

conflict may be tried by military commission as limited by Military Order of November 13, 2001, "Detention, Treatment, and Trial of Certain Non-Citizens in the War Against Terrorism." No offense is cognizable in a trial by military commission if that offense did not exist prior to the conduct in question. These crimes and elements derive from the law of armed conflict, a body of law that is sometimes referred to as the law of war. They constitute violations of the law of armed conflict or offenses that, consistent with that body of law, are triable by military commission. Because this document is declarative of existing law, it does not preclude trial for crimes that occurred prior to its effective date.

(b) *Effect of other laws.* No conclusion regarding the applicability or persuasive authority of other bodies of law should be drawn solely from the presence, absence, or similarity of particular language in this part as compared to other articulations of law.

(c) *Non-exclusivity.* This part does not contain a comprehensive list of crimes triable by military commission. It is intended to be illustrative of applicable principles of the common law of war but not to provide an exclusive enumeration of the punishable acts recognized as such by that law. The absence of a particular offense from the corpus of those enumerated herein does not preclude trial for that offense.

§ 11.4 Applicable principles of law.

(a) *General intent.* All actions taken by the Accused that are necessary for completion of a crime must be performed with general intent. This intent is not listed as a separate element. When the mens rea required for culpability to attach involves an intent that a particular consequence occur, or some other specific intent, an intent element is included. The necessary relationship between such intent element and the conduct constituting the actus reus is not articulated for each set of elements, but is presumed; a nexus between the two is necessary.

(b) *The element of wrongfulness and defenses.* Conduct must be wrongful to constitute one of the offenses enumerated herein or any other offense triable by military commission. Conduct is

wrongful if it is done without justification or excuse cognizable under applicable law. The element of wrongfulness (or the absence of lawful justification or excuse), which may be required under the customary law of armed conflict, is not repeated in the elements of crimes in § 11.6. Conduct satisfying the elements found herein shall be inferred to be wrongful in the absence of evidence to the contrary. Similarly, this part does not enunciate defenses that may apply for specific offenses, though an Accused is entitled to raise any defense available under the law of armed conflict. Defenses potentially available to an Accused under the law of armed conflict, such as self-defense, mistake of fact, and duress, may be applicable to certain offenses subject to trial by military commission. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, defenses in individual cases shall be presumed not to apply. The burden of going forward with evidence of lawful justification or excuse or any applicable defense shall be upon the Accused. With respect to the issue of combatant immunity raised by the specific enumeration of an element requiring the absence thereof, the prosecution must affirmatively prove that element regardless of whether the issue is raised by the defense. Once an applicable defense or an issue of lawful justification or lawful excuse is fairly raised by the evidence presented, except for the defense of lack of mental responsibility, the burden is on the prosecution to establish beyond a reasonable doubt that the conduct was wrongful or that the defense does not apply. With respect to the defense of lack of mental responsibility, the Accused has the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that, as a result of a severe mental disease or defect, the Accused was unable to appreciate the nature and quality of the wrongfulness of the Accused's acts. As provided in 32 CFR 9.5(c), the prosecution bears the burden of establishing the Accused's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt in all cases tried by a military commission. Each element of an offense enumerated herein must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

(c) *Statute of limitations.* Violations of the laws of war listed herein are not subject to any statute of limitations.

§ 11.5 Definitions.

(a) *Combatant immunity.* Under the law of armed conflict, only a lawful combatant enjoys “combatant immunity” or “belligerent privilege” for the lawful conduct of hostilities during armed conflict.

(b) *Enemy.* “Enemy” includes any entity with which the United States or allied forces may be engaged in armed conflict, or which is preparing to attack the United States. It is not limited to foreign nations, or foreign military organizations or members thereof. “Enemy” specifically includes any organization of terrorists with international reach.

(c) *In the context of and was associated with armed conflict.* Elements containing this language require a nexus between the conduct and armed hostilities. Such nexus could involve, but is not limited to, time, location, or purpose of the conduct in relation to the armed hostilities. The existence of such factors, however, may not satisfy the necessary nexus (*e.g.*, murder committed between members of the same armed force for reasons of personal gain unrelated to the conflict, even if temporally and geographically associated with armed conflict, is not “in the context of” the armed conflict). The focus of this element is not the nature or characterization of the conflict, but the nexus to it. This element does not require a declaration of war, ongoing mutual hostilities, or confrontation involving a regular national armed force. A single hostile act or attempted act may provide sufficient basis for the nexus so long as its magnitude or severity rises to the level of an “armed attack” or an “act of war,” or the number, power, stated intent or organization of the force with which the actor is associated is such that the act or attempted act is tantamount to an attack by an armed force. Similarly, conduct undertaken or organized with knowledge or intent that it initiate or contribute to such hostile act or hostilities would satisfy the nexus requirement.

(d) *Military Objective.* “Military objectives” are those potential targets during an armed conflict which, by their nature, location, purpose, or use, effectively contribute to the opposing force’s war-fighting or war-sustaining capability and whose total or partial destruction, capture, or neutralization would constitute a military advantage to the attacker under the circumstances at the time of the attack.

(e) *Object of the attack.* “Object of the attack” refers to the person, place, or thing intentionally targeted. In this regard, the term includes neither collateral damage nor incidental injury or death.

(f) *Protected property.* “Protected property” refers to property specifically protected by the law of armed conflict such as buildings dedicated to religion, education, art, science or charitable purposes, historic monuments, hospitals, or places where the sick and wounded are collected, provided they are not being used for military purposes or are not otherwise military objectives. Such property would include objects properly identified by one of the distinctive emblems of the Geneva Conventions but does not include all civilian property.

(g) *Protected under the law of war.* The person or object in question is expressly “protected” under one or more of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 or, to the extent applicable, customary international law. The term does not refer to all who enjoy some form of protection as a consequence of compliance with international law, but those who are expressly designated as such by the applicable law of armed conflict. For example, persons who either are *hors de combat* or medical or religious personnel taking no active part in hostilities are expressly protected, but other civilians may not be.

(h) *Should have known.* The facts and circumstances were such that a reasonable person in the Accused’s position would have had the relevant knowledge or awareness.

§ 11.6 Crimes and elements.

(a) *Substantive offenses—war crimes.* The following enumerated offenses, if applicable, should be charged in separate counts. Elements are drafted to