

Economics of Genocide and International Law

By

Charles Anderton

and

Jurgen Brauer

November 2014

COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
FACULTY RESEARCH SERIES, PAPER NO. 14-09*



Department of Economics
College of the Holy Cross
Box 45A
Worcester, Massachusetts 01610
(508) 793-3362 (phone)
(508) 793-3708 (fax)

<http://www.holycross.edu/departments/economics/website>

* All papers in the Holy Cross Working Paper Series should be considered draft versions subject to future revision. Comments and suggestions are welcome.

Economics of Genocide and International Law

By
Charles Anderton[†]
College of the Holy Cross

and

Jurgen Brauer^{††}
Georgia Regents University

November 2014

Abstract

This paper provides an overview of genocide and international law concerning genocide.

JEL Classification Codes: K4

Keywords: Genocide

Published in *Encyclopedia of Law and Economics* (Berlin: Springer, forthcoming). General editor: Jürgen G. Backhaus. Section Editor: Giovanni Ramello

© J. Brauer and C.H. Anderton

[†] Department of Economics and Accounting, Box 85A, College of the Holy Cross, 1 College Street, Worcester, MA 01610; Phone: (508) 793-3441; Email: canderto@holycross.edu

^{††} Professor of Economics, Hull College of Business, Georgia Regents University, Augusta, GA, USA, brauer.jurgen@gmail.com.

ECONOMICS OF GENOCIDE AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

By combining the Greek *genos* (a people, tribe, race) and the Latin *cide* (to kill), Raphael Lemkin (1944, p. 79) invented the word genocide. Article 2 of the 1948 United Nations (UN) Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide defines *genocide* as “any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group” (United Nations 2014d). Concepts distinct from but often associated with genocide are mass killing, crimes against humanity, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and intentional violence against civilians. Such crimes are often characterized under the broad heading of mass atrocities.

DATA, DEFINITIONS, AND INSTITUTIONS

Data

In a summary of large-sample datasets on atrocities involving civilians (civilian atrocity datasets), Anderton (in Anderton and Brauer, forthcoming; henceforth “in A/B forthcoming”) identifies 202 distinct cases of state-sponsored genocides and mass atrocities (GMAs) from 1900-2013, 42 state-perpetrated genocides from 1955-2013, and 35 GMAs perpetrated by non-state groups from 1989-2013. Some well-known genocides include the Armenian genocide (1915-1918; estimated fatalities ~1.5 million), the Holocaust (1933-1945; ~10 million), Cambodia (1975-1979; ~1.9 million), Rwanda (1994; ~0.8 million), and Sudan-Darfur (2003-2011; ~0.4 million). A cautious estimate of intentional civilian fatalities associated with the 202

state-perpetrated GMAs since 1900 is 84 million. Less well-known are non-state perpetrated atrocities such as conducted by the so-called Islamic State, with estimated fatalities of 8,198 from 2005-2013 (Uppsala Conflict Data Program 2014).

Definitions

As defined in the UN Convention, *genocide* is the intentional destruction, in whole or in part, of a specific group of people. In non-genocidal *mass killing*, perpetrators do not seek to destroy a group as such (Waller 2007, p. 14). *Crimes against humanity* encompass widespread or systematic attacks against civilians involving inhumane means such as extermination, forcible population transfer, torture, rape, and disappearances. *War crimes* are grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions including willful killing, torture, willfully causing great suffering or serious injury, and extensive destruction and appropriation of property. *Ethnic cleansing* is the removal of people of a particular group from a state or region using means such as forced migration or mass killing (Pergorier 2013). *Violence against civilians* (VAC) can incorporate mass atrocities but it also includes incidents that are relatively small, specifically, less than 1,000 per case or per year. Along with genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and ethnic cleansing are both legal and scholarly terms.

Schabas (2010, pp. 126-127) emphasizes that at the Nuremberg trials of 1945-46, the International Military Tribunal found none of the accused guilty of crimes committed prior to the outbreak of war on 1 September 1939; litigation was limited to atrocities during wartime. Lemkin's (1944) and the UN's conceptions of genocide were novel precisely because they spoke to criminal acts committed in wartime or in peacetime (Schabas, 2010). Nevertheless, the UN definition of genocide has been subject to critical scrutiny by scholars, for instance in regard to groups left out (e.g., political), how to identify "intent," the inability of the Convention to

prevent genocide, the relationship of genocide to other atrocities, and misuse of the term.¹ The UN definition of genocide has not expanded since 1948 to include other groups, but international criminal law has evolved. Schabas (2010, p. 141) maintains that the expanded concept of crimes against humanity has “emerged as the best legal tool to address atrocities” and “genocide as a legal concept remains essentially reserved for the clearest cases of physical destruction of national, ethnic, racial, or religious groups.”

