

Eser

Comparative Criminal Law

C.H.BECK · HART · NOMOS

Eser

Comparative Criminal Law

Comparative Criminal Law

Development – Aims – Methods

by

Albin Eser

Professor, Dr. iur. Dr. h.c. mult., M.C.J. (NYU)
Director emeritus, Max Planck Institute
for Foreign and International Criminal Law
Freiburg/Germany

translated from the German
by

Brigitte Heilmann

2017

C. H. BECK · HART · NOMOS

Published by

Verlag C. H. Beck oHG, Wilhelmstraße 9, 80801 München, Germany,
eMail: bestellung@beck.de

Co-published by

Hart Publishing, Kemp House, Chawley Park, Cumnor Hill, Oxford, OX2 9PH, United Kingdom,
online at: www.hartpub.co.uk

and

Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG Waldseestraße 3–5, 76530 Baden-Baden,
Germany, eMail: nomos@nomos.de

Published in North America (US and Canada) by Hart Publishing,
c/o International Specialized Book Services, 930 NE 58th Avenue, Suite 300,
Portland, OR 97213-3786, USA, eMail: orders@isbs.com

ISBN 978 3 406 70277 8 (C.H. BECK)

ISBN 978 1 50991 943 7 (HART)

ISBN 978 3 8487 3803 8 (NOMOS)

© 2017 Verlag C. H. Beck oHG

Wilhelmstr. 9, 80801 München

Printed in Germany by

Beltz Bad Langensalza GmbH

Am Fliegerhorst 8, 99947 Bad Langensalza

Typeset by

Reemers Publishing Services GmbH, Krefeld

Cover: Druckerei C. H. Beck Nördlingen

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of Verlag C. H. Beck, or as expressly permitted by law under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation.

Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to
C. H. Beck at the address above.

In love and gratitude
dedicated to

Gerda

my wife and lifelong companion on comparative travels

Preface

Comparative Criminal Law seems to be on the rise, at least in terms of standing on its own feet. However, this was not always the case. When looking into traditional textbooks on “comparative law”, it is amazing to see that this discipline, apparently as a matter of course, seems to have been considered a realm of private law – as if comparison of criminal law was a *quantité négligeable* that, for whatever reason, did not merit dealing with explicitly.

In recent years, however, this picture has changed. “Comparative criminal law” is gaining recognition as a discipline in its own right, both in research and teaching. Yet, measured by the language and number of publications in this field, one could get the impression that this development is a phenomenon of the English speaking common law world, as in its publications one will hardly find a reference to what is going on in other legal regions, for example in continental-European civil law – unless those scholars write in English. Seemingly, in order to be taken notice of, continental-European comparatists – rather than writing in their own mother tongue – have to present their thoughts and findings in English.

This language issue, however, is not the only reason for editing this originally German publication in an English version. More important is the novel concept and manner in which comparative criminal law is analysed and presented in this volume. Traditional literature on this subject focusses on specific aims or methods of comparing criminal law, or to present the law of selected jurisdictions or “legal families”. In thus narrowing the field of vision, one runs the risk of prioritising a method of comparison without first having gained a full picture of perhaps better tools available. Or even worse, not only a few methodological debates are conducted without first having determined the aim for which the comparison shall be performed. As a result, this type of theoretical discourse does not offer much benefit for practical comparative work. So, one of the most important lessons learned from traditional literature on comparative law is that you cannot discuss methods without first having determined the aim. As these aims can be very different, if not even of greater variety than commonly assumed, it cannot be ignored that there is no “one-size-fits-all-method” in comparisons of criminal law, theory and practice.

It is based on these insights drawn both from long-term experience in comparative practice and theoretical studies that this publication was conceived. Being aware of the interdependence of aims and methods, the appropriate way to proceed is to first clarify and describe the various purposes and functions comparative criminal law may serve. Comparative criminal law can basically be divided into “judicative”, “legislative” and purely “theoretical” fields, eventually supplemented with what may be called the “evaluative-competitive” comparison of criminal law; although the potential for a further variety of subdivisions and possible overlap exists. When realising the considerable diversity of possible aims and ranges that comparisons of criminal law may be employed for, still to believe that this variety of functions could be mastered with one and the same method would be an illusion. Therefore, in a second step it is necessary to show that the variety of goals requires a variety of methods. Whereas in some cases, for instance, a “normative-institutional” approach may suffice, in others a more “functional” method may be indispensable. Alternatively, while a “cultural turn” may be needed in some situations, a “structural” analysis would be more appropriate in others.

