimum safeguards ....27

D. International law also disfavors prosecuting adults for crimes committed when child soldiers.....29

**CONCLUSION**.....30

**APPENDIX A (List of Amici Curiae)**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Filartiga v. Pena-Irala*, 630 F.2d 876, 880 (2d Cir. 1980) ....8

*Prosecutor v. Brima, Kamara and Kanu*, SCSL-04-16-T, Trial Chamber II, Special Court for Sierra Leone (June 20, 2007)..... 17

*Prosecutor v. Joseph Kony, Vincent Otti, Raska Lukwiya, Okot Odhiambo and Dominic Ongwen*, Indictment, ICC-02/04-01/05)..... 17

*Prosecutor v. Norman*, SCSL-04-14-AR72(E), Special Court for Sierra Leone (May 31, 2004)..... 17

*Prosecutor v Thomas Lubanga Dyilo*, Decision on the confirmation of charges, Pre-Trial Chamber I, International Criminal Court, 29 January 2007, ICC-01/04-01/06-803.15

*Roper v. Simmons*, 543 U.S. 551, 570 (2005) .....29

*Sosa v. Alvarez-Machain*, 124 S. Ct. 2739, 2761 (2004) .....8

*The Paquete Habana*, 175 U.S. 677, 700 (1900) .....9

*United States v. Arjona*, 120 U.S. 479, 487 (1887) .....8

*United States v. Smith*, 18 U.S. (5 Wheat.) 153, 160-61 (1820)  
.....8

**Other Authorities**

Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August  
1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of  
International Armed Conflicts (“Protocol I”), June 8, 1977,  
1125 U.N.T.S. 3 ..... 10, 12

Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August  
1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-  
International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II), June 8, 1977,  
1125 U.N.T.S. 609 ..... 10, 12-13

Geneva Convention III Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners  
of War, Aug. 12, 1949, 75 U.N.T.S. 135 ..... 10

Geneva Convention IV Relative to the Protection of Civilian  
Persons in Time of War, Aug. 12, 1949, 75 U.N.T.S. 287  
..... 10

Geneva Declaration of the Rights of the Child, Sept. 26, 1924,  
League of Nations, O.J. Spec. Supp. 21 at 43 (1924) ..... 8

Graça Machel, *Promotion and Protection of the Rights of  
Children: Impact of Armed Conflict on Children*, U.N. Doc.  
A/51/306 (Aug. 26, 1996) ..... 15

ILO Convention concerning the Prohibition and Immediate  
Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child  
Labour (ILO C182), June 17, 1999, 38 I.L.M. 1207 ...15-16

on  
.24

.27

ilts  
.29

)

....8

20,  
...17

....17

court  
....17

ional  
33.15

....29

Initial Report of the United States of America to the UN  
 Committee on the Rights of the Child Concerning the  
 Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the  
 Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict,  
 U.N. Doc. CRC/C/OPA/USA/1 (22 June 2007).....26

Letter dated 12 January 2001 from the Secretary-General  
 addressed to the President of the Security Council, UN  
 Doc. S/2001/40 .....22

Letter dated 22 December 2000 from the President of the  
 Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General, UN  
 Doc. S/2000/1234 .....22

Letter dated 22 December 2000 from the President of the  
 Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General, UN  
 Doc. S/2000/1234, Annex .....30

Michael J. Matheson, *The Sixth Annual American Red Cross-  
 Washington College of Law Conference on International  
 Humanitarian law: A Workshop on Customary  
 International Law and the 1977 Protocols Additional to  
 the 1949 Geneva Conventions*, 2 AM. U. J. INT'L L. &  
 POL'Y 415 (1987) ..... 13

Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the  
 Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict  
 GA Res. 54/263, U.N. Doc. A/RES/54/49, Annex I (May  
 25, 2000).....13-14, 25

Paris Commitments to Protect Children from Unlawful  
 Recruitment or Use by Armed Forces or Armed Groups,  
 consolidated version .....26

Paris Principles and Guidelines on Children Associated with  
 Armed Forces or Armed Groups .....25, 29