International and domestic institutions

The twentieth and twenty-first centuries display the emergence and growth of international and domestic laws designed to prevent, punish, and/or foster restitution for atrocity crimes. Table 1 shows a selection of such institutions as well as sources that provide further information.

Adjudication of mass atrocity crimes began in earnest following World War I with the establishment of the Turkish Military Tribunal (TMT) (1919-20), which prosecuted organizers of the Armenian genocide (Meierhenrich 2014, p. 316). Dadrian (1997, p. 30) characterized the trials as “a milestone in Turkish legal history.” The trials revealed the systematic planning behind the genocide, enrichment of perpetrators through looting of victims’ assets, and the lack of military necessity for the forced relocation of Armenians. However, the TMT convicted only 15 men among the hundreds who orchestrated the genocide (Dadrian 1997).

Following World War II, the International Military Tribunal (IMT) at Nuremberg was established in which leading officials were tried for war crimes and crimes against humanity (1945-46). Twelve Nazi leaders received the death sentence and many others were given long jail terms. The trials had an important influence on the growth of international criminal law including the 1948 Genocide Convention, the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former

¹ See, for example, Shaw (2007), Curthoys and Docker (2008), Moses (2010), Schabas (2010), and Waller (2007).

Yugoslavia (ICTY) established in 1993, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) established in 1994, and the International Criminal Court (ICC) ratified in 2002. As of August 2014, the ICTY had indicted 161 people for atrocity crimes associated with the wars in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s. As of September 2014, the ICTR had indicted 95 people for atrocity crimes associated with the 1994 civil war and genocide and it established the legal precedent that mass rape during wartime is genocidal. Following the huge backlog of cases awaiting trial in Rwanda, the government turned to the Gacaca court system, based on traditional law developed within communities (Bornkamm 2012, Clark 2010). As of October 2014, the ICC has indicted 36 individuals for atrocity crimes including three current or former heads of state: Omar al-Bashir (Sudan), Uhuru Kenyatta (Kenya), and Laurent Gbagbo (Côte d'Ivoire). According to its Statutes, the ICC has jurisdiction with respect to genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes.

Another important international genocide development occurred at the 2005 UN World Summit, in which a norm was adopted by states known as the *Responsibility to Protect* (R2P). R2P was part of the impetus for UN Security Council Resolution 1973 passed on 17 March 2011, which authorized member states to take actions, including enforcement of a no-fly zone, to protect civilians from attacks by the Libyan military. Nevertheless, the UN's R2P resolution, passed unanimously in 2005, has no legal force (UN Doc. A/RES/60/1, paras 138, 139).

Following the Nuremberg trials and the UN Convention, several dozen nations have developed domestic laws to put on trial suspected Nazi war criminals and/or perpetrators of more recent atrocities (Schabas 2003, Prevent Genocide International 2003). For example, in 2000 the Chilean Court of Appeals lifted former President Augusto Pinochet's immunity from prosecution, paving the way for trial for his role in civilian atrocities that occurred during his

leadership (Pinochet died prior to any conviction). The case is notable not only because it involved a state's prosecution of its former leader, but also because Pinochet's initial arrest occurred in London based on an application of "universal jurisdiction" by European judges. Universal jurisdiction is a principle by which a state (or states, in the Pinochet case) asserts its right to prosecute a person for an alleged crime regardless of the crime's location and the accused's residence or nationality (Lunga 1992).

Not shown in Table 1 are formalized norms within for-profit and non-profit organizations designed to inhibit complicity in atrocities. The ICC followed the ICTY and ICTR in having jurisdiction only over "natural persons" and not "legal persons" (Cernic 2010, p. 141), which ruled out prosecution of corporations complicit in genocide (individual agents within corporations can be tried). Multinational corporations have been complicit in genocide in many cases, but have not usually faced prosecution (Kelly 2012). Nevertheless, there have been legal efforts, including use of the US Alien Tort Claims Act, to bring litigation against corporations for alleged complicity in atrocities and other human rights abuses. Such litigation is leading companies to develop norms to avoid such complicity (Paul 2001, Gilbert 2012, Walczak 2010, Wettstein 2010, Michalowski 2013).

