

HOUSE OF LORDS
HOUSE OF COMMONS
JOINT COMMITTEE ON DRAFT CONSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL BILL

Memorandum by the Campaign to Make Wars History

War Powers

"War is essentially an evil thing. Its consequences are not confined to the belligerent states alone, but affect the whole world. To initiate a war of aggression therefore, is not only an international crime, it is the supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole."

Nuremburg War Crimes Tribunal 1946

Summary

This report focuses on Britain's antiquated, unlawful, undemocratic war powers arrangements. It identifies the treaties, conventions and laws prohibiting war and the reasons why Britain repeatedly reneges on international agreements outlawing war and requiring disputes to be settled peacefully. It asks why we are taking part in the massacre of innocent Afghan and Iraqi citizens, the worst atrocity in British history, and why our political, civil and military leaders are continuing to commit, and our law enforcement authorities are failing to prevent, the worst crimes known to mankind.

The report ascertains five main causes of these horrific failures, concentrating in particular on the inept decision making systems in use in Parliament and Government. We then answer the joint committee's questions and finish with seven recommendations to modernise Britain's dysfunctional war powers arrangements.

What is wrong with Britain's war powers arrangements?

1. Britain's current arrangements for waging war and using armed force cause us to violate war law. Having given binding undertakings to the world that we would never wage a war of aggression[1], never threaten or attack another country[2], never kill or harm human beings[3], never destroy a national, ethnic, racial or religious group[4], settle international disputes peacefully, respect human rights, uphold and enforce the rule of law and act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood and co-operation[5], our Governments repeatedly violate these laws and commit war crimes.

2. The conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan in which at least 1,000,000 people including 400,000 children have been killed are illegal, morally wrong and constitute genocide, crimes against humanity and crimes against peace under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and the Nuremburg Principles. These massacres now rank as the worst atrocities ever committed by a British Government. That both Houses of Parliament allow the killing to continue and support the criminal actions of Government is horrific and has done immense damage to Britain's international reputation. Britain cannot be trusted to uphold the laws of war.

What causes these failures?

3. Our political, civil and military leaders repeatedly break war law, our law enforcement authorities fail to enforce war law and our citizens fail to uphold war law because of:

a. Leaders' lack of knowledge of the laws of war. No American or British political, civil or military leader knows the laws that govern warfare and the relationships between states, or understands the difference between a war of defence and a war of aggression. As no British MP, Peer, civil servant, monarch, military commander, judge, police officer, editor or taxpayer ever receives a correct briefing on war law, they are unable to uphold or enforce the law when it is about to be or has been breached.

b. False legal advice. For fifty years law officers in both Britain and America have provided false and misleading legal advice on the legality of warfare and armed conflict to politicians, Governments, the armed forces and the public. The legal advice provided by the Attorney General to the Government and Parliament was false, deceptive and less than 5% correct. That it is possible for Britain's law officers to deceive the nation over the legality of war is a disgrace and is the worst legal failure in British history.

c. Failures of war law enforcement. Deep-seated corruption in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the MOD, the Law Officers' Department and law enforcement authorities enables political, civil and military leaders to violate war law and commit war crimes. It should not be possible for Police, CPS, Judges or Law Officers to refuse to investigate war law violations and war crimes committed by Ministers of State, or to refuse to arrest and prosecute Britain's main war criminals.

d. Illegitimate investments in armed force. Successive British Governments have deceived citizens into investing vast sums in training and arming military forces for 'defence', whilst using them to wage wars of 'aggression'. Britain currently spends £40bn pa on preparing to kill and killing foreign nationals and £2bn pa on aid and development. These proportions must be reversed if we are to uphold our international commitments.

e. Outdated, faulty, undemocratic decision making systems. With a Monarch commanding our armed forces, the royal prerogative, an unelected House of Lords, faulty decision making systems, false legal advice, antiquated budgeting and non-existent citizen powers, Britain has no chance of operating in a modern democratic manner suitable to the 21st century.