Rej  
S  
S  
Ro  
A  
Spe  
C  
Stat  
P  
C  
L  
C  
V  
S  
a  
r  
1  
Stat  
P  
H  
F  
A  
S  
(1  
The  
C  
The  
A  
U.N.  
U.

e  
t,  
..26  
  
..22  
  
IN  
...22  
  
JN  
....30  
  
ross-  
nal  
  
to  
  
.....13  
  
e  
lict  
May  
14, 25  
  
ips,  
.....26  
  
l with  
.25, 29

Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Paragraph 2 of Security Council Resolution No. 808 (1993), UN Doc. S/2570.....23

Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, U.N. Doc. A/CONF.183/9 (July 17, 1998), 2187 U.N.T.S. 90.... 16, 19

Special Court for Sierra Leone Public Affairs Office, “Special Court Prosecutor Says He Will Not Prosecute Children”, 2 November 2002.....22

Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States, between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994, adopted by S.C. Res. 955, U.N. SCOR, 49th Sess., 3453d mtg. at 3, U.N. Doc. S/RES/955 (1994), 33 I.L.M. 1598, 1600 (1994). ....23

Statute of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991, U.N. Doc. S/25704 at 36, Annex (1993) and S/25704/Add.1 (1993), adopted by Security Council on 25 May 1993, U.N. Doc. S/RES/827 (1993). ....23

The 1990 African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, OAU Doc. CAB/LEG/24.9/49 (1990)..... 15

The 2005 World Summit Outcome Document, U.N. Doc. A/RES/60/1 (Oct. 24, 2005) ..... 11

U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child, G.A. Res. 44/25, U.N. Doc. A/44/49 (Nov. 20, 1989).....11, 13, 20, 25, 28

U.N. Doc. S/RES/1315 (Aug. 14, 2000) .....22

United Nations Transitional Authority in East Timor,  
Regulation 2000/30 On Transitional Rules of Criminal  
Procedure, UNTAET/REG/2000/30.....20

**Treatises**

RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW OF  
THE UNITED STATES § 111 (1987) .....9

Matthew Happold, CHILD SOLDIERS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW,  
(Juris Publishing: 2005)..... 12

i  
l  
e  
M  
v  
S  
U  
F  
F  
p  
p  
e  
c  
l  
w  
re  
  
ch  
cr  
p  
ur  
  
N  
the  
liste  
cou  
mor

## INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*

*Amici Curiae* are international law scholars and experts in the area of international humanitarian law, international criminal law and international human rights law.<sup>1</sup> They submit this brief in support of Petitioners and Respondent Omar Khadr based on their firm belief that the alternative process to habeas corpus provided for under the Military Commissions Act is inadequate for preserving well-established principles of international law. Specifically, *Amici* urge this Court to consider that the United States' position regarding the detention and prosecution of Omar Khadr before the Combatant Status Review Tribunals is in stark contrast to well-established precedent under customary international law which prohibits the prosecution of children alleged to have engaged in combat except in extraordinary cases. In those cases where such prosecutions are allowed, international law requires children be treated with special protections and with an eye towards rehabilitation and reintegration, not retribution.

## SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

It is a principle of customary international law that children are to be accorded special protections in all criminal proceedings, and in any prosecutions for participation in warlike acts. This principle also holds true under international humanitarian law which affords special

---

<sup>1</sup> Names and statements of interest of the individual *amici* are provided in the attached Appendix. This brief was authored by the *amici* and counsel listed on the front cover, and was not authored in whole or in part by counsel for a party. No one other than *amici* or their counsel made any monetary contributions to the preparation or submission of this brief.

status to children in armed conflict and recognizes the need to distinguish them once captured. In appreciation of the unique issues related to children in armed conflict, no international criminal tribunal established under the laws of war, from Nuremberg forward, has prosecuted a former child soldier for violating the laws of war. To the extent that international law recognizes the limited culpability of children as combatants, it does so with an eye towards rehabilitation and reintegration, and not punishment. The alternative procedures established under the Military Commissions Act in lieu of habeas corpus have failed to provide the minimum guarantees afforded to children under clearly established international law norms applicable to the United States.

