

Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft

Done: The Hague December 16, 1970

Opened For Signature: In accordance with Article 13, paragraph 1, the Convention was opened for signature at The Hague on 16 December 1970 by States participating in the International Conference on Air Law held at The Hague from 1 to 16 December 1970 (The Hague Conference). After 31 December 1970, the Convention was opened to all States for signature in Moscow, London and Washington until entry into force of the Convention.

Entry into Force: October 14, 1971

In accordance with Article 13, paragraph 3, the Convention entered into force thirty days following the date of the deposit of instruments of ratification by ten States signatory to this Convention which participated in The Hague Conference. In accordance with Article 13, paragraph 4, for other States, this Convention shall enter into force on the date of entry into force of this Convention in accordance with Article 13, paragraph 3, or thirty days following the date of deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession, whichever is later.

Note: This status list reflects only signatures of the Convention at The Hague and Washington and deposits at Washington of instruments expressing consent to be bound by the Convention.

Legend: (no mark) = ratification; **a** = accession; **d** = succession; **c** = acceptance; **p** = approval; **h** = adherence

Participant	Signature	Consent to be Bound		EIF date	Note
Afghanistan	December 16, 1970				
Albania		October 21, 1997	a		
Algeria		December 13, 1995	a		1
Andorra		October 6, 2004	a		2
Angola		March 12, 1998	a		
Argentina	December 16, 1970	September 11, 1972			3
Australia	June 15, 1971	November 9, 1972			
Austria	April 28, 1971	February 11, 1974			
Azerbaijan		March 3, 2000	a		
Bahamas		August 13, 1976	d		4
Bangladesh		June 28, 1978	a		
Barbados	December 16, 1970				
Belarus	December 16, 1970				5
Belgium	December 16, 1970	August 24, 1973			
Belize		June 10, 1998	a		

Participant	Signature	Consent to be Bound		EIF date	Note
Benin	May 5, 1971	March 13, 1972			
Bolivia		July 18, 1979	a		
Bosnia and Herzegovina		August 15, 1994	d		6
Botswana		December 28, 1978	a		
Brazil	December 16, 1970	January 14, 1972			7
Brunei		May 13, 1986	a		
Bulgaria	December 16, 1970	May 19, 1971			8
Burkina Faso		October 19, 1987	a		
Burma		May 24, 1996	a		
Burundi		February 11, 1999	a		
Cambodia	December 16, 1970	November 8, 1996			
Cameroon		April 14, 1988	a		
Canada	December 16, 1970	June 20, 1972			
Central African Republic		July 1, 1991	a		
Chad	September 27, 1971	July 12, 1972			
China, People`s Republic of		September 10, 1980	a		9
Colombia	December 16, 1970	July 3, 1973			
Comoros		August 1, 1991	a		
Congo, Democratic Republic of		July 6, 1977	a		
Costa Rica	December 16, 1970	July 9, 1971			
Cote d'Ivoire		January 9, 1973	a		
Croatia		June 12, 1993	d		10
Cyprus		July 5, 1972	a		
Czech Republic		December 13, 1994	d		11
Denmark	December 16, 1970	October 17, 1972			12
Djibouti		November 24, 1992	a		
Dominica		July 26, 2005	a		
Dominican Republic	June 29, 1971	June 22, 1978			
Ecuador	March 19, 1971	June 14, 1971			13
Egypt		February 28, 1975	a		14
El Salvador	December 16, 1970	January 17, 1973			
Equatorial Guinea	June 4, 1971	January 2, 1991			
Estonia		December 22, 1993	a		

Participant	Signature	Consent to be Bound		EIF date	Note
Eswatini		December 27, 1999	a		
Ethiopia	December 16, 1970	March 26, 1979			15
Fiji		July 27, 1972			16
Finland	January 8, 1971	December 15, 1971			
France	December 16, 1970	September 18, 1972			
Gabon	December 16, 1970				
Gambia		November 28, 1978	a		
Georgia		April 20, 1994	a		
Germany	December 16, 1970	October 11, 1974			17
Ghana	December 16, 1970	December 12, 1973			
Greece	December 16, 1970				
Grenada		August 10, 1978	a		
Guatemala	December 16, 1970	May 16, 1979			18
Guinea		May 2, 1984	a		
Guyana		December 21, 1972	a		
Haiti		May 9, 1984	a		
Honduras		April 13, 1987	a		19
Hungary	December 16, 1970	August 13, 1971			20
Iceland		June 29, 1973	a		
India	July 14, 1971	November 12, 1982			21
Indonesia	December 16, 1970	August 27, 1976			22
Iran	December 16, 1970	January 25, 1972			
Israel	December 16, 1970	August 16, 1971			
Italy	December 16, 1970	February 19, 1974			
Jamaica	December 16, 1970	September 16, 1983			
Japan	December 16, 1970	April 19, 1971			
Jordan	June 9, 1971	November 18, 1971			
Kenya		January 11, 1977	a		
Korea, Republic of		January 18, 1973	a		23
Kuwait	July 21, 1971	May 25, 1979			24
Kyrgyzstan		February 25, 2000	a		
Laos	February 16, 1971	April 6, 1989			
Lebanon		June 5, 1974	a		