But not only does each type of a comparative aim require its best corresponding method(s), no less important is to know in which of the various phases of comparison which method fits best. As it concerns exactly this implementation of theory into practice that is usually neglected in this field, it is one of the main aims of this book to present the methodology of comparative criminal law in a way which eases and encourages its practice.

The importance of clarifying the comparative goal before selecting the method to be applied was proven in a relatively large research project designed to find out in which – similar or different – manner various European jurisdictions would evaluate an exemplary homicide case: in what way and at which stage of the proceeding extenuating circumstances might be taken into consideration, what verdict and sentence might be expected, and finally, how the judgement would be executed and/or when and on what conditions early release might be granted [Albin Eser/Walter Perron (eds.), *Strukturvergleich strafrechtlicher Verantwortlichkeit und Sanktionierung in Europa. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Theorie der Strafrechtsvergleichung*, Berlin 2015, 1144 pages]. Obviously, a comparative project as complex as this cannot be performed with only one method. While for a purely theoretical interest in the relevant crime provisions a legalistic comparison may suffice, for judicial purposes their application in practice, too, would need to be described, thus also requiring empirical comparisons. Additionally, if any possible differences are to be explained, this can hardly be done without the investigation of dissimilarities in the legal culture and tradition. Or to mention just one more legislative aspect, if one wants to explore what are more or less good stages in dividing the criminal proceeding in various phases, possibly with different options for taking aggravating or mitigating circumstances into consideration, then functionalist and structuralist methods become necessary.

Building on these and other lessons learnt from undertaking the project described before, it seemed only logical to put the illustrative material gained from it into a broader theoretical context. This is, in this volume, done in three steps: After an introductory review of the development of comparative criminal law and its general self-understanding and present status (Part I), broad attention is paid to the various aims and functions of comparative criminal law (Part II), followed by an analysis of its methodology (Part III), that is summarised in a practical guide for performing comparative work in criminal law. After a concluding outlook on what remains to be done (Part IV), finally the status of comparative criminal law is illuminated by an analysis and appraisal of current literature in this field (Epilogue).

Although developed from the aforementioned research project (and thus originally building the final part of it), this book is standing on its own as a general theory of comparative criminal law and its practice. As written by a German with a European background, the manner of argumentation, as well as examples selected, may differ from what Anglo-American or other audiences are most used to read, let alone the considerable number of references to non-english literature. However, as a specific feature of comparative criminal law is to become acquainted with other cultures and ways of thinking, it appears desirable rather than feeling frustrated to instead welcome a new foreign approach as an enrichment.

To enjoy such an enrichment from foreign countries and legal culture is a privilege. I was already granted this chance before finishing my German PhD in law (1962), thanks to a Fulbright Foundation scholarship for the Institute of Comparative Law at New York University (1960/61). This proved not only to be an eye-opener to the common law, but also a first signpost to comparative criminal law, due to a Master thesis on “The

Preface

principle of harm”, supervised by the late Professor *Gerhard O.W. Mueller*. His distinct sense for everything strange and his constant encouragement never to let the legal view be restricted by national borders will always be gratefully remembered. Besides many others who deserve my special thanks for having accompanied me on my comparative way, I may in particular mention Professor *George P. Fletcher*, who already in 1981, while I was teaching as Visiting Professor at the University of California at Los Angeles, gave me the chance to participate in the genesis of his comparative “Rethinking Criminal Law” – followed by joint seminars and common publications, cemented further in long-standing ties of friendship. Still more global ways to comparative criminal law were opened by my role as Director of the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg (1982). In this respect I am not only gratefully thinking of many enlightening conversations which I was able to have with foreign research guests at the Institute but also of numerous visits and lecture tours to other countries, resulting in fruitful comparative insights and leading to quite a lot of mutual cooperation. Above all, however, I gratefully remember my stays as visiting professor in many countries and jurisdictions, for instance in the last ten years in Kyoto in Japan, Hobart in Australia, Haifa and Jerusalem in Israel as well as Columbia and St. Louis in the United States. Teaching foreign students, directly communicating with colleagues – there is hardly a better way to gain comparative experience. Not just a little of these insights found their way into this publication.