## ARGUMENT

### I. THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD TO PROTECTED STATUS IN SITUATIONS OF ARMED CONFLICT IS A CUSTOMARY NORM OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Norms of international law require that children (all persons under the age of 18) be provided with special rights and protections. These include specific norms governing the protection and treatment of children in armed conflict and children accused of having engaged in warlike activities. The development of these norms began in 1924 with provisions included in the Geneva Declaration,<sup>2</sup> and reiterated in 1959 in the Declaration of the Rights of the

<sup>2</sup> Geneva Declaration of the Rights of the Child, Sept. 26, 1924, League of Nations, O.J. Spec. Supp. 21 at 43 (1924) (providing that “The child must be the first to receive relief in times of distress” and “must be protected against every form of exploitation.”).

Chi  
chil  
and  
incl  
Rig  
A/4  
or  
recr  
prof  
abse  
inte  
prac  
part  
on tl

recr

<sup>3</sup> *The*  
part c  
justic  
upon  
*Arjon*  
to a n  
this n  
FORE  
(1987  
its so  
as evi  
accep  
emine  
(2d C  
works  
usage  
enforc  
153, 1  
2739,  
charac

Child enumerating ten principles of special attention to the child as a vulnerable person, who by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, Declaration of the Rights of the Child, G.A. Res. 1386 (XIV), U.N. Doc. A/4354 (Nov. 20, 1959). The prohibition of the recruitment or use of child soldiers, the requirement that illegally recruited child soldiers be treated as victims, and the prohibition of the retributive prosecution of child soldiers absent extraordinary circumstances are well enshrined in international treaty law and supported by sufficient state practice and *opinio juris* that they should be recognized as part of customary international law and, hence, as binding on the United States.<sup>3</sup>

International humanitarian law definitively recognizes the need to protect children, especially from the

---

<sup>3</sup> *The Paquete Habana*, 175 U.S. 677, 700 (1900) ("International law is part of our law, and must be ascertained and administered by the courts of justice of appropriate jurisdiction, as often as questions of right depending upon it are duly presented for their determination."); *United States v. Arjona*, 120 U.S. 479, 487 (1887) ("A right secured by the law of nations to a nation or its people is one the United States, as the representatives of this nation, are bound to protect."); RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW OF THE UNITED STATES § 111 (1987). International law, also referred to as "the law of nations," has as its source international conventions, international custom or state practice as evidence of a general practice of law, general principles of law accepted by civilized nations, judicial decisions, and the opinions of eminent scholars in the field. *Filartiga v. Pena-Irala*, 630 F.2d 876, 880 (2d Cir. 1980). "The law of nations 'may be ascertained by consulting the works of jurists, writing professedly on public law; or by the general usage and practice of nations; or by judicial decisions recognizing and enforcing that law.'" (citing *United States v. Smith*, 18 U.S. (5 Wheat.) 153, 160-61 (1820), *Id.* See also, *Sosa v. Alvarez-Machain*, 124 S. Ct. 2739, 2761 (2004) (international law includes "norm[s] of international character accepted by the civilized world").

horrors of war, and to provide redress for those horrors once the children have been removed from the conflict. Child-related provisions of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, recognized as binding in customary international law, provide repeatedly for age as a reason for privileges.<sup>4</sup>

The 1977 Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions further establishes “children shall be the object of special respect and shall be protected against any form of indecent assault. The Parties to the conflict shall provide them with the care and aid they require, whether because of their age or for any other reason.” Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (“Protocol I”), June 8, 1977, 1125 U.N.T.S. 3, Art. 77(1).

The principle of special care for children is extended to non-international armed conflicts in Article 4(3) of Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II), June 8, 1977, 1125 U.N.T.S. 609, wherein child combatants,

---

<sup>4</sup> Geneva Convention III Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, Aug. 12, 1949, 75 U.N.T.S. 135, Art. 16 (creating a position exception from equality accorded by reason of age) and Art. 49 (requiring age differentiation); Geneva Convention IV Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, Aug. 12, 1949, 75 U.N.T.S. 287, Art. 24 (outlining specific provisions for children under 15), Art. 50 (outlining specific obligations of occupying powers vis-à-vis children), Art. 51 (excluding persons under 18 from any circumstances that might necessitate them to be enlisted and compelled to labour by an occupying power) and Art. 68 (excluding children who were under 18 at the time of the offence committed from the death penalty).

particularly if illegally recruited, are entitled by virtue of their age to protections above and beyond those to which any similarly situated adult is entitled.