[PLACE TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL ASPECTS

If genocide risk is thought of as a variable, r , then this section asks: What are (some of) the risk factors that economic theory and associated empirical work point to, i.e., what makes the risk nonzero ($r > 0$)? The section thereafter asks: How can genocide risk be reduced below 1 ($r < 1$)?

Theoretical perspectives

Formal economic models of genocide are relatively new in the literature on conflict, peace, and security between and within states. Verwimp (2003), Ferrero (2013), Anderton (2014b), Anderton and Carter (2014), and Anderton and Brauer (in A/B forthcoming) present nonstrategic constrained optimization models to highlight conditions under which a political authority would choose genocide as part of its goal of controlling territory or government (or both). The models reveal conditions in which genocide has a low opportunity cost for the authority, specifically, when genocide enhances the authority's control in the context of crisis or war, is not too disruptive to economic activities (e.g., trade), is conducive to looting victims' wealth, and is not likely to generate third-party intervention. Under such conditions, genocide is "cheap," and a positive amount demanded can exist. Genocide prevention requires that the opportunity cost of genocide is made high through sanctions, credible threats of third-party intervention to help victims and/or oppose authorities, threats of prosecution, and surveillance of atrocities which can lead to "naming and shaming" of perpetrators. In addition to modeling genocide risk factors, Anderton and Brauer (in A/B forthcoming) use a Lancaster household production model to study the "optimal" choice of genocidal techniques (e.g., mass killing, starvation, forced relocation, etc.) by a regime that has already chosen genocide. Among the results is a "bleakness theorem" in which "piecemeal protection policies along just one or a few dimensions will have relatively little overall effect, and sometimes *no effect*, in protecting the out-group."

Game theory models of genocide consider strategic interactions between warring groups and/or between an oppressive in-group and an out-group (or victim group) in which intentional destruction of civilian groups is part of war tactics or strategy. For example, Azam (2002) and Azam and Hoeffler (2002) identify conditions in which warring sides use violence against civilians to strengthen themselves in their strategic interaction. Focusing on the years preceding

the 1994 Rwandan genocide, Verwimp (2004) develops a four-player game to model the strategic interactions among the regime, the domestic opposition, a violent rebel group, and the international community. Within the game, eliminating the moderate Hutu opposition and exterminating the Tutsi can be “optimal” strategies. Anderton (2010) draws upon the bargaining theory of war to show how severe threat against an authority group or an incentive to eliminate a persistent rival can lead to genocide as an “optimal” choice. Anderton (2010) and Gangopadhyay (in A/B forthcoming) use evolutionary game theory to model how genocide can become socially contagious (acceptable) among “ordinary people.” Vargas’ (in A/B forthcoming) model of contestation between a government and a rebel group reveals the incentives of each to side to kill the civilians who are supporting the enemy. Within the model, Vargas finds that the strengthening of either side can have ambiguous effects on the total number of civilians killed, thus showing that third-party support for one side or the other can potentially increase civilian killing. Esteban, Morelli, and Rohner’s (forthcoming and in A/B forthcoming) inter-temporal models of contestation between a government and a rebel group reveal several important and sometimes counterintuitive results. In particular they find that new discoveries of resources, democratization of the polity, and third-party intervention to defend vulnerable civilians can *enhance* incentives for mass killing if they materialize under the “wrong” conditions.

The lessons of constrained rational choice and game theory models for thinking about the emergence of laws designed to punish and (one hopes) prevent genocide are critical. Laws that come into being will be evaluated by potential perpetrators of genocide as part of the constraint set being faced. Such agents, if determined to carry out genocide, have an extensive menu of inputs for working around such laws to achieve objectives. Laws to punish or prevent genocide must consider the multiple options available to potential perpetrators and the potential for laws to

lead to unintended consequences. This concern is especially significant in the context of strategic interplay between a government, rebel organization, and possible third-party intervener.

Genocide punishment and prevention law, if not carefully designed, can serve to increase incentives for genocide as the Vargas and Esteban, Morelli, and Rohner analyses show. (On the design of law, see the next section.)

