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<tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
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<td></td>
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<td>26 Nov 1976 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>3 Jun 1997 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>6 Nov 2009 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>11 Sep 1995 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>30 Sep 1975 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qatar</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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<td>25 May 1983 a</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td>8 Sep 1997 a</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>14 Mar 1977 a</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>24 Sep 2003 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
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<td></td>
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<td>1 Mar 2004 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>12 Apr 2002 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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### Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto see hereinafter.)

#### ALGERIA

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria states that in each individual case, a dispute may be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute.

#### ANDORRA

In view of article 1, paragraph 1 (a) of this Convention, the Principality of Andorra declares that, in accordance with article 43 of the Constitution of Andorra, and the tradition dating from the Pareatges of 1278, the Heads of State of Andorra are jointly and indivisible the Co-princes. These Co-princes, in their personal and exclusive right, are the Bishop of Urgell and the President of the French Republic.

#### ARGENTINA

In accordance with article 13, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Argentine Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

#### BELARUS

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

#### BRAZIL

With the reservation provided for in paragraph 2 of article 13.

#### BULGARIA

In respect of cases where the alleged offenders belong to a national liberation movement recognized by Burundi or by an international organization of which Burundi is a member, and their actions are part of their struggle for liberation, the Government of the Republic of Burundi reserves the right not to apply to them the provisions of article 2, paragraph 2, and article 6, paragraph 1.
CHINA
[The People's Republic of China] declares that, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 13 of the Convention, the People's Republic of China has reservations on paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention and does not consider itself bound by the provisions of the said paragraph.

COLOMBIA
3. Colombia enters a reservation to those provisions of the Convention, which are contrary to the guiding principles of the Colombian Penal Code and to article 29 of the Political Constitution of Colombia, the third paragraph of which states that:

Everyone shall be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law. Anyone who is charged with an offence shall be entitled to defence and the assistance of counsel of his own choosing, or one appointed by the court, during the investigation and trial; to be tried properly, in public without undue delay; to present evidence and to refute evidence brought against him; to contest the sentence; and not to be tried twice for the same act.

Consequently, the expression "Alleged offender" shall be taken to mean "the accused".

CUBA
In accordance with article 13, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Republic of Cuba declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC

DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA
The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, recognizing that any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention should not, without consent of both parties, be submitted to international arbitration and to the International Court of Justice.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
The Republic of Zaire does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice. In the light of its policy based on respect for the sovereignty of States, the Republic of Zaire is opposed to any form of compulsory arbitration and hopes that such disputes may be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice but not at the request of one of the parties but with the consent of all the interested parties.

ECUADOR
Ecuador wishes to avail itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2, of the Convention, declaring that it does not consider itself bound to refer disputes concerning the application of the Convention to the International Court of Justice.

EL SALVADOR
The State of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention.

ETHIOPIA
"The Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia does not consider itself bound by the aforementioned provision of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention would be submitted to arbitration or to the Court only with the prior consent of all the parties concerned."

FINLAND
"Finland reserves the right to apply the provision of article 8, paragraph 3, in such a way that extradition shall be restricted to offences which, under Finnish Law, are punishable by a penalty more severe than imprisonment for one year and, provided also that other conditions in the Finnish Legislation for extradition are fulfilled."

"Finland also reserves the right to make such other reservations as it may deem appropriate if and when ratifying this Convention."

FRANCE
France understands that only acts which may be defined as acts of terrorism constitute crimes within the meaning of article 2 of the Convention.


GERMANY
"The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right, upon ratifying this Convention, to state its views on the explanations of vote and declarations made by other States upon signing or ratifying or acceding to that Convention and to make reservations regarding certain provisions of the said Convention."

GHANA
"(i) Paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention provides that disputes may be submitted to arbitration, failing which any of the parties to the dispute may refer it to the International Court of Justice by request. Since Ghana is opposed to any form of compulsory arbitration, she wishes to exercise her option under article 13 (2) to make a reservation on article 13 (1). It is noted that such a reservation can be withdrawn later under article 13 (3)."

HOLY SEE
"By acceding to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, the Holy See intends to contribute and to give its moral support to the global prevention, repression and prosecution of such crimes and to the protection of their victims.

In conformity with its own nature, its Mission, and the particular character of Vatican City State, the Holy See upholds the values of brotherhood, justice and peace between persons and peoples, whose protection and strengthening require the primacy of the rule of law and respect for human rights, and it reafirms that instruments of criminal and judicial cooperation constitute effective..."
safeguards in the face of criminal activities that jeopardize human dignity and peace. [...]