The laws of war

4. Wars are started by leaders never by the people. The decision to wage war or use armed force is the most important that a leader can take. Modern warfare and weapons automatically cost the lives of thousands of innocent people. The horrific consequences of war caused the world's major nations to sign and ratify the International Treaty for the Renunciation of War [the Kellogg-Briand Pact] in 1928.

ARTICLE I The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it, as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

ARTICLE II The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

Why is Britain unable to keep its promises? The Kellogg-Briand Pact is binding international law and it has never been repealed. UK citizens have a right to expect it to be honoured by the inheritors of the solemn promises - the government. If citizens are required to obey the law then so must the government.

5. The Kellogg-Briand Pact together with the London Charter provided the legal basis for the trial of Germany's leaders at Nuremburg after WWII.

"War between nations was renounced by the signatories of the Kellogg-Briand Treaty. This means that it has become throughout practically the entire world an illegal thing. Hereafter, when nations engage in armed conflict, either one or both of them must be termed violators of this general treaty law.... We denounce them as law breakers."

Henry Stimson, USA Secretary of State 1932

"After the signing of the Pact, any nation resorting to war as an instrument of national policy breaks the Pact. In the opinion of the Tribunal, the solemn renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy necessarily involves the proposition that such war is illegal in international law; and that those who plan and wage such a war with its inevitable and terrible consequences are committing a crime in so doing... War is essentially an evil thing. Its consequences are not confined to the belligerent states alone, but affect the whole world. To initiate a war of aggression therefore, is not only an international crime, it is the supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole...

Nuremburg War Crimes Tribunal 1946

6. The main laws governing war, armed conflict and relationships between states are:

- The Treaty for the Renunciation of War [the Kellogg-Briand Pact]
- The United Nations Charter
- The Judgement of the Nuremburg War Crimes Tribunal
- The Genocide Convention
- The Geneva Conventions
- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- The Nuremburg Principles
- The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court
- The International Criminal Court Act 2001[6]

7. Why do British Governments and Parliaments regularly renege on war law taking us into illegal wars of aggression and committing the world's worst crimes? Why have we fought five illegal wars[7] since 1998, killing and injuring 2,000,000 people including 750,000 children, when we had given a firm and binding promise never to do so?

What causes Britain's poor quality decisions?

8. The problem lies with the outdated inappropriate decision making systems used in Parliament and Government. In comparing modern decision making systems used in industry and commerce with those used in Whitehall and the Palace of Westminster it becomes clear that almost every essential component of a high quality decision is absent from political decisions.

9. The House of Commons debate on the Iraq war exemplifies the poor quality of parliamentary decision making. The resolution was deceptive, complex, contained false statements, lacked reference to the laws of war; lacked guidance on the illegal nature of the use of armed force; lacked guidance on the criminal implications for MPs; lacked reference to peaceful alternatives; lacked consideration of the needs and interests of the Iraqi people; lacked a risks / rewards analysis; lacked consideration of outcomes; lacked discussion of moral and ethical standards and basic human values and took no account of Britain's largest ever protest march.

Is the Government's proposal for a detailed House of Commons resolution appropriate?

10. No. As this is the most important decision that Parliament can take it must be approached carefully and by due process of law. Not only is a resolution totally inappropriate but under Britain's current outdated, undemocratic, incompetent, unfair system it would inevitably result in a poor quality outcome.

Is the Government right to adopt a resolution route rather than a legislative route for War Powers?

11. No. The power to wage war or to use armed force must be governed by Statute. When lives are at stake every citizen whose life is at risk should be involved in the decision. Warfare inevitably causes loss of life and no-one has the right to take another's life. That any Member of Parliament should think that they have the right to overrule the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Human Rights Act, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the UN Charter and common law and take a decision to wage war, disposing of human lives as if they were so many insects, is a disgrace and a travesty of justice. That Parliament is complicit in the massacre of at least 1,000,000 people, including 400,000 children, and continues to condone and support the genocide of hundreds of Afghan and Iraqi citizens is an act of pure evil which ranks alongside the actions of Germany's leaders during WWII.