In addition to constrained optimization and game theory models, perspectives from behavioral economics may work their way into the study of genocide to a much greater degree than has occurred to date. Especially important is the reference-dependent objective function of one or a few leaders who have become accustomed to control of political, economic, and/or territorial goods. Experiments in behavioral economics often find evidence of *loss aversion*, in which, relative to a reference point such as current hold on power, subjects believe they are worse off from a loss than a similar gain leads them to feel better off. The notion of loss of power as a form of extreme crisis or existential threat in the minds of leaders is palpable in many genocide case studies (Valentino 2004, Totten and Parsons 2013). Such losses, coupled with the behavioral phenomenon of loss aversion, suggest that leaders could make extreme choices including repressive violence or genocide to avoid loss (Midlarsky 2005, pp. 64-74).²

Empirical perspectives

There are about 30 published large-sample cross country empirical studies of genocide or other forms of VAC risk or seriousness (see Anderton 2014a, Anderton and Carter 2014, and Hoeffler in A/B forthcoming). Most of these studies focus on genocide risk or severity from the

² Midlarsky (2005, chs. 5, 7, 18) introduces loss aversion into a theoretical framework of genocide. Anderton and Brauer (in A/B forthcoming) introduce a reference-dependent utility function into a constrained optimization model of genocide. Slovic, Västfjäll, and Gregory (in A/B forthcoming) analyze “psychic numbing” in which the perceived importance that people attach to saving lives diminishes as the number of lives at risk increases. Anderton (2014a) identifies other behavioral economics phenomena that are likely relevant to understanding mass atrocity and its prevention.

perspective of *countries*, and thus they focus on the problem of genocide from the “macro” or top-down perspective. Another branch of empirical genocide literature focuses on particular countries, regions, or locales in which genocide took hold and spread, thus emphasizing a “micro” or bottom-up perspective. While almost all of the empirical studies of genocide in the literature focus on risk or seriousness based on historical data, studies are emerging with an emphasis on forecasting (e.g., Rost 2013, Goldsmith and Butcher in A/B forthcoming).

The most prominent macro empirical study of genocide risk in the literature is by Harff (2003), who focused on a sample of states that experienced “state failure” (e.g., civil war, regime collapse) from 1955 to 1997. Of 126 state failures in the sample, 35 led to genocide. Conditioned on state failure, Harff used logit analysis to identify six significant risk factors for genocide onset: magnitude of political upheaval; history of prior genocide; exclusionary ideology held by the ruling elite; autocratic regime; ethnic minority elite; and low trade openness. Failing to make the list of significant risk factors was economic development, which Harff proxied by infant mortality. Another important macro empirical study of mass atrocity risk is Easterly, Gatti, and Kurlat (2006), who assemble a dataset for many countries for the period 1820-1998. Among their key results, they find that mass atrocity is significantly less likely at high levels of democracy and economic development, in which the latter was proxied by real income per capita.

Regarding potential *economic* risk factors for genocide, subsequent empirical research suggests that Harff’s result for trade is not robust with most studies reporting no significant impact of trade on atrocity risk. In addition, Harff’s result on economic development is open to question because an inverse relationship between real income per capita and atrocity risk or

seriousness is one of the few modest empirical regularities in the literature.³ Other economic risk factors considered in the empirical literature are income inequality and resource dependence, in which no empirical regularities have yet emerged, and *economic* discrimination, which is only beginning to be considered but in which two studies report a significant positive effect on genocide risk (Rost 2013, Anderton and Carter 2014). In the small but emerging empirical forecasting literature on genocide, no clear results have yet emerged on the roles of economic variables. In their survey of such literature, Butcher and Goldsmith (in A/B forthcoming) suggest that “while economic factors might have an underlying causal effect on the likelihood of genocidal violence in a society, as predictors in forecasting models they might be overshadowed by political or demographic factors that are more proximate to genocide onset.”

In addition to large-sample “macro” empirical studies of genocide risk or severity are country-specific “micro” empirical studies that focus on particular characteristics of a nation, region, or individuals that led to the onset or spread of atrocity (see Ibañez and Moya in A/B forthcoming and Justino in A/B forthcoming, for literature surveys). Country-specific studies typically identify historical, social, and economic conditions particular to the country and tactical and strategic aspects of war that are critical for understanding atrocity. Such finer-grained elements can be glossed over in large-sample cross section studies. For example, Ibañez and Moya’s (in A/B forthcoming) study of Colombia reveals many dynamic, nuanced, and interrelated aspects of community and household incentives for civilians to flee violence, why some do not flee, and why contesting military forces (government, militias, rebels) tactically and strategically kill and/or force relocation of civilians. Such complexities are obviously critical in

³ Theoretical interpretations of low per capita income and elevated genocide risk include the notions that low per capita income signifies a “weak state” and low per capita income implies a low opportunity cost of genocide for architects and perpetrators (Anderton and Carter 2014).

considering laws to reduce risks of future civilian atrocities, but also in prosecuting perpetrators and designing reparations in post-genocide settings.

