

# AMICC

American Non-Governmental Organizations Coalition for the International Criminal Court

## Secretariat

John Washburn  
*Convenor*

Anne Heindel  
*Deputy Convenor*

## Members

*ABA Section of Int'l Law & Practice*  
*American Humanist Ass'n*  
*American Jewish Comm/ Jacob Blaustein Inst.*  
*Amnesty Int'l USA*  
*Baha'is of the US*  
*Campaign for UN Reform*  
*Church World Service*  
*Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*  
*Fellowship of Reconciliation*  
*Feminist Majority Found.*  
*Human Rights Watch*  
*Independent Student Coalition for the ICC*  
*Int'l Comm. on Offensive Microwave Weapons*  
*Int'l Human Rights Law Institute, DePaul Univ.*  
*Int'l Federation of Women Lawyers*  
*Int'l NGO Coalition for an ICC (CICC)*  
*Lawyers Comm. for Human Rights*  
*Lawyers Comm. on Nuclear Policy*  
*Maryknoll Fathers, Brothers, Sisters and Lay Missioner's National Ass'n of Criminal Defense Lawyers*  
*National Service Conf. of the Am. Ethical Union*  
*Network of Solidarity with the People of Guatemala*  
*Philadelphia Bar Ass'n*  
*Presbyterian Church, USA*  
*Unitarian-Universalist Ass'n*  
*United Methodist Church*  
*United Nations Ass'n USA*  
*Veterans for Peace, Inc.*  
*Women's Int'l League for Peace and Freedom*  
*World Federalist Ass'n*

## Observers

*US Fund for UNICEF*  
*Women's Caucus for Gender Justice*  
*Women's Bar Ass'n*

## What You Should Know About US Efforts to Renew Security Council Resolution 1422

- Security Council Resolution 1422, which exempts UN peacekeepers from the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court, expires on July 1, 2003. The United States is expected to attempt to renew it for another year.
- Many UN member states are pressing to hold an open Security Council session expressing their opposition to the resolution and support for the Court, as they did last year.
- If 1422 is renewed, it would not be because countries have dropped their objections to it. With tensions still high following disagreement in the Security Council over Iraq, both sides may want to avoid contention by proceeding as quickly and quietly as possible.
- 1422 is part of the growing friction between the US and the EU over the ICC. US opposition to the Court and efforts to undermine it are being implemented in the American Servicemember's Protection Act (ASPA), Resolution 1422, and strong-arm tactics to pressure states to conclude bilateral immunity agreements (BIAs) with the US
- EU states strongly believe that the ICC is necessary and important to the promotion of peace, security and the rule of law, and to act against atrocities of the kind they well remember. They have made it a centerpiece of their foreign policies and a focus of EU unity. The EU is asking candidate countries to conform to EU policy supporting the Court and rejecting US BIA agreements. The EU says these violate the terms of the ICC's Rome Statute.
- No states argue that the United States does not have a right to protect its personnel from politically motivated charges. However, the hard-pressure tactics the US has been using have generated a high level of resentment in EU and other countries. These US allies argue that attacks on the Court are unnecessary and are not compatible with US efforts to achieve worldwide cooperation in the campaign against terrorism and to secure support for its Iraq policies.
- US concerns do not persuade other states because while the UN has nearly 37,000 personnel currently working under UN missions, only 558 of these are US citizens, and only 2 of them are US military personnel. The US had only 46 unarmed personnel taking part in the UNMIBH mission threatened last year by the US that led to the adoption of 1422. At the time it was suggested that if the US was truly concerned about its peacekeepers and wasn't attempting to undermine the Court, the US should remove them from Bosnia instead of jeopardizing the entire mission. The US refused to do so.