Crimes against humanity
Agenda item 80
78th session (resumed)

DRAFT DECLARATION FOR THE USE OF EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON THEMATIC CLUSTER II DRAFT ARTICLES 2, 3 AND 4

Madam@hair, and distinguished delegates,

We would like share our views on Clustwith regard forticle 2Türkiye would like to reiterate its concern that modelling the definition largely after the Rome Statute could formplicate the modalities of notice edifice on consensus as previous pointed out by some Memberthsone Statute is not signed or ratified by morethindrofinal Member Stateshus, Türkiye remains hesitant about the extent to which draft article 2 reflectives to the concerns, it is noted that definitions in international transitions transitions of the concerns of the concern

As a nonparty to the Rome Statutkiye suggests that thereluis in giving further consideration to the definition of crimes against humanity in the draft articles. Some of the used in the definition lacked clarity and could complicate national prosequitiposed nder a IXWXUH FRQYHQWLRQ EDVHG RQ WKH GUDIW DUWLFO SRSXODWLRQ. DQG ‡RUJDQL]DWLRQDO SROLF\ WR FRPF previous statements.

In this context, we also would like the reiterate that our view, the definition in the Rome Soverbroadens the scope of the crimes against humanity. We suggest that, in order to DPELJXLW\ WKH UHTXLUHPHQWV RI ‡ZLGHVSUHDG· Delements, both of which must be met, rather than alternative to one another.

) X U W K H U P R U H 7 U N L \ H Q R W H V W K D W W K H S K U D V H V X U U R X Q G L Q J W K H H O H P H Q W V D Q G H [W H Q W R I µ N Q R Z F R X U W V D Q G W U L E X Q D O V) R U W K L V U H D V R Q 7 U N L \ F R I ¶ P X V W E H F O D U L I L H G W K U R X J K W K H Z L G H V W S R V V L

:LWK UHJDUG WR WKH TXHVWLRQ DV WR µZKHWKHU ‡ZKHWKHU WR GHOHWH WKH FRQQHFWLRQ WR RWKHU DDERXW UHFRQVWUXFWLQJ µSHUVHFXWLRQ¶ DV D VWDQ:H EHOLHYH WKDW WKH GHILQLWLRQV RI WKH XQGHU(VLQFH LQ WKH GUDIW DUWLFOHV DQG FXVWRPDU\ LQ\\ almost kind of an umbrella term.

) LQDOO\ ZLWK UHJDUG WR WKH ‡ZLWKRXW SUHMXGLF that there exists no need to make such a reference given that, as is well established, inter law is not and cannow ont states from accepting differentions under their national jurisdictions. Even in circumstances where a State has entered into a treaty obligation of effect, as a natural consequence of the principle of sovereignty, a broader or narrower defined in domestic law will not result in the invalidity of that definition.

A particular issue that the Turkish Delegation has observed is that there is a serious possthat the omission of paragraph three of the definition provided in the Rome Statute may

Türkiye considers that a future convention may benefit from an explicit recognition of the HVWDEOLVKHG SULQFLSOH WKDW D $VWDWH\PV$ UHVSRC authority.

Further with regard to the DdtafW L F O H D W K H W H U P μ R U R W K H appears rather ambiguous and too broad. Türkiye believes that the phrase should be fuclarified.

As to draft article 4 (b), regarding the scope of the obligation to cooperates width other Starelevant organization there is no guidance on which organizations are referred in this paragraph or how to address situations where such cooperation might not be possible. Thus, we below the zright of the properties of the obligation to cooperates with the paragraph or how to address situations where such cooperation might not be possible. Thus, we below the properties of the proper