ECONOMICS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Despite some cases of GMA having been brought to trial in national and international courts or tribunals – the Armenian trials in Turkey, the Nuremburg trials, the Pinochet case, and more recent tribunals regarding Cambodia, Rwanda, and the Balkan wars of the 1990s – the overall record of reducing the risk of GMA to below certainty ($r < 1$) is only mildly encouraging. There are several reasons for this. First, even assuming away issues of ignorance and apathy, as a matter of *economics*, unilateral action runs into the problem of sufficient scale and multilateral, collective action into issues related to strategic behavior, free-riding, coordination, agency, benefit appropriation, and cost shifting. But even assuming that none of these pose a problem, all options rely on the existence of well-codified and well-functioning regimes of national and international law and their enforcement. Second, as a matter of *law*, then, (a) state sovereigns generally do not cede jurisdiction over nonstate GMA actors to international bodies (e.g., Nigeria maintains jurisdictional prerogative over Boko Haram; and if a nonstate actor prevails in an internal conflict it may not be brought to justice at all) and (b) state sovereigns are cautious to accede to any international treaty that may expose them to undue legal liability. And third, as a matter of *institutional design*, these topics bring up questions, to echo Oliver Williamson (1999), as to what kind of bad GMAs are in the first place and, correspondingly, what kind of good GMA-related laws are, and how to best supply them.

On the demand (or usage) side, are GMA and GMA-related law private (excludable and rivalrous), public (nonexcludable, nonrivalrous), club (excludable, nonrivalrous), or common-resource pool (nonexcludable, rivalrous) bads or goods, or some changing mixture thereof? And

on the supply side, are they best provided by private or public actors, or some changing combination of the two, and what is the technology of their production (e.g., best-shot, weakest-link, aggregate effort, or variants thereof)? What sort of issues in agency, transaction costs, and institutional design arise? While a considerable global public goods (GPG) literature has sprung up in economics (see, e.g., the volumes co-edited by Inge Kaul 1999, 2003, 2006 and literature cited therein), application to the design of international law as an instance of GPGs is thin in general and almost entirely absent in regard to law and GMA (see, e.g., a recent symposium of papers in the *European Journal of International Law*, 23(3), 2012).

As regards GMAs, we suggest that indiscriminate bombing may be conceptualized as a public bad for the affected population if it is neither feasible to exclude oneself from the bombing nor feasible to seek effective shelter (there can be no rivalry for shelter if there is none to be had). Those who do manage to crowd into a bomb shelter, however, partake in the benefit it offers, the shelter being a common-resource pool good (nonexclusionary but rivalrous). In contrast to indiscriminate bombing, genocide would be a club bad precisely because its architects differentiate and select victims. Finally, examples of a private bad suffered in violent conflict include un-orchestrated rape in war (rather than orchestrated mass rape) or the death of a soldier in the performance of his or her duties (one might say the “expected” bad in war, but not a war crime). Similarly, in regard to the good that GMA-related law may provide, international law of war is intended as a GPG in that all soldiers share in the benefits the law provides and none of them are excluded. In contrast, national law is private to the state whose legislative body passes it: It excludes nationals of other states and reserves benefits to its own nationals. But all international law is effectively a club good, benefitting those who accede, and becomes a pure GPG if and only if *all* states become Party to the treaty in question. In practice, however, it is

conceivable that benefits can be withheld so that the benefits law offers become rival to those with the means to access its provisions when needed. Thus, while the Genocide Convention is (not quite)⁴ a global public good in principle, the evident practice of “too little, too late” suggests that its enforcement is rivalrous and therefore constitutes a common-resource pool good.

Even this cursory “walk around goods space” (Brauer 1999, Brauer and van Tuyll 2008, ch. 8) suggests that neither GMAs nor GMA-related law have been well-theorized and that the good (or bad) in question can take various forms and that each may change across geographic space and time. Neither the goods nor the bads are necessarily unitary (of a single form), and to conceive of GMA simply as a global public bad requiring a global public good response may be inadequate. Moreover, as Shaffer (2012) points out, international laws can be rivalrous to each other and their construction is designed, in part, to trade off against multiple national laws (legal pluralism).