The 1989 U.N. Convention of the Rights of the Child (the "CRC"), defining a child as "every human being below the age of eighteen years," G.A. Res. 44/25, U.N. Doc. A/44/49 (Nov. 20, 1989), establishes the centrality of the survival and development of children, and articulates three major principles: (1) non-discrimination; (2) children's participation; and (3) the best interests of the child. *Id.*, Art. 1. Included in the CRC are specific provisions relating to armed conflict, *id.*, Arts. 38-39, which grant full recognition to the rules of international humanitarian law as they pertain to children, and call upon States Parties "to promote physical and psychological recovery and social reintegration" in "an environment which fosters the health, self-respect and dignity of the child." *Id.*, Art. 39.<sup>5</sup>

The 2005 World Summit Outcome Document, U.N. Doc. A/RES/60/1 (Oct. 24, 2005), called upon States to take effective measures to prevent the recruitment and use of children in armed conflict by armed forces and groups, to prohibit and criminalize such practices, and to "ensure that children in armed conflicts receive timely and effective humanitarian assistance, including education, for their rehabilitation and reintegration into society." *Id.* at ¶¶ 117-118.

---

<sup>5</sup> Similar provisions are articulated in Article 40 of the CRC pertaining to treatment of juveniles under penal law.

II. INTERNATIONAL LAW PRESUMES A CHILD WHO HAS SERVED IN CIRCUMSTANCES SIMILAR TO THAT OF RESPONDENT WAS RECRUITED ILLEGALLY AND SERVED INVOLUNTARILY

A. International law restricts the recruitment and use of child soldiers in hostilities.

International law increasingly restricts the recruitment and use of child soldiers, with a prohibition on the recruitment and use of all children under fifteen for active participation in hostilities, and a prohibition on the forcible or compulsory recruitment of children aged between fifteen and eighteen years, who even if voluntarily recruited may not be used to participate directly in hostilities. Although children between 15 and 18 may volunteer for military service for the State, international law imposes strict criteria to ensure that such enlistments are the result of the child's (and his or her parents') informed consent. All recruitment into non-governmental armed groups is prohibited and deemed not to be truly voluntary.

The prohibition of the recruitment and use of children under 15 to participate actively in hostilities is both a treaty rule and a rule of customary international law. Article 77 of Protocol I prohibits the recruitment of children under fifteen into armed forces and their direct participation in hostilities in international armed conflicts.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, Article 4(3)(c) of Protocol II prohibits the recruitment of children under fifteen into armed forces or groups or their participation in hostilities in non-

---

<sup>6</sup> 1125 U.N.T.S. 3

7  
8  
9  
89  
De  
ra  
re  
fe  
a c  
An  
Im  
In  
Co

international armed conflicts.<sup>7</sup> Article 38(2) of the CRC requires all states “ensure that persons who have not attained the age of fifteen years do not take a direct part in hostilities,” and Article 38(3) obliges states to “refrain from recruiting any person who has not attained the age of fifteen years into their armed forces.”<sup>8</sup> These texts are derived directly from Article 77(2) of the 1977 Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions, which was used as the benchmark from which discussion on the CRC commenced, even by States which had not ratified or signed the Additional Protocol.<sup>9</sup>

For children between the ages of fifteen and eighteen, Article 3 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict imposes restrictions on the voluntary recruitment of children, obliging states to maintain safeguards to ensure, as a minimum: a) such recruitment is genuinely voluntary; b) is carried out with the informed consent of the person’s parents or legal guardians; c) such persons are fully informed of the duties involved in such a military service; and d) they provide reliable proof of age