Does the draft Resolution in the White Paper give Parliament sufficient control over conflict decisions?

12. No.

Should the PM determine the most appropriate timing for seeking parliamentary approval?

13. No. A war of aggression is always illegal. The only occasions when Parliament can approve the use of armed force is when (i) Britain or British territory is attacked or (ii) Britain is asked to assist another nation that is under attack. The timing will be governed by the circumstances, not by the Prime Minister.

Should the PM decide what information should be supplied to Parliament?

14. No, never. It is because the Prime Minister controls and manipulates the information supplied to Parliament that we are now effectively a dictatorship.

In the event that the mechanism contains exceptions to the requirement for parliamentary approval, should the PM alone determine if the relevant emergency or security conditions are met?

15. No. The Prime Minister cannot be trusted.

Should there be a requirement to seek retrospective approval where exceptional circumstances have been deemed to apply?

16. No. If the Prime Minister takes a decision that causes the death of another human being then he and his accomplices must answer to charges of murder, genocide or a crime against humanity in court. Under no circumstances should he or she be able to seek retrospective approval from Parliament. If the PM can claim on the hoof that "exceptional circumstances" apply; it would be a recipe to make unlawful decisions and retrospectively invent plausible justifications.

Should the Prime Minister determine whether the security condition continues to mean that it would not be appropriate to lay a report before Parliament?

17. No. Such a power would be open to abuse. There must be democratic checks and balances at every stage.

Should there be a regular re-approval process?

18. No. Approval and re-approval would be illegal.

Is the role of the House of Lords under the proposals right?

19. No. The House of Lords' role as the judiciary in our tripartite system [Commons = legislature, Monarch + Government = executive] should mean that it retains the power to halt the illegal actions of the House of Commons, the Government and the Monarch. It is because it has repeatedly failed to enforce war law that the nation is in this predicament. The House of Lords should be 100% elected [as required by European law] with the power to overrule the House of Commons, the Government and the Monarch if they breach the law.

Is it appropriate that approval is not required for a conflict decision involving or assisting the armed forces?

20 No.

Have the terms 'conflict decision' and 'UK forces' been adequately defined in the draft resolution?

21. No. No resolution should contain anything that conflicts with international or domestic law. Those who draft any such resolution make themselves ancillaries to war crimes if the resolution contains clauses suggesting other than purely defensive use of the armed forces.

Recommendations

22. To carry out an effective review of 'War Powers' the Committee must brief itself on international and domestic war law. Britain's future war powers legislation must reflect these binding agreements. In briefing itself the committee should obtain independent legal advice and avoid advice from the Attorney General, the FCO, the MOD, the Law Officers' Department, Law Lords and government law officers all of whom have taken part in the worst legal deception in history.

23. The committee must establish the truth of the allegation that the Attorney General and Prime Minister deceived Parliament, HM Armed Forces and the nation over the legality of the wars with Iraq and Afghanistan. This can be done by identifying the laws governing warfare and armed conflict and establishing actions that are prohibited or required. A summary of war law is attached [Appendix 1]

24. Once the truth has been established the committee must initiate immediate action in Parliament to halt the killing, rescind the active service orders and recall the armed forces. No further lives must be lost in war.

25. Once the fighting has stopped, the committee should initiate independent criminal inquiries into the wars with Iraq and Afghanistan ensuring that the political, civil and military leaders responsible for planning, initiating or waging the wars and causing the deaths of Iraqi and Afghan citizens are arrested, indicted and tried; that those responsible for misleading Parliament and HM Armed Forces over the legality of war are arrested, indicted and tried; as are those responsible for preparing misleading intelligence reports and those responsible for aiding and abetting the crimes.