In addition, economically efficient (no under- or overprovision) GMA-law in response to GMAs may depend on the summation technology of GMA production. Applying Hirshleifer’s (1983) insight, that some GPGs are best provided as best-shot products (the single-best effort suffices; no need for anyone else to contribute to its provision), weakest-link products (the weakest provider limits the good’s effectiveness), or aggregate effort products (the more is provided by all, the better for all), Shaffer (2010; esp. Table 2, p. 690), argues that best-shot GPGs are best dealt with in global administrative law, weakest-link GPGs by fostering legal pluralism, and that only aggregate effort GPGs may require a global constitutionalist approach. To illustrate, when a single country has effectively become the world’s only superpower to intervene in other states’ (GMA or GMA-alleged) affairs, it may be tempted to overreach or

⁴ As of mid-2014, some 50 countries—including Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, and Thailand, for example—have not ratified the UN Genocide Convention.

under-reach according to its own cost-benefit calculated perception of its Responsibility to Protect, regardless of the wishes of all other UN members. But superpower intervention (or nonintervention) solely at its own discretion challenges global legitimacy (and the US in particular is often accused in this regard; France, in regional interventions, less often so). Such situations, Shaffer (2010) argues, are best dealt with by global administrative law which might hold the “incumbent” of the superpower “office” responsible for its actions. We imagine (since Shaffer does not address GMA), that instead of a Genocide Convention, there might exist an UN-approved automatic trigger obligating the superpower to intervene in cases of GMA, subject to global administrative law. Again, as of this writing, little has been theoretized in this regard.

An additional issue pertains to transgenerational global public goods (Sandler, 1997, p. 68). Again, this is insufficiently theorized but probably of great importance in cases of GMAs since each event carries significant generational implications (for a review see, e.g., Ibañez and Moya in A/B forthcoming). For public goods provision, Sandler (1999) speaks for four levels of awareness rules: First, the myopic view considers making a marginal cost (MC) contribution to the provision of a GPG only up to the sum of the marginal benefits (MB) a state estimates for its own current generation, $MC = \sum MB$. Second, although still selfish, a forward-looking view is to include one’s own offspring generations, i , such that $MC = \sum MB_i$. Since the expected benefits are larger, this translates into greater willingness to make a larger MC contribution. Third, a more generous view of the benefits summation includes other states’ populations, j , but only for the current generation ($MC = \sum MB_j$). The most enlightened view of all – we call this the “Buddha rule” – sums the expected benefits across all generations across all populations, $MC = \sum MB_{ij}$. Since such benefit is likely to be large, it justifies correspondingly large outlays.

Finally, design criteria for GPG that would take account of goods (or bads)-space, summation technologies, transboundary, and transgenerational aspects have been discussed in the literature (Sandler 1997, Brauer 2006, and literature cited therein) but rarely in regard to GMA-related national and international law (Myerson, in A/B forthcoming, is an exception). It would appear that a fruitful field of inquiry is ready for exploration in this regard.

REFERENCES

- Anderton, C.H. (2010). "Choosing genocide: Economic perspectives on the disturbing rationality of race murder." *Defence and Peace Economics*, 21(5-6):459-486.
- Anderton, C.H. (2014a). "A research agenda for the economic study of genocide: Signposts from the field of conflict economics." *Journal of Genocide Research*, 16(1):113-138.
- Anderton, C.H. (2014b). "Killing civilians as an inferior input in a rational choice model of genocide and mass killing," *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy*, 20(2):327-346.
- Anderton, C.H. and J. Brauer, eds. (forthcoming). *Economics Aspects of Genocide, Mass Atrocities, and Their Prevention*. New York: Oxford University Press. Cited draft chapters include the following: Anderton, C.H. "Datasets and trends of genocide, mass killing, and other civilian atrocities." Anderton, C.H. and J. Brauer. "Genocide and mass killing risk and prevention: Perspectives from constrained optimization models." Esteban, J., M. Morelli, and D. Rohner. "Incentives and constraints for mass killings."
- Gangopadhyay, P. "Economic theory of genocide from gaming between oligarchs in a heterogeneous society." Goldsmith, B. and C. Butcher. "Economic risk factors and predictive modeling of genocide and mass killing." Hoeffler, A. "Development and the risk of mass atrocities: An assessment of the empirical literature." Ibañez, A. and A.