---

<sup>7</sup> 1125 U.N.T.S. 609

<sup>8</sup> U.N. Doc. A/44/49

<sup>9</sup> Matthew Happold, CHILD SOLDIERS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW (2005), pp. 89-91. Indeed, in 1987 the then Deputy Legal Adviser to the State Department, explaining that whilst the U.S. Government was unwilling to ratify the 1977 Additional Protocol, it saw a number of its provisions as reflecting customary international law, including “the principle ... that all feasible measures be taken in order that children under fifteen do not take a direct part in hostilities.” Michael J. Matheson, *The Sixth Annual American Red Cross-Washington College of Law Conference on International Humanitarian law: A Workshop on Customary International Law and the 1977 Protocols Additional to the 1949 Geneva Conventions*, 2 AM. U. J. INT’L L. & POL’Y 415 (1987) at 421.

prior to acceptance into national military service. Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, GA Res. 54/263, U.N. Doc. A/RES/54/49, Annex I (May 25, 2000) ("Child Soldier Protocol").<sup>10</sup>

All recruitment of child soldiers by non-State armed groups is presumed to be involuntary and, as such, illegal. Article 4 of the Child Soldier Protocol prohibits non-State armed groups to, "under any circumstances, recruit or use in hostilities persons under the age of 18 years." This total prohibition, in contrast to the partial prohibition on the recruitment and use of child soldiers imposed by the Child Soldier Protocol for participation in government-sponsored military service, is justified because non-State groups cannot be parties to the Protocol. In consequence, the existence and effectiveness of any safeguards they claim to apply to ensure that the recruitment of child soldiers into their ranks is based on the child's (and his or her parents') informed consent cannot be monitored.

International law actively disfavours children's involvement in armed conflict, even where that participation occurs through arguably lawful recruitment and it severely restricts the recruitment of children and their use to participate in hostilities. Both Protocol I and the CRC require that in recruiting among children who have attained the age of 15, but who have not yet attained the age of 18, States shall endeavour to give priority to

<sup>10</sup> The United States signed the Protocol on July 5, 2000, and ratified it on December 23, 2002. There are 117 parties to the Protocol, and 122 signatories. [http://www.ohchr.org/english/countries/ratification/11\\_b.htm](http://www.ohchr.org/english/countries/ratification/11_b.htm) (last updated July 13, 2007).

those  
movin  
soldier

are tre  
viewed  
is firm  
and th  
confer  
childre  
Conve  
compu

<sup>11</sup> The 19  
Doc. CAI  
parties, re  
in hostilit  
22(2).

In 1995, t  
Crescent  
promoting  
all childre

<sup>12</sup> The 19  
study on  
Graça Ma  
Children:  
horrific al  
and other  
26, 1996  
soldiers 1  
regarding

those who are oldest. Indeed, international law may be moving towards prohibiting all recruitment and use of child soldiers.<sup>11</sup>

B. Children illegally recruited into armed conflict are deemed to have served involuntarily and therefore should be treated as victims, not perpetrators.

In most cases, children recruited into armed conflict are treated as victims of a war crime; in all cases, they are viewed as victims of human rights violations.<sup>12</sup> This status is firmly supported by international treaty law. The CRC and the Child Soldier Protocol are human rights treaties conferring individual entitlements on those persons (i.e. children) which they seek to protect. Article 3 of ILO Convention 182 goes so far as to define the forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed

---

<sup>11</sup> The 1990 African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, OAU Doc. CAB/LEG/24.9/49 (1990), to which 39 African States are parties, requires that parties: "ensure that no child shall take a direct part in hostilities and refrain in particular from recruiting any child." Art. 22(2).

In 1995, the 26th International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent adopted a plan of action, which (Commitment 1) committed it to promoting the non-recruitment and non-participation in armed conflict for all children under the age of 18.