Pursuant to articles 8.2 and 8.3 of the Convention, the Holy See declares that it takes the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other Parties to the Convention, subject to the limitations to the extradition of persons provided for by its domestic law.

With regard to articles 8 and 10 of the Convention, the Holy See declares that, in light of its legal doctrine and the sources of its law (Vatican City State Law LXXI, 1 October 2008), nothing in the Convention shall be interpreted as imposing an obligation to extradite or provide mutual legal assistance if there are substantial grounds for believing that the request is made for the purpose of prosecuting or punishing a person on account of that person’s race, religion, nationality, ethnic origin or political opinion; that compliance with the request would cause prejudice to that person’s position for any of these reasons; or that the person would be subject to the death penalty or to torture.

Pursuant to the last sentence of article 2.2(a) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, of 9 December 1999, the Holy See, acting also in the name and on behalf of Vatican City State, declares that, from the moment the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, enters into force for the Holy See, it shall be deemed to be included within the scope of the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism pursuant to its article 2.1(a).

“Pursuant to article 13.2 of the Convention, the Holy See, acting also in the name and on behalf of Vatican City State, declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 13.1 of the Convention. The Holy See, acting also in the name and on behalf of Vatican City State, specifically reserves the right to agree in a particular case, on an ad hoc basis, to any convenient means to settle any dispute arising out of this Convention.”

**HUNGARY**

"The Government of the Republic of India does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 which establishes compulsory arbitration or adjudication by the International Court of Justice concerning disputes between two or more States Parties relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention.”

**INDIA**

(1) The resolution of the United Nations General Assembly with which the above-mentioned Convention is enclosed shall be considered to be an integral part of the above-mentioned Convention.

(2) Sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph (1) of article 1 of the Convention shall cover the representatives of the national liberation movements recognized by the League of Arab States or the Organization of African Unity.

(3) The Republic of Iraq shall not bind itself by paragraph (1) of article 13 of the Convention.

(4) The accession of the Government of the Republic of Iraq to the Convention shall in no way constitute a recognition of Israel or a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith.

**ISRAEL**

"The Government of the State of Israel declares that its accession to the Convention does not constitute acceptance by it as binding of the provisions of any other international instrument, or acceptance by it of any other international instrument as being an instrument related to the Convention.

The Government of Israel reaffirms the contents of its communication of 11 May 1979 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

"The State of Israel does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention.

**JAMAICA**

"Jamaica avails itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2, and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."
MALAWI

"The Government of the Republic of Malawi declares, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 13, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention."
SLOVAKIA

ST. LUCIA

“1. In accordance with Article 13 paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Government of Saint Lucia does not consider itself bound by the arbitration procedures established under Article 13 paragraph 1 of the Convention.

2. That the explicit expressed consent of the Government of Saint Lucia would be necessary for any submission of any dispute to arbitration of the International Court of Justice.”

ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES

“Saint Vincent and the Grenadines avails itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2 of the aforesaid Convention and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.”

SWITZERLAND

The Swiss Federal Council interprets article 4 and article 5, paragraph 1, of the Convention to mean that Switzerland undertakes to fulfill the obligations contained therein in the conditions specified by its domestic legislation.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

1. The Syrian Arab Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, concerning arbitration and the results thereof.

2. Accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention in no way implies recognition of Israel or entry into any relations with Israel concerning any question regulated by this Convention.

THAILAND

"1. In applying the provision of article 8, paragraph 3 of the Convention, extraditable offences shall be restricted to offences which, under Thai law, are punishable with imprisonment of not less than one year and are subject to the procedural provisions and other conditions of the Thai legislation for extradition.

2. The Kingdom of Thailand does not consider itself bound by article 13, paragraph 1 of the Convention."

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

"The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago avails itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2, and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

TUNISIA

No dispute may be brought before the International Court of Justice unless by agreement between all parties to the dispute.

UKRAINE

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider it self bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, in accordance with the provision of article 13 (2) of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents formulates a reservation with respect to the provision established under paragraph 1 of the said article. Consequently, it does not consider itself obligated to refer to arbitration as a means of settlement of disputes, nor does it recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

VIET NAM

"Acceding to this Convention, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam makes its reservation to paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention."

YEMEN

In acceding to this Convention, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen does not consider itself bound by article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, which states that disputes between States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention may, at the request of anyone of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice. It declares that the competence of the International Court of Justice with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, in each case be subject to the express consent of all parties to the dispute.