- Moya. "Who stays and who leaves in genocides and mass killings?" Justino, P. "The microeconomic effects of genocide and mass killing." Myerson, R. "Local and national democracy in political reconstruction." Slovic, P., D. Västfjäll, and R. Gregory. "Valuing lives you might save: Understanding psychic numbing in the face of genocide." Vargas, J.F. "Strategic atrocities: Civilians under crossfire. Theory and evidence from Colombia."
- Anderton, C.H. and J. Carter (2014). "A new look at weak state conditions and genocide risk." Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy, forthcoming December.
- Azam, J. (2002). "Looting and conflict between ethno-regional groups." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 46(1):131-153.
- Azam, J. and A. Hoeffler (2002). "Violence against civilians in civil wars: looting or terror?" *Journal of Peace Research*, 39(4):461-485.
- Bornkamm, P. C. (2012). *Rwanda's Gacaca Courts: Between Retribution and Reparation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brauer, J. (1999). "An economic perspective on mercenaries, military companies, and the privatisation of force." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 13(1):130-146.
- Brauer, J. (2006). "Theory and practice of intervention." *The Economics of Peace and Security Journal*, 1(2):17-23.
- Brauer, J. and H. van Tuyll (2008). *Castles, Battles, and Bombs*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cernic, J.L. (2010). *Human Rights Law and Business: Corporate Responsibility for Fundamental Human Rights*. Groningen, The Netherlands: Europa Law Publishing.
- Clark, P. (2010). *The Gacaca Courts, Post-Genocide Justice and Reconciliation in Rwanda: Justice without Lawyers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Curthoys, A. and J. Docker (2008). "Defining genocide," in C. Stone, ed. *The Historiography of Genocide*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 9-41.
- Dadrian, V.N. (1997). "The Turkish Military Tribunal's prosecution of the authors of the Armenian genocide: Four major court-martial series." *Holocaust Genocide Studies*, 11(1):28-59.
- Easterly, W., R. Gatti, and S. Kurlat (2006). "Development, democracy, and mass killing." *Journal of Economic Growth*, 11(2):129-156.
- Esteban, J., M. Morelli, and D. Rohner (forthcoming). "Strategic mass killings." *Journal of Political Economy*.
- Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (2014). Homepage of the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia. <http://www.eccc.gov.kh/en> [accessed 20 October 2014].
- Ferrero, M. (2013). "You shall not overkill: substitution between means of group removal." *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy*, 19(3):333-342.
- Gilbert, J. (2012). "Corporate accountability and indigenous peoples: Prospects and limitations of the US Alien Tort Claims Act." *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, 19:25-52.
- Harff, B. (2003). "No lessons learned from the Holocaust ? Assessing risks of genocide and political mass murder since 1955." *American Political Science Review*, 97(1):57-73.
- Hillemanns, C.F. (2003). "UN norms on the responsibilities of transnational corporations and other business enterprises with regard to human rights." *German Law Journal*, 4(10):1065-1080.

- Hirshleifer, J. (1983). "From weakest-link to best-shot: The voluntary provision of public goods." *Public Choice*, 41(3):371-386.
- International Criminal Court (2014). Homepage of the International Criminal Court.
<http://www.icc-cpi.int/> [accessed 20 October 2014].
- Kaul, I., I. Grunberg, and M.A. Stern, eds. (1999). *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kaul, I., P. Conceição, K. De Goulven, and R.U. Mendoza, eds. (2003). *Providing Global Public Goods: Managing Globalization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kaul, I. and P. Conceição, eds. (2006). *The New Public Finance: Responding to Global Challenges*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kelly, M.J. (2012). "Prosecuting corporations for genocide under international law." *Harvard Law and Policy Review*, 6(2):339-367.
- Lemkin, R. (1944). *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Lunga, L. (1992). *Individual Responsibility in International Law for Serious Human Rights Violations*. New York: Springer.
- Meierhenrich, J. (2014). *Genocide: A reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Michalowski, S., ed. (2013). *Corporate Accountability in the Context of Transitional Justice*. New York: Routledge.
- Midlarsky, M.I. (2005). *The killing trap: Genocide in the twentieth century*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Moses, A.D. (2010). "Raphael Lemkin, culture, and the concept of genocide," in D. Bloxham and A.D. Moses, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 19-41.
- Paul, J.R. (2001). "Holding multinational corporations responsible under international law." *Hastings International and Comparative Law Review*, Special Issue, 24(3):285-560.
- Pegorier, C. (2013). *Ethnic Cleansing: A Legal Qualification*. New York: Routledge.
- Prevent Genocide International (2003). *Genocide and International Crimes in Domestic Courts*. <http://www.preventgenocide.org/punish/domestic/>, last updated 21 July 2003 [accessed 18 October 2014].
- Rost, N. (2013). "Will it happen again? On the possibility of forecasting the risk of genocide." *Journal of Genocide Research*, 15(1):41-67.
- Sandler, T. (1997). *Global Challenges*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandler, T. (1999). "Intergenerational public goods: Strategies, efficiency and institutions," pp. 20-50 in I. Kaul, I. Grunberg, and M.A. Stern, eds., *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schabas, W.A. (2003). "National courts finally begin to prosecute genocide, the 'Crime of Crimes'." *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 1(1):39-63.
- Schabas, W.A. (2009). *Genocide in International Law*. 2nd edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schabas, W.A. (2010). "The law and genocide," in D. Bloxham and A.D. Moses, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 123-141.
- Shaffer, G. (2012). "International law and global public goods in a legal pluralist world." *European Journal of International Law*, 23(3):669-693.