<sup>12</sup> The 1993 Vienna World Conference on Human Rights initiated a study on the impact of armed conflict on children, which resulted in Graça Machel's 1996 Report, *Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Children: Impact of armed conflict on children*, a shocking revelation of horrific abduction and recruitment of child soldiers, sexual exploitation and other appalling crimes against children. U.N. Doc. A/51/306 (Aug. 26, 1996). The Report reiterated the need for reintegration of child soldiers put forth in the CRC, and articulated specific guidelines regarding the means by which to achieve that reintegration.

nal  
on  
es.  
00)

ned  
ch,  
ocol  
any  
the  
the  
child  
for  
e, is  
o the  
ness  
t the  
n the  
ot be

dren's  
that  
tment  
d their  
nd the  
n who  
ttained  
rity to

fied it on  
122  
[11 b.htm](#)

conflict as a form of slavery or a practice similar to slavery. Convention concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (ILO C182), June 17, 1999, 38 I.L.M. 1207 at Art. 3.<sup>13</sup> It is not only the act of illegal recruitment that violates a child's rights, but also his or her retention in an armed force or group into which he or she has been illegally recruited. In consequence, the war crime of child recruitment is a continuing crime.<sup>14</sup>

Article 8(2)(b)(xxvi) and 8(2)(e)(vii) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court respectively list "[c]onscripting or enlisting children under the age of fifteen years into the national armed forces or using them to participate actively in hostilities" in international and non-international armed conflicts and "[c]onscripting or enlisting children under the age of fifteen into armed forces or groups or using them to participate actively in hostilities" in non-international armed conflicts as war crimes within the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court. U.N. Doc. A/CONF.183/9 (July 17, 1998). Individual criminal liability for recruitment of children in an armed conflict has also been seen in international criminal tribunals created under the auspices of the United Nations, such as the Special Court for Sierra Leone.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> The United States ratified the Convention 182 on December 2, 1999. 165 countries have ratified the Convention. <http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/>

<sup>14</sup> See *Prosecutor v Thomas Lubanga Dyilo*, Decision on the confirmation of charges, Pre-Trial Chamber I, International Criminal Court, 29 January 2007, ICC-01/04-01/06-803, para. 248.

<sup>15</sup> Article 4(c) of the Statute of the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL) incorporates Article 8(2)(e)(vii) of the Rome Statute word for word. U.N. Doc. S/RES/1315 (Aug. 14, 2000). All the defendants before the Special Court have been indicted for the war crime of child recruitment. In

J  
t  
c  
t  
I  
c  
t  
f  
F  
v  
C  
t  
c  
c  
C  
h  
—  
Pr.  
Ch  
cu:  
res  
sta  
No  
mo  
Sec  
Ch.  
thru  
Ko.  
De.  
16 S  
The  
Proc  
ana  
17 I  
the  
200

The first prosecutions undertaken by the International Criminal Court confirm that international law treats children—even those who may commit crimes in the context of armed conflict—as victims of the conflict, rather than legally responsible actors. The ICC’s first active prosecution, *The Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo*, charges him with the war crime of “enlisting children under the age of fifteen” and “using children under the age of fifteen to participate actively in hostilities.”<sup>16</sup> The ICC Prosecutor, Luis Moreno Ocampo confirmed that the case was intended to address “serious crimes against children. Child conscription destroys the lives and futures of thousands of children around the world. This case will contribute to exposing the problem and in stopping these criminal practices.”<sup>17</sup> Notably, neither the International Criminal Court nor other international criminal tribunals have sought to hold the child soldiers who were recruited in

---

*Prosecutor v. Samuel Hinga Norman*, the Special Court's Appeals Chamber ruled that enlisting child soldiers had been prohibited in customary international law and incurred individual criminal responsibility prior to the adoption of the Rome Statute, at least from the start of the SCSL's temporal jurisdiction in November 1996. *Prosecutor v. Norman*, SCSL-04-14-AR72(E) (May 31, 2004), Decision on preliminary motion based on lack of jurisdiction (child recruitment), May 31, 2004. See also, *Prosecutor v. Brima, Kamara and Kanu*, SCSL-04-16-T, Trial Chamber II, Special Court for Sierra Leone (June 20, 2007) (finding all three accused guilty of child recruitment); and, *Prosecutor v. Fofana and Kondewa*, SCSL-04-14-T, Trial Chamber I (August 2, 2007) (finding Defendant Kondewa guilty of child recruitment).

<sup>16</sup> Situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, *The Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo*, Warrant of Arrest of 10 February 2006. See also, *Prosecutor v. Joseph Kony, Vincent Otti, Raska Lukwiya, Okot Odhiambo and Dominic Ongwen*, Indictment, ICC-02/04-01/05.