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen declares that its accession to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or serve as grounds for the establishment of relations of any sort with Israel.

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)
(b) With regard to the reservation expressed by Burundi on 17 December 1980, [the Italian Government considers that] the purpose of the Convention is to ensure the punishment, world-wide, of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny a safe haven to the perpetrators of such crimes. Considering therefore that the reservation expressed by the Government of Burundi is incompatible with the aim and purpose of the Convention, the Italian Government can not consider Burundi’s accession to the Convention as valid as long as it does not withdraw that reservation.

NETHERLANDS

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration relating to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents made by the Government of Malaysia at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that in making the interpretation and application of Article 7 of the Convention subject to the national legislation of Malaysia, the Government of Malaysia introduces a general and indefinite reservation that makes it impossible to clearly identify in which way the Government of Malaysia intends to change the obligations arising from the Convention. Therefore the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany hereby objects to this declaration which is considered to be a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and Malaysia."

ISRAEL

"The Government of the State of Israel does not regard as valid the reservation made by Iraq in respect of paragraph (1) (b) of article 1 of the said Convention."

"The Government of the State of Israel regards the reservation entered by the Government of Burundi as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is unable to consider Burundi as having validly acceded to the Convention until such time as the reservation is withdrawn."

"In the view of the Government of Israel, the purpose of this Convention was to secure the world-wide repression of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny the perpetrators of such crimes a safe haven."

ITALY

(a) The Italian Government does not consider as valid the reservation made by Iraq on 28 February 1978 with regard to article 1, paragraph 1(b), of the said Convention;

(b) With regard to the reservation expressed by Burundi on 17 December 1980, [the Italian Government considers that] the purpose of the Convention is to ensure the punishment, world-wide, of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny a safe haven to the perpetrators of such crimes. Considering therefore that the reservation expressed by the Government of Burundi is incompatible with the aim and purpose of the Convention, the Italian Government can not consider Burundi’s accession to the Convention as valid as long as it does not withdraw that reservation.

NETHERLANDS

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration relating to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents made by the Government of Malaysia at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that in making the interpretation and application of Article 7 of the Convention subject to the national legislation of Malaysia, the Government of Malaysia is formulating a general and indefinite reservation that makes it impossible to identify changes to the obligations arising from the Convention that it is intended to introduce. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers that a reservation formulated in this way is likely to contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

For these reasons, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby objects to this declaration which it considers to be a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Malaysia."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservation made by Iraq in respect of paragraph (1) (b) of article 1 of the said Convention."

"The purpose of this Convention was to secure the world-wide repression of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny the perpetrators of such crimes a safe haven. Accordingly the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland regard the reservation entered by the Government of Burundi as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, and are unable to consider Burundi as having validly acceded to the Convention until such time as the reservation is withdrawn."
**Participant** | **Date of receipt of the notification** | ** Territories**
---|---|---
Guernsey, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Bailiwick of Jersey, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, St. Helena and Dependencies and Turks and Caicos Islands

**Notes:**

1. The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 17 December 1974 and 29 December 1976, respectively. See also note 1 under “Bosnia and Herzegovina”, “Croatia”, “former Yugoslavia”, “The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and “Yugoslavia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

2. The Secretary-General received, on 6 and 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under “China” and note 2 under “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” regarding Hong Kong in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with reservation will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

3. On 11 August 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention will apply to Macao. Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 18 November 1999 and 13 December 1999, communications concerning the status of Macao from Portugal and China (see also note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portugal” regarding Macao in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with reservation will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

4. Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 11 October 1974 and 30 June 1975, respectively, with a reservation. Subsequently, by a notification received on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 13 (1) made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 234. See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

5. In a notification received on 12 March 1980, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon ratification of the Convention, which specified that until further decision, the Convention would not apply to the Faeroe Islands or to Greenland. The notification indicates 1 April 1980 as the effective date of withdrawal.


7. See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

8. On 9 January 2020, the Secretary-General received a communication from the Government of Mauritius regarding the Chagos Archipelago.

   See C.N.44.2020.TREATIES-XVIII.7 of 31 January 2020 for the text of the above-mentioned communication.

9. See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

10. For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

11. The instrument of accession specifies that the Convention will also apply to the Cook Islands and Niue. See also note 1 under “New Zealand” regarding Tokelau in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

12. On 20 October 2015, the Government of Ukraine made a communication. The text can be found here: C.N.604.2015.TREATIES-XVIII.7 of 20 October 2015.