26. When criminal proceedings are underway and the architects of the wars and crimes have been indicted, the committee should initiate a wide ranging independent inquiry into Britain's inability to uphold or enforce war law. Why is it that the systems and structures of government in Britain fail to reflect international law? Why do we maintain traditions, conventions, laws and ways of operating that are often several hundred years out of date and inappropriate in a modern democratic society?

27. Utilise £5m from the Conflict Prevention Fund to set up an independent Peace and Conflict Prevention Commission reporting to Parliament and briefed to identify, eliminate and replace the systemic, structural and cultural factors that cause British Governments and political, civil and military leaders to violate the laws of war, renege on international treaties and commit the most serious crimes known to mankind.

28 Finally the committee should recommend new legislation to Parliament governing the conduct of war and the use of armed force. A new War Powers Act should:

- i. ensure that a comprehensive high quality decision-making process is followed whenever warfare or the use of armed force is postulated;
- ii. reflect the laws of war and the international conventions, treaties and agreements governing the relationships between states;
- iii. penalise the use armed force or the violation of war law by British citizens anywhere in the world;
- iv. require the UK Government to educate every citizen in the laws of war and their duties and responsibilities in relation to the use of armed force;
- v. require military intelligence to monitor the risks of international warfare and report to Parliament and the UN whenever the risks of armed conflict rise to an unacceptable level;
- vi. require military expenditure to be reduced to the current level of the aid and development budget;
- vii. require military forces to be focussed solely on defence capabilities, eliminating all weapons, policies and practices that cause death or injury, replacing them with 'weapons', policies and practices that temporarily disable or disempower attackers.

The Campaign to Make Wars History is the world's first civil obedience campaign. We are an international alliance of peace activists working together to take lawful non-violent direct action to bring an end to war. By persuading politicians to obey the laws of war, police to enforce war law and the public to uphold war law we will end the killing and return our world to the path of peace, justice and the rule of law.

June 2008

Appendix 1

War Law and War Crimes

The armed invasion and occupation of Iraq is illegal in international and domestic law, violates treaties and renders those involved criminally liable for war crimes.

When the Prime Minister and the Attorney General claimed in 2003 that the war with Iraq was legal and authorised by the Security Council they lied. The use by Britain's armed forces of cruise missiles, rockets, cluster bombs and depleted uranium artillery shells to attack villages, towns and cities in Iraq killing Iraqi citizens violated the International Treaty for the Renunciation of War, the UN Charter and the Rome Statute and constitutes a crime against peace under Article VI of the Nuremburg Principles as well as genocide and a crime against humanity under the International Criminal Court Act 2001.

All war is illegal.

War was outlawed in 1928 by the International Treaty for the Renunciation of War [the Kellogg-Briand Pact]. Sixty three nations including Britain, America, France, Germany and Japan ratified the Pact condemning recourse to war and agreeing to settle disputes peacefully. This treaty is still in force.

ARTICLE I The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it, as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

ARTICLE II The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

The Kellogg-Briand Pact formed the legal basis for the Nuremburg War Crimes Trials. The attack on Iraq renders Britain's political, civil and military leaders liable for the same crime of waging aggressive war for which Germany's leaders were convicted and hanged in 1946. The judgement concluded:

"After the signing of the Pact, any nation resorting to war as an instrument of national policy breaks the Pact. In the opinion of the Tribunal, the solemn renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy necessarily involves the proposition that such war is illegal in international law; and that those who plan and wage such a war with its inevitable and terrible consequences are committing a crime in so doing."

"The charges in the indictment that the defendants planned and waged aggressive wars are charges of the utmost gravity. War is essentially an evil thing. Its consequences are not confined to the belligerent states alone, but affect the whole world. To initiate a war of aggression therefore, is not

only an international crime, it is the supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole."