Shaw, M. (2007). *What is Genocide?* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Totten, S. and W.S. Parsons, eds. (2013). *Centuries of Genocide: Essays and Eyewitness Accounts*, 4th edition. New York: Routledge.

United Nations (2014a). International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

<http://www.icty.org/> [accessed 20 October 2014].

United Nations (2014b). International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. <http://www.unicttr.org/>

[accessed 20 October 2014].

United Nations (2014c). The Responsibility to Protect. Office of the Special Advisor on the Prevention of Genocide.

<http://www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/adviser/responsibility.shtml> [accessed 8 October 2014].

United Nations (2014d). Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of

Genocide. <https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume%2078/volume-78-I-1021-English.pdf> [accessed 26 October 2014].

Uppsala Conflict Data Program (2014). UCDP One-sided Violence Dataset.

http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/datasets/ucdp_one-sided_violence_dataset/ [accessed 26 October 2014].

US Holocaust Memorial Museum (2014a). The Nuremburg Trials.

<http://www.ushmm.org/outreach/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007722> [accessed 20 October 2014].

US Holocaust Memorial Museum (2014b). The Genocide Convention in International Law.

<http://www.ushmm.org/confront-genocide/justice-and-accountability/introduction-to-the-definition-of-genocide> [accessed 20 October 2014].

US Holocaust Memorial Museum (2014c). The International Criminal Court.

<http://www.ushmm.org/confront-genocide/justice-and-accountability/introduction-to-the-international-criminal-court> [accessed 20 October 2014].

Valentino, B. (2004). *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the Twentieth Century*.

Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Verwimp, P. (2003). "The political economy of coffee, dictatorship, and genocide." *European*

Journal of Political Economy, 19(2):161-181.

Verwimp, P. (2004). "Games in multiple arenas and institutional design on the eve of the

Rwandan genocide." *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy*, 10(1):1-47.

Walczak, A. (2010). "Coming to the table: Why corporations should advocate for legal norms for

the protection of indigenous rights." *George Washington International Law Review*,

42(3): 623-648.

Waller, J. (2007). *Becoming Evil*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wettstein, F. (2010). "The duty to protect: Corporate complicity, political responsibility, and

human rights advocacy." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96:33-47.

Williamson, O. (1999). "Public and private bureaucracies: A transaction cost economics

perspective." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 15(1): 306-342.

TABLE 1: Select Legal Institutions, Jurisprudence, and International Norms Related to Genocide Prevention and Post-Genocide Justice

Selected Legal Institutions (or Norms)	Selected Sources For Further Information
<u>International</u>	
International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg (IMT) (1945-46)	US Holocaust Memorial Museum (2014a)
Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948, 1951)	Schabas (2009, 2010), US Holocaust Memorial Museum (2014b)
International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) (1993)	United Nations (2014a)
International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) (1994)	United Nations (2014b)
International Criminal Court (ICC) (2002)	International Criminal Court (2014), US Holocaust Memorial Museum (2014c)
Norms on the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises with regard to Human Rights (2003)	Hillemanns (2003)
Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC) (2003)	Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (2014)
Responsibility to Protect (R2P) (2005)	United Nations (2014c)
<u>Domestic</u>	
Turkish Military Tribunal (1919-20)	Dadrian (1997)
US Alien Tort Claims Act (1789, 1980)	Gilbert (2012), Michalowski (2013)
Prosecution of civilian atrocities (not necessarily genocide) in domestic courts (includes Nuremberg and others)	Schabas 2003 , Prevent Genocide International (2003)