

# Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
<b>Introduction</b>	1
<b>1 The Politics of ‘Historical Truth’: An Outline</b>	8
1. ‘Historical Truth’ as a Goal and a Problem	9
2. Extreme Selectivity and Slices of Truth	12
3. The Need for Representative Case Selections	15
4. Are Objective Selections Possible? The Gravity Test	20
5. The Critical Systemic Role of the Prosecutor	27
6. Checks on the Prosecutor? The ‘Accountability v Independence’ Debate	31
7. Conclusion	37
<b>2 German Objections to the Nuremberg Trials after 1949</b>	40
1. The Allies in Control	41
2. Allied Priorities: Shaping the Historical Narrative	42
3. Germany and the <i>nullum crimen</i> Debate	47
4. Germany and the <i>tu quoque</i> Debate	53
5. Germany’s Opposition to New Tribunals	56
6. Conclusion	59
<b>3 Germany’s Own GDR Trials after 1989</b>	62
1. West Germany in Control	62
2. West German Narrative Interests	64
3. The U-Turn on <i>nullum crimen</i>	68
4. Conclusion	72
<b>4 German Support for the UN Ad Hoc Tribunals in the 1990s</b>	74
1. The UN Security Council in Control	75
2. Germany’s Narrative Interests on the Balkans	78
3. Western Priorities: Shaping the Historical Narrative	81
4. Germany’s Interests in New Tribunals	87
5. Conclusion	90
<b>5 Germany’s Role (and Stake) in the Creation of the ICC</b>	92
1. Who Should Be in Control?	92
2. Originally, Germany Favoured UN Security Council Control	96

x *Contents*

3. Then, Germany Argues for 'Independence' Instead	100
4. Remarkably, Idealist and Realists in Germany had Joined Hands	108
5. German Realists had Nothing to Lose from the Shift Towards Independence	110
6. More Importantly However, They had a Lot to Gain	116
7. Independence and the Crime of Aggression	119
8. Conclusion	128
<b>6 Cosmopolitan Ideals and National Interests: Concluding Remarks</b>	131
<i>Bibliography</i>	136
<i>Index</i>	149