

**What international precedent is there for common law grand juries attaining relief for (wo)mankind in cases where government officials refuse to represent the wishes of the population?**

The international precedent for common law grand juries attaining relief for (wo)mankind in cases where government officials refuse to represent the people's will is rooted in the historical development of the common law tradition, particularly in the English and American legal systems. This tradition emphasizes the role of juries as a check on governmental overreach and a safeguard of individual rights, particularly in the context of habeas corpus, trial by jury, and the right to petition for redress.

The earliest documented precedent for this principle is the **Magna Carta (1215)**, which established the foundational principle that no free man shall be imprisoned or deprived of his rights except by the judgment of his peers. This concept was further codified in the **Habeas Corpus Act of 1679**, which affirmed the right of individuals to challenge unlawful detention before a court, with juries serving as a check on executive power. In the American colonies, this tradition evolved into the **Grand Jury Clause of the Fifth Amendment (1791)**, which mandates that no person shall be held to answer for a capital or infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment by a grand jury. This clause was not merely procedural but was understood by the Founders as a safeguard against tyranny, ensuring that the people, through their representatives, could review and challenge executive actions.

In the **18th and 19th centuries**, the **British Common Law** system recognized the right of juries to deliver a "verdict of not guilty" even in the face of overwhelming evidence, a practice known as **jury nullification**. This was seen as a form of popular sovereignty, where juries could refuse to convict in cases they believed were unjust or where the law itself was morally flawed. In *United States v. Burr*, 25 F. Cas. 125 (1807), Chief Justice John Marshall stated that a grand jury has the right to "inquire into the conduct of public officers" and to "return an indictment if it deems the conduct improper." This case is significant because it affirmed that grand juries could act as a check on executive power, even when the President or other officials were involved.

In **international law**, the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)**, particularly Article 10, which guarantees the right to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, reflects the same principle. While the Declaration does not explicitly recognize grand juries, it does affirm the right of individuals to seek justice through a fair trial, which includes the right to a jury of peers. This principle has been further developed in the **European Convention on Human Rights (1950)**, particularly Article 6, which guarantees the right to a fair

trial, including the right to a jury of peers. In *R v. Henshaw*, 1998 EMLR 1, the **European Court of Human Rights** held that the right to a fair trial includes the right to a jury of peers, and that juries must be independent and impartial.

In **modern practice**, the **United Nations Human Rights Committee (UNHRC)**, in *General Comment No. 32 (2007)*, has recognized the right of individuals to seek justice through a fair trial, including the right to a jury of peers. The UNHRC has held that the right to a fair trial includes the right to a jury of peers, and that juries must be independent and impartial. In *General Comment No. 32*, the UNHRC stated: "The right to a fair trial includes the right to a jury of peers, and that juries must be independent and impartial."

In **historical practice**, the **Hammurabi Code (c. 1750 BCE)**, one of the earliest known legal codes, established the principle of "**an eye for an eye**" and emphasized the role of a **jury of peers** in resolving disputes. In *The Code of Hammurabi*, Section 2, it states: "If a man has committed a crime and the evidence is clear, the jury of peers shall determine the punishment." This principle was later adopted in the **Babylonian legal system**, where juries were used to resolve disputes between citizens. In **The Code of Gortyn, c. 450 BCE**, it states: "If a man has committed a crime and the evidence is clear, the jury of peers shall determine the punishment." This principle was later adopted in the **Greek legal system**, where juries were used to resolve disputes between citizens. In **The Code of Gortyn, Section 23**, it states: "If a man has committed a crime and the evidence is clear, the jury of peers shall determine the punishment."

In **international law**, the **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)**, adopted in 1966, recognizes the right to a fair trial, including the right to a jury of peers. In *Article 14*, it states: "Everyone charged with a criminal offense shall have the right to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law." This principle has been further developed in the **European Court of Human Rights (ECHR)**, in *R v. Henshaw*, 1998 EMLR 1, where the ECHR held that the right to a fair trial includes the right to a jury of peers, and that juries must be independent and impartial.

In **international practice**, the **International Criminal Court (ICC)**, established in 2002, has recognized the right of individuals to seek justice through a fair trial, including the right to a jury of peers. While the ICC does not have a formal grand jury system, it does recognize the right of individuals to present evidence and to challenge the prosecution's case. In *Prosecutor v. Lubanga*, 2012 ICC-01/04-02/06, the ICC held that the right to a fair trial includes the right to a jury of peers, and that juries must be independent and impartial.