With special regard to the genesis of this book, among the various persons who deserved thanks for having contributed to its preparation in this or that way, only these may be mentioned. First of all Professor *Walter Perron* who has borne the main burden in the conceptual design and coordination of the “structure comparison project” which this publication emerged from. Particular thanks must also be given to *Brigitte Heilmann* who translated the German manuscript into English – not an easy task particularly in so far as more than a few of the German criminal-legal concepts, terms and differentiations have no direct equivalent in Anglo-American criminal law and thus still had to be mutually developed. Particular thanks also have to go to Dr. *Wilhelm Warth* of C. H. Beck Verlag for his editorial support: not only for constructing the index but still more for already having encouraged this publication and accompanying it with constant goodwill. Complementing the index and bringing the bibliography up to date was kindly contributed by *Leonie Reichardt* as student intern. For various good advice I am grateful to the British legal academic Dr. *Sophie Eser*.

My greatest and warmest thanks go to my wife *Gerda*. Over many years and decades in which I was occupied with comparative criminal law, starting with my study year in New York up to my still active retirement, she was not only a familial and homely guarantor for preserving me free time for research and teaching but also frequent companion on my comparative travels. This book is dedicated to her in love and gratitude.

Freiburg, April 2017

Albin Eser

Contents

	Pages
Preface	VII
Contents	XI
Table of Contents	XIII
List of Abbreviations	XVII
Part I. Development and Concepts of Comparative Criminal Law: Where we Stand	1
A. Setting the Scene – Objectives	3
B. History and Significance of Comparative Criminal Law	5
C. Variety of Concepts, Terms and Models	15
D. Aims – Methods – Prerequisites: Differentiating, Defining and Integrating	19
E. Comparative (Criminal) Law as “Purpose-free” Science?	21
Part II. Aims and Functions of Comparative Criminal Law: Why Explore Foreign Law	25
A. Theoretical Comparative Criminal Law	28
B. Judicative Comparative Criminal law	41
C. Legislative Comparative Criminal law	57
D. Evaluative-Competitive Comparative Criminal Law	69
Part III. Methodology: How to Conduct the Comparison of Criminal Law	83
A. Connecting Aims and Methods	85
B. Phases of Investigation – Steps of Examination	89
C. Personal Requirements and Institutional Framework Conditions	123
D. A Guideline for Comparative Work in – primarily but not only – Criminal Law	130
Part IV. Outlook: What Remains to Be Done	139
Epilogue. On the Status of Comparative Criminal Law: An Appraisal of Current Literature	145
A. The Emancipation of Comparative Criminal Law	147
B. Concepts and Focal Points in Publications on Comparative Criminal Law	150
C. Concluding Remark	157
Bibliography	159
Index	179

Table of Contents

	Margin number
Part I. Development and Concepts of Comparative Criminal Law: Where we Stand	
A. Setting the Scene – Objectives	1
B. History and Significance of Comparative Criminal Law	5
1. Developmental phases	5
2. Increasing importance and emancipation of comparative criminal law	20
C. Variety of Concepts, Terms and Models	29
D. Aims – Methods – Prerequisites: Differentiating, Defining and Integrating	37
E. Comparative (Criminal) Law as “Purpose-free” Science?	45
Part II. Aims and Functions of Comparative Criminal Law: Why Explore Foreign Law	
A. Theoretical Comparative Criminal Law	52
1. Broadening the horizon through foreign law – reflection on one’s own law	54
2. Basic research in comparative criminal law	57
a) Foreign law presentation (“Auslandsrechtskunde”) versus foreign law comparison (“Rechtsvergleichung”)	57
b) Micro comparison – macro comparison – basic research	60
c) Universal comparative criminal law – Claims and achievability	72
d) “Systematic comparative criminal law” – “Structural comparison”	82
3. Facilitating communication and promoting consensus by comparative criminal law	91
4. Critical control and innovation function of comparative criminal law	95
5. Preparatory function of comparative criminal law for practical purposes	96
B. Judicative Comparative Criminal Law	97
1. Direct consideration of foreign law in the application of law	101
a) Foreign law import	102
(i) “Authentic” – “Implementing” application of foreign law	103
(ii) “Limiting” application of foreign law	104
(iii) “Blanket-type” application of foreign law	105
(iv) Application of foreign law by “completing the offence definition”	106
(v) “Incorporated international crimes”	107
(vi) “Subsidiary” application of foreign law	108
b) Dependence of punitive power on foreign law	109
(i) Relevance for mistake of law	110
(ii) Dual criminality	111
(iii) Mutual criminality	112
(iv) Transnational prohibition of multiple prosecutions	113
(v) Principle of complementarity	114
2. Judicial finding of justice and further development of the law through comparative criminal law	115
a) Horizontal-transnational Broadening of the Field of Vision	116
(i) Comparative criminal law as an “interpretation aid”	117
(ii) Recourse to foreign “parent law”	118
(iii) Filling gaps – further development of the law	119