The Nuremberg Principles

These seven international war laws derived from the Nuremberg and Tokyo War Crimes Tribunals were adopted as universal statute war law by the United Nations General Assembly in 1950.

I. Any person who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible therefor and liable to punishment.

II. The fact that internal law does not impose a penalty for an act which constitutes a crime under international law does not relieve the person who committed the act from responsibility.

III. The fact that a person who committed an act which constitutes a crime under international law acted as Head of State or responsible Government official does not relieve him from responsibility.

IV. The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his Government or a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him.

V. Any person charged with a crime under international law has the right to a fair trial on the facts and law.

VI. The crimes hereinafter set out are punishable as crimes under international law:

(a) Crimes against peace: (i) Planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances; (ii) Participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the acts mentioned under (i).

(b) War crimes: Violations of the laws or customs of war which include, but are not limited to, murder, ill-treatment or deportation to slave-labor or for any other purpose of civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill treatment of prisoners of war, of persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns, or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity.

(c) Crimes against humanity: Murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhuman acts done against any civilian population, or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds, when such acts are done or such persecutions are carried on in execution of or in connection with any crime against peace or any war crime.

VII. Complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity as set forth in Principle VI is a crime under international law.

Armed attacks on another State are illegal

When Britain signed and ratified the UN Charter we made a binding agreement with every Member State never to threaten or attack them and to settle all disputes peacefully.

2.3 All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security and justice are not endangered.

2.4 All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

Pre-emptive attacks are illegal. The only legitimate use of armed force is self defence. If an attack occurs a nation may legitimately use proportionate force to defend itself, but it may do so only until the UN Security Council implements measures to resolve the conflict.

The UN Security Council cannot authorise the use of armed force.

The claim that the invasion and occupation of Iraq was authorised by Security Council resolutions 678, 687 and 1441 was a lie. The Security Council is a peacekeeping body and may not use armed force.

41. The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon its members to apply such measures...

Wilful killing is a crime

At least 80,000 Iraqis including 30,000 children have been violently killed since the war with Iraq began. Wilful killing is a crime and is never condoned or 'right' in law. The Human Rights Act 1998 specifies:

"Everyone's right to life shall be protected by law. No-one shall be deprived of his life intentionally save in the execution of a sentence of a court following his conviction of a crime for which this penalty is provided in law."

Deliberately killing a person because of their nationality is a crime under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. It is never legal for a serviceman to wilfully kill an enemy. Just as it is a crime to explode a bomb in a pub or to fly a plane into the World Trade Centre so it is a crime to deliberately cause the death of another human being. When the first Iraqi citizen died as a result of the actions of Coalition forces those responsible for giving, transmitting, executing or condoning the orders to wage war committed a crime and became criminally liable for every violent death.

Killing Iraqi citizens constitutes genocide.

It is an offence against the law of England and Wales for a person to commit genocide, a crime against humanity or a war crime, or to engage in conduct ancillary to such an act. This applies to acts committed in England or Wales or outside the United Kingdom by a UK national, resident or person subject to UK service jurisdiction[8].

For the purpose of this Statute "genocide" means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such (a) killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

When Coalition armed forces attacked Iraq causing the deaths of thousands of Iraqis every resident of Britain involved in aiding, abetting or executing the decision to wage war became criminally liable for the crimes of 'genocide' or 'conduct ancillary to genocide' and subject to the sanctions of domestic and international law. If a person did anything to aid, abet or assist the commission of the crime, even such things as paying tax, speaking in favour of executing Saddam Hussein or congratulating returning troops for a job well done they committed a crime of conduct ancillary to genocide. You may argue that you did not intend to destroy a national group, but as the legal meaning of intent is defined in the legislation you will find it hard to argue that you were not aware that anyone would be killed.

A person has intent in relation to 'conduct' where he means to engage in the conduct, and in relation to a consequence, where he means to cause the consequence or is aware that it will occur in the ordinary course of events.