13. The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 1 under “Yemen” regarding Tokelau in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

14. On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 13 (1) of the Convention, made upon signature and renewed upon ratification. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 228.

15. Upon depositing its instrument of accession, the Government of France made the following declaration with regard to declarations made by the following States:

   **Burundi** upon accession:

   France objects to the declaration made by Burundi on 17 December 1980 limiting the application of the provisions of article 2, paragraph 2 and article 6, paragraph 1.

   **Iraq** upon accession:
France contests the interpretation made by Iraq on 28 February
1978 that the resolution of the United Nations General
Assembly with which the above-mentioned Convention is
enclosed should be considered to be an integral part of the
Convention, and objects to Iraq's reservation relating to article 1,
paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention.

On 1 March 2002, the Government of Colombia informed
the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the
following reservations made upon accession:

1. Colombia enters a reservation to those provisions of the
Convention, and particularly to article 8 (1), (2), (3) and (4)
thereof, which are inconsistent with article 35 of the Basic Law
in force which states that: Native-born Colombians may not be
extradited. Aliens will not be extradited for political crimes or
for their opinions. Any Colombian who has committed, abroad,
crimes that are considered as such under national legislation,
shall be tried and sentenced in Colombia.

2. Colombia enters a reservation to article 13 (1) of the
Convention, inasmuch as it is contrary to the provisions of
article 35 of its Political Constitution.

In a notification received on 18 November 1976, the
Government of Ghana informed the Secretary-General that it
had decided to withdraw the reservation contained in its
instrument of accession, concerning article 3 (1)(c) of the
Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations,

In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the
Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it
had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect to article 13
(1) of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the

The Secretary-General received on 11 May 1979 from the
Government of Israel the following communication:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Iraq contains
a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the
view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for
making such political pronouncements, which are, moreover, in
flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of
the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of
Iraq cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding
upon it under general international law or under particular
treaties.

"The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the
substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq
an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Identical communications, in essence, mutatis mutandis have
been received by the Secretary-General from the Government of
Israel on 11 March 1985 in respect of the reservation made by
Jordan; on 21 August 1987 in respect of the declaration by
Democratic Yemen; on 26 July 1988 in respect of the
declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic; and on 17 May
1989 in respect of the declaration made by Kuwait.

The communication of 11 May 1979 referred to in the
second paragraph of the declaration made by Israel upon
accession to the Convention, refers to the communication made
with respect to the reservation made by Iraq upon its accession
to the Convention. See note 14 in this chapter.

On 16 October 1997, the Government of Poland notified the
Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its
reservation with regard to article 13, paragraph 1 of the
Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the
394.

In a communication received on 19 September 2007, the
Government of Romania notified the Secretary-General that it
had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon signature
and confirmed upon ratification to the Convention. The text of
the reservation read as follows:

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares that it does not
consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph
1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or
more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or
application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation
shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or
referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such
disputes may be submitted to arbitration or referred to the
International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties
to the dispute in each individual case.

In a communication received on 1 May 2007, the
Government of the Russian Federation informed the Secretary-
General of its decision to withdraw the following reservation
made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics upon signature
to the Convention and confirmed upon ratification thereof:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider
itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the
Convention, under which any dispute between two or more
States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the
Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to
arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states
that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a
dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration
or to the International Court of Justice.

The Government of the United Kingdom specified that the
application of the Convention had been extended to Anguilla as
from 26 March 1987.

The Secretary-General received, on 25 May 1979 from the
Government of Guatemala, the following communication:

The Government of Guatemala [does] not accept [the
extension by the United Kingdom of the Convention to the
Territory of Belize] in view of the fact the said Territory is a
territory concerning which a dispute exists and to which
[Guatemala] maintains a claim that is the subject, by mutual
agreement, of procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes
between the two Governments concerned.

In this respect, the Government of the United Kingdom of
Great Britain and Northern Ireland in a communication received
by the Secretary-General on 12 November 1979, stated the following:
"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their sovereignty over Belize and do not accept the reservation submitted by the Government of Guatemala."

26 On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands [and dependencies], which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection, the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their right, by notification to the Depositary under the relevant provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, to extend the application of the Convention in question to the Falkland Islands or to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, as the case may be.

For this reason alone, the Government of the United Kingdom are unable to regard the Argentine [communication] under reference as having any legal effect."