



**Special Session of the Assembly of States Parties  
on the Review of the Amendments on the Crime of Aggression**  
*Lessons Learned, 8 July 2025*

**Statement by Germany**

*Tania von Uslar-Gleichen, Director General for Legal Affairs,  
Federal Foreign Office, Berlin*

Madam President,

It will come as no surprise that I fully endorse the joint statement delivered yesterday on behalf of 34 states parties including Germany who are members of the Group of Friends on the review of the ICC's jurisdiction over the crime of aggression

Let me take the opportunity of this review to make Germany's national case for the proposed amendment.

In diplomatic speeches, references to history and historical moments are all too common. This should not blind us however, to register historical changes that are clearly in evidence. And to act decisively upon them!

The international legal order and European security are at a crossroads. An order that by and large ensured security and prosperity on our continent for 80 years is facing the greatest challenge since its inception. While there has been war and conflict in the course of those decades, something fundamental is different today. A member of the P5 and a state with nuclear weapons has engaged in an outright war of aggression in Europe in clear and utter defiance of the UN Charter.

80 years ago, after a war started by Germany, the idea of individual criminal responsibility, particularly for planning and conducting a war of aggression, was brought to fruition in the Nuremberg Trials, spurred in particular, by the United States, Great Britain and France.

One core motivation for the Nuremberg Trials and for the Nuremberg Principles to which they gave rise, was to deter aggression.

As a consequence of our history, Germany has been a supporter of the Rome Statute from the start. Germany has argued for the meaningful inclusion of the crime of aggression in Rome, in Kampala and in New York. But what has given new impetus to this long-standing policy was the realization in 2022, that the Kampala regime does neither deter aggression, nor ensure that aggressors against states parties can be tried in The Hague.

Ensuring the ICC has jurisdiction over an aggressor if a state party to the Rome Statute is attacked, irrespective of the aggressor's nationality, should be a common sense proposition. And yet we have been debating the crime of aggression in the ICC context for a quarter century.

With the international legal order under threat and geopolitical realities changing fast, we do not have the time to postpone harmonization once more. We do not have the time to postpone justice. We do not have the time to postpone deterrence.

Thank you.