<sup>17</sup> International Criminal Court Press Release, Child Soldier Charges in the First International Criminal Court Case, 28 August 2006, ICC-OTP-20060828-157-En

these conflicts responsible for any crimes they may have committed on the battlefield.

### III. INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMARY LAW AND POLICY CLEARLY DISFAVOURS THE PROSECUTION OF CHILD SOLDIERS FOR THEIR WARLIKE ACTS, RECOGNIZING CHILD SOLDIERS AS VICTIMS AND NOT PERPETRATORS

International law generally precludes the prosecution of child soldiers before war crimes tribunals, unless the exercise of criminal jurisdiction is intended to serve a rehabilitative function. This is particularly true for child soldiers who have been unlawfully recruited and whom international law categorizes as victims, requiring them to be treated in such a manner as to promote their rehabilitation and reintegration into society.<sup>18</sup> Accordingly, rehabilitation, not retribution, should be the purpose of any proceedings taken against or sanctions imposed on a child soldier.

To date, there is no precedent for the prosecution of a child soldier before an international criminal tribunal. In those instances where international tribunals or semi-internationalized domestic courts operating in post-conflict settings do allow for the exercise of criminal jurisdiction over minors under the age of eighteen, they make clear that such prosecutions must recognize the special status of minors and should be intended for educational or rehabilitative purposes.

A. International law presumes that child soldiers are not triable absent extraordinary circumstances, and there is no precedent under

<sup>18</sup> See discussion, *infra*, Section II.

pre  
law  
circ  
pro:  
pro:  
law  
bein  
offe

(1)

minc  
war  
Rom  
treat  
agre  
It pro  
no ju  
at the  
the c  
made  
refle  
Thes  
jurisc  
discu  
Com

<sup>19</sup> U.N.  
26.

international law for the prosecution of individuals who engaged in conflict when they were under the age of eighteen.

Although international law does not entirely preclude the exercise of jurisdiction over child soldiers by law of war tribunals, it is clear that, absent exceptional circumstances and rehabilitative intent, it disfavours such prosecutions. Even when the tribunal's statute permits such prosecutions, examination of the practices of international law of war tribunals provides no precedent for any person being tried before an international law of war tribunal for offences committed prior to his or her eighteenth birthday.

(1) *The International Criminal Court*

The tendency towards an international legal status of minors as exempt from criminal liability and prosecution for war crimes is underscored by the treatment of minors in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. This treaty is the most recent and comprehensive international agreement with respect to liability for international crimes. It provides expressly at Article 26 that "The Court shall have no jurisdiction over any person who was under the age of 18 at the time of the alleged commission of a crime."<sup>19</sup> During the drafting of the Rome Statute, numerous proposals were made for varying ages of criminal responsibility which reflected different approaches taken in different countries. These discussions resulted ultimately in the exclusion of jurisdiction for those under eighteen. According to the discussion of the drafting history of Article 26 in the Commentary on the Rome Statute of the International

<sup>19</sup> U.N. Doc. A/CONF.183/9 (July 17, 1998), 2187 U.N.T.S. 90, at Article 26.

Criminal Court, “under *international* law criminal responsibility begins at the age of eighteen, because according to all these laws no one under the age of 18 was charged with any crime by any of the Nuremberg Courts.”<sup>20</sup>

(2) *The Special Panels for Serious Crimes Established by the United Nations Transitional Authority in East Timor*

The legislation establishing the Special Panels for Serious Crimes operated under the auspices of the United Nations Transitional Authority in East Timor provides special protections related to the prosecution of minors. While it allows that “A minor between 12 and 16 years of age may be prosecuted for criminal offences only in accordance with such rules as may be established in subsequent UNTAET regulations on juvenile justice,”<sup>21</sup> those regulations further provides that any prosecution of a minor under the age of 16 must be in “accord with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, and shall consider his or her juvenile condition in every decision made in the case.”<sup>22</sup> The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, in turn, provides that measures relating to children in armed conflict should be intended “to promote physical and psychological recovery and social reintegration”.<sup>23</sup>

(3) *The Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia*

<sup>20</sup> Commentary on the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court: Observers’ Notes, Article by Article, Otto Triffterer, ed., (1999) at 494.