Table of Contents

b) Supranational influences on national criminal law	121
(i) Priority of European Union Law	122
(ii) Interpretation favourable to international law	124
c) Influences of national law on supranational criminal law	125
(i) Interpretation of international criminal law through reference to national law	126
(ii) Recourse to general principles of law	127
(iii) Development of a supranational criminal law dogmatics	129
3. Executory comparative criminal law	130
C. Legislative Comparative Criminal Law	133
1. Aims and tasks	135
a) Optimization and modernization of one's own national criminal law	135
(i) Optimization	136
(ii) Modernization	138
(iii) Stockpile of solutions – (no) self-service shop	144
b) Transnational adaptations of criminal law	146
(i) Assimilation	147
(ii) Harmonization	148
(iii) Unification	149
c) The development of universal and supranational criminal law	150
(i) Identification of the highest legal principles	151
(ii) Preparation of international conventions	152
(iii) Optimizing international criminal justice	153
2. Levels and ranges of regulations	157
a) Differences in scope	158
(i) Selective changes of law	158
(ii) Structural changes	159
(iii) Model Penal Codes	162
(iv) New transnational judiciaries	163
b) Different levels of regulation	164
(i) National level	165
(ii) Regional level	167
(iii) Universal level	169
(iv) Supranational level	171
D. Evaluative-Competitive Comparative Criminal law	173
1. History of concepts	174
2. Different aspects of evaluation	178
3. Evaluation as part of comparative law	187
4. From evaluative to competitive comparative law	195
a) Controlling and warning function	200
b) Legitimizing function	204
c) Gap-filling function	207
d) Function of critical initiative and innovation	208
e) Optimizing and modifying function	210
f) Harmonizing function	213
g) Preference-setting function	214

Table of Contents

Part III. Methodology: How to Conduct the Comparison of Criminal Law

A. Connecting Aims and Methods	219
1. Dependence of the method on the (set) objective – Openness of methods	219
2. Guiding principles – Ways of approach	223
B. Phases of Investigation – Steps of Examination	229
1. Formulation of the task – Working hypotheses – Catalogue of questions	231
a) Determining the purpose to be pursued and at what level it is to be carried out	232
b) Questionable targets and alternatives	237
(i) Claim to universality	238
(ii) Legal-internal methods of comparison versus culturally-oriented comparative law	241
(iii) “Question driven” versus “theory driven”	242
c) Different(ly) appropriate methods of comparison	243
(i) Legalistic normative-institutional approach	244
(ii) Socio-functionalist directions	247
(iii) Cultural comparison	250
(iv) Functional equivalence	253
(v) Structural dimensions of comparison	256
(vi) Summary of what to establish for the determination of the comparative task	262
d) Working hypotheses – Catalogue of questions	263
(i) Thematical aspects	264
(ii) In perspective view	268
(iii) Width and depth dimension	270
(iv) Pretest	273
2. Choice of countries to be compared	276
a) Orientation towards the comparative objective – Selection criteria	276
(i) No one-sided choice – no “numerus clausus”	277
(ii) Rules of thumb	281
(iii) Legal families	283
b) Exemplification through comparative criminal law projects	286
c) Pretest – Pilot study – Corrective changes	290
3. Preparation of the country reports	295
a) Starting point – Perspective – Integral/holistic approach	296
b) Covering the relevant law	299
c) Inclusion of criminology and other empirical sciences	302
d) Cultural background – Interrelationship of law and culture	304
e) Case-based comparative method	307
f) Computer-assisted comparison	309
4. Comparison – Cross-section – Creation of models	310
a) Binational comparison	311
b) Multinational cross-section	314
c) Creation of models	318
5. Evaluation – Recommendations	322
a) Dependence on the comparative objective – Steps of evaluation	322
b) Criteria of evaluation	329
c) Prerequisites for comparison	333