Every resident of Britain who condoned, supported or took part in the invasion or occupation of Iraq is bound by the Rome Statute and criminally liable for genocide and conduct ancillary to genocide.

This Statute shall apply equally to all persons without any distinction based on official capacity. In particular, official capacity as Head of State or Government, a member of a Government or Parliament, an elected representative or a government official shall in no case exempt a person from criminal responsibility under this Statute, nor shall it in and of itself, constitute a ground for reduction of sentence. Immunities or special procedural rules which may attach to the official capacity of a person, whether under national or international law, shall not bar the Court from exercising its jurisdiction over such a person.

Everyone has a duty to disobey illegal orders

24. If a person who is bound to obey a duly constituted superior receives from the superior an order to do some act or make some omission which is manifestly illegal, he is under a legal duty to refuse to carry out the order and if he does carry it out he will be criminally responsible for what he does in doing so."

This article from Chapter VI of the Manual of Military Law applies to every British citizen and taxpayer as well as to servicemen and women. It was derived from the Nuremburg War Crimes Trials when Germany's leaders claimed that they were not responsible for the crimes of the German Government as they were following Hitler's superior orders. The judgement rejected their claim.

"It was submitted [by the defendants] that international law is concerned with the action of sovereign states, and provides no punishment for individuals; and further, that where the act in question is an act of state, those who carry it out are not personally responsible, but are protected by the doctrine of the sovereignty of the State. In the opinion of the Tribunal, both these submissions must be rejected. That international law imposes duties and liabilities upon individuals as well as upon States has long been recognised... The very essence of the Charter is that individuals have international duties which transcend the national obligations of obedience imposed by the individual State. He who violates the laws of war cannot obtain immunity while acting in pursuance of the authority of the State, if the State in authorising action moves outside its competence under international law...

Leaders are responsible for the war crimes of their subordinates.

The International Criminal Court Act makes it clear that no matter who launches the rockets, fires the cruise missiles, drops cluster bombs or deploys depleted uranium shells, responsibility for the resulting deaths, injuries and destruction lies with those who ordered the attack to take place.

65. A military commander, or a person effectively acting as a military commander, is responsible for offences committed by forces under his effective command and control or his effective authority and control... A person responsible under this section for an offence is regarded as aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring the commission of the offence.

78. This Act binds the Crown and applies to persons in the public service of the Crown.

Although it is impossible to arrest and try everyone in Britain responsible for war crimes many of Britain's political, civil and military leaders may eventually be arrested, tried and punished as war criminals.

We all have a duty to prevent war

All British residents must abide by their obligations and duties in law and confine their activities to the legitimate path outlined by the UN Charter and the laws of war. To do this residents must

disassociate themselves from any action that can be construed as aiding, abetting or assisting the British Government's use of armed force. Members of the Armed Forces and Civil Service must refuse superior orders contributing to the wars with Iraq and Afghanistan. MPs and Peers must force the Government to end the use of armed force or resign from their seats in Parliament. Taxpayers [Individuals and employers] must withhold taxes from the Inland Revenue until the crimes have ceased and others should report war crimes to the police. The wars with Iraq and Afghanistan in which thousands of innocent men, women and children have been killed are the worst atrocities ever committed by a British Government and they must be stopped. They continue today because too many of us condone or support the Government's illegal actions and fail to take active practical steps to end the killing.

May 2008

[1] The General Treaty for the Renunciation of War 1928 [Kellogg-Briand Pact]

[2] The United Nations Charter 1945

[3] The Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948

[4] The Genocide Convention 1948, The International Criminal Court Act 2001

[5] The United Nations Charter 1945

[6] Together with the International Criminal Court [Scotland] Act 2001 these are the domestic criminal laws prohibiting acts of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes.

[7] The no-fly zone bombing of Iraq, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan, Iraq.

[8] This is a summary; for the full definition of the offences refer to the International Criminal Court Act 2001 [Sections 50 - 80]