<sup>21</sup> United Nations Transitional Authority in East Timor, Regulation 2000/30, art 45.1

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*, at Art. 45.4

<sup>23</sup> U.N. Doc. A/44/49, Art. 39.

Ch  
Cr  
Ka  
ov  
cri  
Ca  
mo  
Ka  
wh  
hav  
pro  
Art  
Ext  
juri  
just  
14  
Poli  
that  
of  
reha  
over  
reha

(4)

<sup>24</sup> Mei  
Young  
Khmr  
<sup>25</sup> Law  
Prosec  
Kamp  
<sup>26</sup> *Id.*,  
<sup>27</sup> Inter

The legislation establishing the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia for the Prosecution of Crimes Committed During the Period of Democratic Kampuchea essentially precludes the exercise of jurisdiction over minors, despite the fact that numerous international crimes were committed by minors during the conflict.<sup>24</sup> The Cambodian legislation limits jurisdiction to “those who were most responsible” for crimes during the Period of Democratic Kampuchea, thereby precluding the prosecution of minors who were mere perpetrators of such crimes.<sup>25</sup> Should a minor have been among those most responsible, the purpose of any prosecution would nonetheless have to be rehabilitative. Article 33 of the Cambodian legislation provides: “The Extraordinary Chambers of the trial court shall exercise their jurisdiction in accordance with international standards of justice, fairness and due process of law, as set out in Articles 14 and 15 of the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.”<sup>26</sup> Article 14 of the ICCPR, in turn, stipulates that criminal process over minors persons must “take account of their age and the desirability of promoting their rehabilitation.”<sup>27</sup> Hence, any exercise of criminal jurisdiction over minors by the court should be intended to promote rehabilitation rather than retributive punishment.

(4) *The Special Court for Sierra Leone*

<sup>24</sup> Meng Try Ea & Sorya Sim, Victims and Perpetrators The Testimony of Young Khmer Rouge Cadres at S-21 (2001) (documenting crimes in Khmre Rouge Cambodia by minors).

<sup>25</sup> Law on the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia for the Prosecution of Crimes Committed During the Period of Democratic Kampuchea, (NS/RKM/1004/006), art 1.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.*, art 33.

<sup>27</sup> International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Art. 14(4).

Although the Statute of the SCSL does provide the Court jurisdiction over children between the ages 15 and 18, it requires that juvenile offenders be treated differently than adults.<sup>28</sup> The drafting history makes clear the provision related to juvenile offenders was retained only because the Statute left to the Court's Prosecutor, rather than its founders, the determination of who bore the greatest responsibility for the crimes committed during the conflict in Sierra Leone and who should consequently be prosecuted before the Special Court. The large number of child soldiers who actively participated in the conflict in Sierra Leone required, however unlikely, for provisions related to how those children were to be treated should the Court's Prosecutor ultimately decide to prosecute them.<sup>29</sup> The view of the United Nations Security Council, however, was that child soldiers were more appropriately dealt with by other accountability mechanisms, such as the Sierra Leone Truth and Reconciliation Commission.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, following the Special Court's establishment, its first Prosecutor, Mr David Crane, announced that he did not intend to charge anyone for crimes committed whilst they were under the age of 18 and no such charges have been brought.<sup>31</sup>

(5) *The Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda*

---

<sup>28</sup> U.N. Doc. S/RES/1315 (Aug. 14, 2000) at Arts. 7(1)-7(2).

<sup>29</sup> Letter dated 12 January 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, UN Doc. S/2001/40, at 1.

<sup>30</sup> Letter dated 22 December 2000 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General, UN Doc. S/2000/1234, at 1.

<sup>31</sup> See Special Court for Sierra Leone Public Affairs Office, "Special Court Prosecutor Says He Will Not Prosecute Children", 2 November 2002, available at <http://www.sc-sl.org/Press/pressrelease-110202.pdf>.