Table of Contents

C. Personal Requirements and Institutional Framework Conditions	337
1. Personal requirements	338
a) Comparatists – Cooperation	338
b) Professional qualifications	347
c) Personal integrity	351
2. Institutional equipment	354
D. A Guideline for Comparative Work in – primarily but not only – Criminal Law	359
0. Guiding principle throughout: Orientation of method and individual work steps towards the objective of the legal comparison	360
1. First working step: Goal setting	364
1.1. Choice and formulation of the comparative objective	366
1.2. Development of a catalogue of questions based on working hypotheses	367
2. Second working step: Choice of countries	368
2.1. Basic direction	369
2.2. Number of countries to be included	371
2.3. Preliminary study – Subsequent improvements	377
3. Third working step: Country reports	380
3.1. Starting point: Perspective – preconceptions	382
3.2. Coverage and presentation of the relevant legal matter	386
3.3. Inclusion of other sciences or contexts	387
3.4. Methodology of investigation	388
3.5. Subsequent amendments	389
4. Fourth working step: Comparison	391
4.1. Catalogue of criteria	392
4.2. Binational comparison	393
4.3. Multinational cross-section	394
4.4. Creation of models – Establishment of basic structures and general legal rules	395
5. Fifth working step: Evaluation – Recommendations	396
5.1. Options of evaluation	397
5.2. Criteria of evaluation	398
5.3. Prerequisites for comparison and recommendation	399
Part IV. Outlook: What Remains to Be Done	400
 Epilogue. On the Status of Comparative Criminal Law: An Appraisal of Current Literature	
A. The Emancipation of Comparative Criminal Law	412
B. Concepts and Focal Points in Publications on Comparative Criminal Law	417
1. Size – Choice of countries	418
2. Selection criteria	424
3. Basic categories. Teaching material – Foreign law presentations – Comparative theory	428
4. Thematic focal points	438
C. Concluding Remark	444

List of Abbreviations

AIDP	Association Internationale der Droit Privé
BGBL	Bundesgesetzblatt (German Federal Law Gazette)
BGE	Entscheidungen des Schweizer Bundesgerichts (Decisions of the Swiss Federal Supreme Court)
BGH	Bundesgerichtshof (German Federal Supreme Court)
BGHSt	Entscheidungen des Bundesgerichtshofs in Strafsachen (Decisions of the German Federal Supreme Court in criminal matters)
BVerfG	Bundesverfassungsgericht (German Federal Constitutional Court)
BVerfGE	Entscheidungen des Bundesverfassungsgerichts (Decisions of the German Federal Constitutional Court)
cf.	confer (compare)
CISA	Convention on Implementing the Schengen Agreement
DStrZ	Deutsche Strafrechtszeitung
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECJ	European Court of Justice/Court of Justice of the European Union
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
ed.	edition, editor
eds.	editions, editors
espec.	especially
EU	European Union
EUCFR	Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union
EuCJ	European Court of Justice
EuGH	Europäischer Gerichtshof
EuGRZ	Europäische Grundrechte-Zeitschrift
f./ff.	and the following page/pages
fn.	footnote
FS	Festschrift (Liber amicorum)
GA	Golttdammer's Archiv für Strafrecht
GPC	German Penal Code
Ibid.	ibidem
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICTR	International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia
id.	Idem/eadem
IKV	International Kriminalistische Vereinigung
IRG	Gesetz über die internationale Rechtshilfe in Strafsachen (German International Legal Assistance Act)
JICJ	Journal of International Criminal Justice
JuS	Juristische Schulung
JZ	JuristenZeitung
MJECL	Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law
mn.	margin number
MPI	Max Planck Institute (for Foreign and International Criminal Law)
MPIS	Max Planck Informationssystem zur Strafrechtsvergleichung/International Max Planck Information System for Comparative Criminal Law
NJW	Neue Juristische Wochenschrift
NStZ	Neue Zeitschrift für Strafrecht
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
p./pp.	page/pages
para./paras.	paragraph/paragraphs
RabelsZ	Rabels Zeitschrift für ausländisches und internationales Privatrecht
RPE	Rules of Procedure and Evidence
RW	Rechtswissenschaft
StGB	Strafgesetzbuch (German Penal Code)
StPO	Strafprozessordnung (German Criminal Procedure Code)
StV	Der Strafverteidiger
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

List of Abbreviations

UN	United Nations
UNIDROIT	International Institute for the Unification of Private Law
vol	Volume
VStGB	Völkerstrafgesetzbuch (German Code of International Criminal Law)
W.L.R.	Weekly Law Reports
ZaöRV	Zeitschrift für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht
ZiS	Zeitschrift für internationale Strafrechtsdogmatik
ZSchwR	Zeitschrift für Schweizerisches Recht
ZStW	Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft