



**General Assembly**

Distr.  
GENERAL

A/40/451

11 September 1985

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: ARABIC/ENGLISH/FRENCH/  
RUSSIAN/SPANISH

Fortieth session  
Item 134 of the provisional agenda\*

DRAFT CODE OF OFFENCES AGAINST THE PEACE AND SECURITY OF MANKIND

Report of the Secretary-General

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	2
II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS .....	3
Australia .....	3
Egypt .....	4
Gabon .....	6
German Democratic Republic .....	7
Malawi .....	9
Mongolia .....	10
Qatar .....	10
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics .....	11
Uruguay .....	12
Venezuela .....	13

\* A/40/150.

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. On 13 December 1984, the General Assembly adopted resolution 39/80, entitled "Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind". The operative paragraphs of the resolution read as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"1. Requests the International Law Commission to continue its work on the elaboration of the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind by elaborating an introduction as well as a list of the offences, taking into account the progress made at its thirty-sixth session, 1/ as well as the views expressed during the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly; 2/

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States and intergovernmental organizations regarding the conclusions contained in paragraph 65 of the report of the International Law Commission 3/ and to include them in a report to be submitted to the General Assembly at its fortieth session with a view to adopting, at the appropriate time, the necessary decision thereon;

"3. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its fortieth session the item entitled "Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind", to be considered in conjunction with the consideration of the report of the International Law Commission."

2. The Secretary-General, on 20 March 1985, addressed a note to Governments of Member States and a letter to the relevant international organizations inviting them to communicate to him before 15 August 1985 any views they might wish to submit in response to paragraph 2 of resolution 39/80.

3. The present report reproduces replies that have been received as at 6 September 1985. Replies that might still be forthcoming will be circulated in addenda to the present report.

---

1/ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 10 (A/39/10).

2/ See A/C.6/39/SR.47-49 and 63.

3/ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 10 (A/39/10).

## II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS

### AUSTRALIA

[Original: English]

[12 August 1985]

1. The Australian Government is of the view that if the proposed Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind is to serve a useful purpose as an international charter, it should be conceptually clear, juridically sound and as precise in its terminology as possible. It has therefore been encouraged by the approach taken thus far by the International Law Commission in its discussion of the topic and considers that if this methodology is maintained, the most serious pitfalls in the area can be avoided. In particular it welcomes the decision of the Commission to limit the application of the Code at this stage to the criminal liability of individuals and not to try to tackle the conceptually dubious problem of allocating criminal liabilities to States. While Australia is of the view that the question of the responsibility of States for actions and policies that cause damage to others is a legitimate and important subject for the consideration of the Commission, it does not believe that such consideration in the context of this item would do anything but obscure the central objective in the exercise and delay completion of the Code.

2. The Australian Government also welcomes the decision of the Commission to approach the topic inductively; that is to begin its consideration of the subject by cataloguing those actions that might be generally accepted as constituting "offences against the peace and security of mankind" and only then to try to extrapolate general principles in identifying such offences. It is the Australian Government's belief that such an approach will more quickly and more readily lead to an international consensus on the Code than an approach that seeks as a first step to identify the elements of the offences to be included in it.

3. In considering what actions should constitute offences against the peace and security of mankind, the Australian Government is concerned to ensure that the currency of the concept and the terminology not be devalued by their indiscriminating application to all acts or policies of which the international community generally disapproves. It therefore supports the Commission's view that the distinction between international crimes (i.e. crimes with an international character such as drug trafficking, aircraft hijacking, etc.) and those actions to be included in the Code should be confined to those offences of a truly barbarous nature or which "threaten the foundations of modern civilization and the values it embodies". This is not to say that international crimes are not serious, but rather that the offences against the peace and security of mankind have a character that goes beyond the merely criminal.

4. Having examined the various options for inclusion in the Code looked at by the International Law Commission, the Australian Government considers that the offences listed in the 1954 draft Code form a good starting point for the updated Code and would wish to see all these retained, subject only to such modifications as are

/...

necessary in the light of international legal developments in the last 30 years. In addition the Government would accept the inclusion of colonialism as an offence on the understanding that the idea was dealt with, as suggested in paragraph 52 of the report, as the "denial of self-determination".

5. Australia agrees that apartheid, which is a particularly reprehensible breach of human rights on a massive scale, deserves to be included on the list of offences. Australia has had difficulty in the past, however, with the extraterritorial legal consequences of declaring apartheid a "crime against humanity" and it would hope that this could be avoided in this exercise.

6. The Australian Government agrees that acts causing particularly serious damage to the environment might also be considered for inclusion in the Code, subject to appropriate legal formulations. In this area there may well be problems in attributing a mens rea to those responsible for such damage and careful thought will be needed as to whether it would be worthwhile including this in the Code, no matter what the enormity of the damage, if the offence can never be proved satisfactorily.

7. This problem of proving intent, compounded by that of trying to fit resolutely non-legal concepts into legal formulations, also bedevils the proposal to declare "economic aggression" an offence against peace and security. The Australian Government would be inclined to exclude it therefore from the ambit of the Code. As with the use of atomic weapons, this is a subject best left by the Commission for debate in the more political arena of the General Assembly.

8. The Australian Government is sympathetic to the notion of including "mercenarism" in the Code, mindful of the reprehensible nature of the practice. Having had experience in the operation of one of the few domestic laws in the world prohibiting mercenary activities, (Commonwealth of Australia Crimes (Foreign Incursions and Recruitment) Act, 1978), it is very aware, however, that the definition of offences committed by mercenaries needs to be clear and precise. The problem of defining a "mercenary" and mercenary activities is currently exercising the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries and, in our view, "mercenarism" should not be considered for inclusion in the Code until the results of that Committee's deliberations are known.

EGYPT

[Original: Arabic]

[3 July 1985]

1. The Government of Egypt has already had occasion to state its views regarding the content of paragraph 69 of the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-fifth session pursuant to paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 38/132 of 19 December 1983.

/...

2. In response to General Assembly resolution 39/80, the Government of Egypt wishes to present its views concerning paragraph 65 of the Commission's report on the work of its thirty-sixth session relating to the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind, as follows:

(a) Although the Commission's intention to limit its work at the current stage to the criminal liability of individuals, without prejudice to subsequent consideration of the possible application to States of the notion of international criminal responsibility (para. 65, subpara. (a)), does not take fully into consideration Egypt's previously stated position regarding the possibility of holding States criminally responsible, we can agree to this approach at present, provided that the criminal responsibility of States remains open for discussion in the future.

(b) It is therefore only logical that the Commission should begin (as stipulated in para. 65, subpara. (b)), by drawing up a list of offences constituting a threat to the peace and security of mankind, while bearing in mind the need to draft, at an appropriate stage, an introduction summarizing the general principles of international criminal law relating to such offences.

(c) In addition, the Government of Egypt feels that a list of offences must necessarily be based on the list prepared by the International Law Commission in 1954. However, the study of this list will naturally lead to the inclusion of amendments and the addition of new types of offences that have emerged as a result of international and legal developments since 1954, and that, by a sort of common international conviction, must be considered criminal.

3. Hence the Commission must, at the present stage, work on reaching agreement concerning offences internationally recognized as criminal, with a view to including them in the list of offences; perhaps the most serious are apartheid and the use of nuclear weapons, which no two States could differ in considering offences against the peace and security of all mankind.

4. To quote the examples of apartheid and the use of nuclear weapons is not to minimize the seriousness of other offences such as are stipulated in paragraph 65, subparagraph (c). We merely think that these two ought to be given priority as the least controversial offences, following which the Commission could proceed to examine colonialism, economic aggression, etc., as mentioned in the report.

5. Lastly, the Arab Republic of Egypt attaches special importance to setting a time-limit for completion of the Commission's work on the list of offences. This is a matter that should be dealt with by the Commission when it next examines this subject.

GABON

[Original: French]

[27 June 1985]

1. The Gabonese Republic considers that the elaboration of a Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind is a step forward in the process of the progressive development and codification of international law. In order to move ahead and arrive at concrete results, the International Law Commission should continue its work on the basis of the views expressed by Member States in the course of the discussion in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly and in the written replies from Governments.
2. For the purpose of harmonizing the various views expressed by Member States, a cautious and realistic approach on the part of the Commission is therefore essential. In the present situation regarding the international community, the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind raises controversial issues at both the legal and the political levels.
3. With regard to the content ratione personae of the draft Code, Gabon endorses the Commission's pragmatic decision to limit itself at the current stage to the criminal liability of individuals, as indicated in paragraph 65 (a) of the Commission's report on the work of its thirty-sixth session.
4. This circumspect approach is in keeping with the principles underlying the Charter and the Judgement of the Nürnberg Tribunal. The Commission's intention to draw up a provisional list of offences and draft an introduction summarizing the general principles of international criminal law relating to such offences is in conformity with its mandate.
5. With regard to the content ratione materiae, the Gabonese Republic is of the view that the 1954 draft is an acceptable point of departure for preparing the list of offences.
6. Offences that have emerged since 1954, such as colonialism, apartheid and all other forms of foreign domination, should also be included in the list of offences, since they are a violation of one of the most fundamental of human rights, namely the right of peoples to self-determination, and constitute a threat to international peace and security. The same is true of the offence of mercenarism and hegemony.
7. The necessary updating of the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind should be based on the "minimum content" set out in paragraphs 52 to 62 of the Commission's report.
8. In this connection, the Gabonese Republic endorses the view that the draft Code would be weakened if it was too broad in scope.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

[Original: English]

[5 September 1985]

1. This year the peoples commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. Having emerged from the victorious struggle of the nations and States united in the anti-Hitler coalition and taking account of the experience of pre-war history, the world organization has set itself the noble aim of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war. This task is now more topical than ever before at a time when questions of war or peace have taken on a nuclear dimension, when the pursuit of predominance in connection with the search for the "super weapon" on Earth and in outer space conjures up the danger of mankind's annihilation. All States, large, medium or small, are facing the responsible task of putting a stop to that disastrous development. In this context, special importance attaches to the United Nations Organization, as a universal forum for international dialogue, for the preparation of internationally binding instruments to safeguard peace and international security.

2. For these reasons and considering the historical experience of which the peoples are particularly aware on the fortieth anniversary of the defeat of nazism, the German Democratic Republic emphatically welcomes all efforts aimed at drawing up, as early as possible, a Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind. It holds the view that the preparation of such a Code would be an important contribution toward safeguarding peace and observing generally recognized principles and norms of international law, preventing and punishing grave international crimes and deterring potential criminals from committing such offences.

3. Guided by these objectives, the United Nations General Assembly, in its resolutions 95 (I) and 177 (II) adopted almost 40 years ago (on 11 December 1946 and 21 November 1947 respectively), entrusted the International Law Commission with the formulation of a draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind, in which it was to rely on the Nürnberg principles.

4. In the view of the German Democratic Republic, now as before, the elaboration and finalization of the draft Code should focus on the further development and updating of the Nürnberg principles on the basis of the newest international instruments, with a view to determining and reaffirming the individual criminal responsibility for grave international crimes against the peace and security of mankind.

5. The German Democratic Republic welcomes and supports the proposal of the Commission that in the further work on the draft Code major emphasis should be placed on the examination of the criminal responsibility of individuals. As was already outlined in several comments of the German Democratic Republic, regarding the scope ratione personae of the draft Code, the determination of the criminal responsibility of individuals who have committed crimes against the peace and security of mankind does not imply the exclusion of the international

responsibility of States that induce, organize or tolerate those crimes or participate in committing such crimes by their own actions. The German Democratic Republic considers that offences against the peace and security of mankind are committed, as a rule, through activities performed by organs of States, on behalf of States or tolerated by States, and entail the international responsibility of the States concerned. The purpose of the draft Code, however, is not to codify State responsibility by rather to elaborate an international agreement on international offences committed by individuals for which they are held responsible irrespective of whether or not they acted in the capacity of an organ of a State. Moreover, the draft Code should not exclude that groups of individuals or judicial persons committing such offences against the peace and security of mankind are subject to criminal responsibility.

6. The German Democratic Republic wishes to reaffirm its standpoint that the criterion in the classification of international crimes as offences against the peace and security of mankind should be the degree of their seriousness and of the danger to the peace and security of mankind. Of decisive importance is the legal object against which an offence is committed, namely the peace and security of mankind. Therefore, in the case of crimes to be included in the Code, it should be established whether they constitute an attack upon or a serious threat to the peace and security of mankind or a breach of peace and thus a violation of obligations that are of essential importance for the protection of fundamental interests of the community of States as a whole.

7. The German Democratic Republic shares the view expressed so far by the majority of States in their comments that the draft prepared in 1954 by the International Law Commission represents an acceptable starting point for the elaboration of a list of offences against the peace and security of mankind.

8. As regards new offences the addition of which has become necessary because of the progressive development of international law since 1954, the German Democratic Republic holds the following view:

(a) The first use of nuclear weapons should be included in the Code of Offences against the peace and security of mankind as the gravest international crime. The first use of nuclear weapons would not only pose a threat to international peace and security but jeopardize the existence of mankind as a whole. The fact that the majority of States regard the renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons as a decisive step to prevent nuclear war has already been reflected in a number of General Assembly resolutions.

(b) As for the inclusion of the crimes of colonialism and apartheid, the German Democratic Republic considers that these crimes violate one of the most fundamental human rights, namely the right of the peoples to self-determination, as it is laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. They pose a serious threat to the peace and security of mankind and must, therefore, be included in the Code.

(c) Activities undertaken by mercenaries against sovereign States to overthrow Governments and against national liberation movements, as well as the support for such activities constitute, without doubt, an offence against the peace and security of mankind and should be included in the Code as a separate offence.



9. In the view of the German Democratic Republic the following generally recognized principles should be included in the Code to ensure the punishment of individuals having committed offences against the peace and security of mankind:

(a) The principle of individual criminal responsibility for offences against the peace and security of mankind;

(b) The principle that the official status of an individual provides no legal reason for exemption from punishment for an unlawful act or for mitigation of punishment;

(c) The principle that activities undertaken pursuant to the order of a superior provide no grounds for exemption from punishment but can merely be considered a mitigating circumstance;

(d) The principle of non-applicability of any statutory limitations in respect of offences against the peace and security of mankind;

(e) Applicability of the principle aut judicare aut dedere in respect of individuals who committed offences against the peace and security of mankind;

(f) The principle that offences against the peace and security of mankind are not to be considered political crimes and do not justify the granting of asylum;

(g) The principle that individuals having committed offences against the peace and security of mankind shall be subject to universal prosecution and punishment.

10. Due to the great political importance to be attached to the Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind, it should remain a separate item on the agenda of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly.

MALAWI

[Original: English]

[26 August 1985]

The Government of Malawi fully agrees with the conclusions and statements in paragraph 65 of the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-sixth session.

/...

MONGOLIA

[Original: Russian]

[10 June 1985]

In addition to the comments transmitted to the United Nations in 1980, Mongolia wishes to state the following:

(a) In the current complex international situation, marked by an increased risk of nuclear war as a result of the actions of the aggressive forces of imperialism, completing work on the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind as quickly as possible is extremely important for the conservation of peace on Earth.

(b) Generally speaking, the draft Code prepared by the International Law Commission in 1954 represents a good basis for the Code. However, in further work on the draft Code, account must be taken of the relevant provisions of the extremely important decisions taken by the General Assembly in recent years. These include the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe (resolution 36/100 of 9 December 1981), resolution 38/75 of 15 December 1983, entitled "Condemnation of nuclear war", and the Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace (resolution 39/11 of 12 November 1984).

(c) The idea of the draft, consisting of the principle of the criminal responsibility of the individual for serious crimes against peace and the imperative nature of punishment for such crimes, must be maintained.

(d) The Code could include a provision whereby countries would enter into an obligation to incorporate definitions of international crimes into their national legislation and to introduce severe penalties for persons committing such crimes.

QATAR

[Original: English]

[18 April 1985]

1. The Government of the State of Qatar is in agreement with the conclusions reached by the International Law Commission with regard to the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind, as contained in paragraph 65 of the Commission's report to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

2. With regard to the use of atomic weapons in particular, the Government of the State of Qatar concurs in the position that the Commission cannot remain indifferent to the legal characterization to be given to the use, at least in the case of a first strike, of such weapons of mass destruction causing incalculable long-term harm to the planet and its inhabitants.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

[Original: Russian]

[30 August 1985]

1. The following comments are provided in addition to the views communicated earlier by the Soviet Union to the United Nations Secretariat (documents A/35/210, A/37/325 and A/39/439/Add.3).
2. The elaboration of the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind is one of the urgent and important items on the agenda of the session of the General Assembly. This document is destined to become an effective international legal instrument in the effort to eradicate the most dangerous crimes against peace and humanity to eliminate the threat of nuclear war and strengthen peace on earth.
3. The draft Code, drawn up by the International Law Commission in 1954, constitutes in principle an acceptable basis for continuing work in this field, although the text as it stands needs to be considerably enlarged upon and broadened. The Code must take into account the major international agreements designed to prevent the most dangerous crimes against peace and humanity and also the trends in the development of international legal norms in this field.
4. In order to strengthen its preventive function, the Code, in our view, must include a broad general definition of the concept of an offence against the peace and security of mankind. This definition must contain the most essential criteria for such offences: the internationally wrongful nature of the act, the impairment of the vital interests of the international community and the recognition of such an act by the entire international community as an offence.
5. The following must be regarded as offences against the peace and security of mankind: the planning, preparation, launching or waging of a war of aggression; actions aimed at the first use by a State of nuclear weapons; acts of State terrorism; the establishment or maintenance by force of colonial rule; genocide; apartheid; violations of the laws and customs of war, etc.
6. Actions that constitute conspiracy to commit any of the acts referred to above, direct incitement, complicity or an attempt to commit such acts are also criminal.
7. In order to ensure the inevitability of punishment of persons guilty of committing offences against the peace and security of mankind, the following principles must be given international legal recognition in the Code:
  - (a) No statutory limitation shall apply in respect of such offences;
  - (b) The principle aut judicare aut dedere <sup>1/</sup> must be applied in all circumstances in respect of persons guilty of committing offences;

---

<sup>1/</sup> Either judge or release.

(c) The fact that a person guilty of committing an offence acted pursuant to an order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him of responsibility and may be considered only as a ground for mitigating the punishment;

(d) The fact that any person who is an accessory to an international crime acted in accordance with the political policy of an offender State or was carrying out such a policy must not constitute grounds for the granting to him of political asylum by any person or in any place.

8. The Code must also contain provisions to promote co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations in order to prevent offences against the peace and security of mankind and to punish persons guilty of committing such offences.

9. Furthermore, the Code could provide for the inclusion by States in their domestic penal law of a definition of the elements constituting international offences and for the enactment of severe measures to punish persons involved in the commission of such offences. In such a way, national legal guarantees for the prevention and elimination of the very possibility of international crime being committed can also be established through the Code.

10. The draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind must continue to be one of the main items on the agenda of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly.

URUGUAY

[Original: Spanish]

[19 August 1985]

With regard to General Assembly resolution 39/80, entitled "Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind", the opinion of Uruguay is as follows:

(a) With regard to the content ratione personae of the draft, Uruguay agrees that at this stage the Commission should limit its work to considering the criminal liability of individuals in the commission of offences against the peace and security of mankind. This does not mean, however, that the conduct of States, organizations and other subjects of international law capable of committing such acts should be totally excluded from consideration.

(b) With reference to the methodology to be used in preparing the draft, Uruguay supports the proposal made by the Commission, if this proposal facilitates its work by enabling general principles to be elaborated, in the light of the various types of offence listed, for inclusion in the introduction.

(c) With respect to the content ratione materiae of the draft, Uruguay generally supports the Commission's conclusions that the offences contained in the

1954 draft Code should be included prima facie with appropriate modifications of form and substance. With regard to offences provided for since that draft, Uruguay believes that, in determining which types of offences are to be included, it will have to be remembered that the legal property that is being safeguarded is the peace and security of mankind and that consequently, the offences included will have to be those that damage that legal property and are therefore of an especially serious nature.

## VENEZUELA

[Original: Spanish]

[13 August 1985]

With regard to the conclusions contained in paragraph 65 of the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-sixth session, Venezuela has the following comment to make:

(a) Paragraph 65 (a) of the report of the International Law Commission stated that, with regard to the content ratione personae of the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind, the Commission intends that it should be limited at this stage to the criminal liability of individuals, without prejudice to subsequent consideration of the possible application to States of the notion of international criminal responsibility. On this subject point, Venezuela believes that study of the question could begin with the analysis and determination of the criminal liability of individuals, but that the possible application to States of the notion of international criminal responsibility should be considered at an appropriate moment since it is possible that States too may incur this type of responsibility. Moreover, the possible responsibility that might derive from the activities of other persons or bodies, such as transnational or multinational corporations, should likewise be considered in this study.

(b) Subparagraph (b) notes that the Commission intends to begin the first stage of its work by drawing up a provisional list of offences and drafting an introduction summarizing the general principles of international criminal law relating to offences against the peace and security of mankind. In our view, and as the Commission itself recognizes, sufficient elements exist to draw up as complete a list of offences against the peace and security of mankind. We therefore believe that the Commission can prepare an updated and complete list of these offences, which could be preceded by an introduction incorporating the general principles of international criminal law relating to those offences. We also suggest that the Commission should not limit itself merely to drawing up the list of offences but should attempt to define them and to classify them accordingly.

(c) Subparagraph (c) (i) states that, with regard to the content ratione materiae of the draft code, the Commission intends to include the offences covered in the 1954 Code, with appropriate modifications of form and substance. On this point, we believe that the types of offences envisaged in 1954 should be

/...

incorporated into the draft Code, with revisions, modifications or adaptations as required, taking into account the evolution of international criminal law over the last 30 years.

(d) Subparagraph (c) (ii) refers to the general trend in the Commission in favour of including colonialism, apartheid, and possibly serious damage to the human environment and economic aggression in the draft Code, if appropriate legal formulations can be found. We share the view of the majority of Commission members that these elements should be incorporated into the draft Code.

(e) Subparagraph (c) (iii) mentions the need to examine the problem of the use of atomic weapons in greater depth in the light of any views expressed in the General Assembly. In this connection, we consider it important to take into consideration the ongoing debate on this subject in the First Committee.

(f) Subparagraph (c) (iv) notes that the Commission considers that, in so far as mercenarism is used to infringe State sovereignty, undermine the stability of Governments or oppose national liberation movements, it constitutes an offence against the peace and security of mankind, but that it would be desirable to take account of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries. We share the Commission's view on this subject and believe that since the work of that Ad Hoc Committee is fairly well advanced, there would be no problem in waiting until the Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries is concluded, which will presumably envisage and define all actions that, in connection with the use of mercenaries, constitute an offence.

(g) Subparagraph (c) (v) states that the Commission considers that the practices of the taking of hostages, violence against persons enjoying diplomatic privileges and immunities and the hijacking of aircraft have aspects that are related to the problem of international terrorism and should be approached from that angle. We agree with the Commission that these acts must be viewed rather as elements of international terrorism for the purposes of their inclusion in the draft Code and we believe, for the same reason, that when the concept of international terrorism is being studied and classified, it must be developed in the most comprehensive and specific manner possible so that it can cover all the situations that might be included in this idea.

(h) In subparagraph (vi), the Commission recognizes that piracy is an international crime under customary international law but doubts whether, in the present international community, the offence can be such as to constitute a threat to the peace and security of mankind. We believe that the Commission has taken the right approach to this question and we have no comments to make on this subject.

-----