

## **Congressional Statements in Favor of the International Criminal Court**

**Senator Christopher Dodd D-CT**  
**May 13, 2002**

---

“It is outrageous that the United States has now put itself in a position of joining only a handful of rogue nations that are frightened to death of the International Criminal Court as we enter the 21st century. We should be joining these countries and supporting them in their commitment to making the Court work and strengthening international respect for the rule of law. That is what we stand for as Americans. That is what we are trying to export around the world. In addition, we try to export the notion of justice, of fair justice, such as the symbols we see outside this building a block away: The Supreme Court, Justice blindfolded with the scales equally divided.”

**Senator Patrick Leahy D-VT**  
**May 5, 2003**

---

“The whole world wants the United States to be involved with the development of this institution. Yet, instead of seizing this opportunity to shape the Court in our interests, we are one of the only democracies sitting on the sidelines—joined by some of the world's worst human rights offenders. It is an embarrassment, and contrary to the arguments of those who oppose the Court, it is self-defeating.”

**Representative James Leach R-IA**  
**September 19, 2002**

---

“America's well-deserved reputation as a champion for human rights and extension of the rule of law has been called into question. Our efforts to play hardball in the UN Security Council by threatening to withhold support for UN peacekeeping missions unless the U.S. is granted immunity from the ICC alienated friends and allies abroad. The withholding of military assistance to members of the ICC may be seen as an attempt to undermine the court and influence the decisions of other countries to join the ICC. By demanding special treatment in the form of immunity from the ICC, the US may be seen as bolstering the perception of its preference for a unilateral approach to world affairs and a determination to operate in the world exclusively on our own terms. As a result, U.S. efforts to build coalitions in support for the war against terrorism as well as the enforcement of UN resolutions against Iraq may have been impaired.”

**Representative William Delahunt D-MA**  
**August 1, 2001**

---

“At a time when the United States is increasingly perceived as “going it alone,” this is not the moment to abdicate our responsibilities by abandoning our historic commitment to the rule of law.”

# FACT SHEET

## **Representative Patrick Kennedy D-RI** **April 10, 2001**

---

“...since coming to Congress I have been highly supportive of an I.C.C., and I strongly believe in its principal, that human rights abusers who commit crimes against humanity or genocide should be brought to justice. Several years ago, I visited the Hague, and was deeply moved by the intense law enforcement and criminal justice efforts there to bring abusers to justice. A permanent international criminal court which can bring future perpetrators of war crimes to full and complete justice is in our national interests.

## **Representative Tom Lantos D-CA** **April 11, 2002**

---

“...I believe that it is imperative that we now all work together to ensure that the Court is a responsible international actor that advances the cause of human rights and international accountability, and fulfills its promise as a worthy legacy of the Nuremberg Tribunal.”

## **Representative Tammy Baldwin D-WI** **March 6, 2003**

---

“Following the devastation of World War II, the United States showed tremendous leadership in the world as we created international institutions and a framework of international law to prevent war and to sustain and maintain peace. We were the leaders in promoting a world where conflicts could be resolved peacefully and cooperatively. While never perfect, this system of international institutions has been remarkably effective. I and many others around the world are shocked and dismayed by the unilateral, confrontational approach that this administration has taken in the world arena. We must recognize the consequences in the world community of our rejection of Kyoto, of the International Criminal Court, of the treaty to ban land mines, and our own withdrawal from the ABM treaty. We must be mindful about how our criticisms of the U.N. and NATO are heard throughout the world community.”

## **Delegate Donna Christensen D-Virgin Islands** **July 8, 2003**

---

“While there may be differing opinions as to whether the United States should be given a waiver from liability under this court (ICC), it is unconscionable in my view for us to strong arm the Caribbean countries into supporting the waiver by threatening to cut off financial aid which has been previously committed and on which they are depending. With friends like us, the CARICOM nations do not need enemies.”