Participant	Signature	Consent to be Bound		EIF date	Note
Lesotho		July 27, 1978	a		
Liberia		February 1, 1982	a		
Libya		October 4, 1978	a		25
Liechtenstein	August 24, 1971	March 28, 2001			
Lithuania		December 4, 1996	a		26
Luxembourg	December 16, 1970	November 22, 1978			
Madagascar		November 18, 1986	a		
Malawi		December 21, 1972	a		28
Malaysia	December 16, 1970	May 4, 1985			
Mali		September 29, 1971	a		
Marshall Islands		May 31, 1989	a		
Mauritania		November 1, 1978	a		
Mauritius		April 25, 1983	a		
Mexico	December 16, 1970	July 19, 1972			
Moldova		May 21, 1997	a		
Morocco		October 24, 1975	a		29
Mozambique		January 16, 2003	a		30
Namibia		November 4, 2005	a		
Nauru		May 17, 1984	a		
Nepal		January 10, 1979	a		
Netherlands	December 16, 1970	August 27, 1973			31
New Zealand	September 15, 1971	February 12, 1974			
Nicaragua		November 6, 1973	a		
Niger	February 19, 1971	October 15, 1971			
Nigeria		July 3, 1973	a		
Niue		September 30, 2009	a		
North Macedonia		January 7, 1998	d		27
Norway	March 9, 1971	August 23, 1971			
Pakistan	August 12, 1971				
Palau		August 3, 1995	a		
Panama	December 16, 1970	March 10, 1972			
Papua New Guinea		December 15, 1975	d		32
Paraguay	July 30, 1971	February 4, 1972			

Participant	Signature	Consent to be Bound		EIF date	Note
Peru		April 28, 1978	a		33
Philippines	December 16, 1970	March 26, 1973			
Poland	December 16, 1970	March 21, 1972			34
Portugal	December 16, 1970				
Qatar		August 26, 1981	a		35
Romania	October 13, 1971	July 10, 1972			36
Russia	December 16, 1970	September 24, 1971			37
Rwanda	December 16, 1970	November 3, 1987			
Samoa		July 9, 1998	a		
Sao Tome and Principe		May 8, 2006	a		
Saudi Arabia		June 14, 1974	a		38
Senegal	May 10, 1971				
Serbia		October 5, 2001	d		39
Sierra Leone	July 19, 1971				
Singapore	September 8, 1971	April 12, 1978			
Slovak Republic		December 13, 1995	d		40
Slovenia		August 20, 1992	d		41
South Africa	December 16, 1970	May 30, 1972			42
Spain	March 16, 1971	October 30, 1972			
Sri Lanka		June 2, 1978	a		
St. Lucia		November 8, 1983	a		
Sudan		January 18, 1979	a		
Suriname		October 27, 1978	d		43
Sweden	December 16, 1970	July 7, 1971			
Switzerland	December 16, 1970	September 14, 1971			
Syria		July 10, 1980	a		44
Tajikistan		February 29, 1996	a		
Tanzania		August 9, 1983	a		
Thailand	December 16, 1970	May 16, 1978			
Togo		February 9, 1979	a		
Trinidad and Tobago	December 16, 1970				
Tunisia		December 2, 1981	a		45
Turkey	December 16, 1970				

Participant	Signature	Consent to be Bound		EIF date	Note
Turkmenistan		June 4, 1999	a		
Ukraine	December 16, 1970				46
United Kingdom	December 16, 1970	December 22, 1971			47
United States	December 16, 1970	September 14, 1971			
Uruguay		January 12, 1977	a		
Vanuatu		February 22, 1989	a		
Venezuela	December 16, 1970	July 7, 1983			
Vietnam					48
Yemen		September 30, 1986	a		49
Zambia		March 3, 1987	a		
Zimbabwe		February 8, 1989	a		

NOTES

1. Algeria acceded to the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
2. The instrument of accession by Andorra includes a declaration, an unofficial English translation of which reads as follows:
“At the time of accession to this Convention, the Principality of Andorra has no airport or airfield, although it does have a heliport and helistation.”
3. The instrument of ratification by Argentina contains a declaration, an English translation of which reads as follows:
“The application of this Convention to territories the sovereignty of which may be disputed among two or more States, whether Parties to this Convention or not, may not be interpreted as alteration, renunciation, or waiver of the position upheld by each up to the present time.”
4. Date of receipt of notification of succession to the Convention by The Bahamas.
5. The former Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic signed the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
6. Date of receipt of notification of succession to the Convention by Bosnia and Herzegovina; the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia signed the Convention on December 16, 1970 and deposited an instrument of ratification on October 2, 1972.
7. Brazil ratified the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
8. Bulgaria ratified the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12. Bulgaria withdrew its declaration on May 9, 1994.
9. The Convention was signed on December 16, 1970 and an instrument of ratification of the Convention was deposited on July 27, 1972 in the name of the Republic of China. The instrument of accession by the Government of the People’s Republic of China, received September 10, 1980, is accompanied by declarations, an English translation of which reads as follows:
“. . . the Chinese Government will not be bound by Paragraph 1, Article 12 of The Hague Convention . . . “At the same time, the Chinese Government declares illegal and null and void the signature and ratification of the . . . [Convention] by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China.”
By circular note dated November 18, 1980, the Secretary of State set forth the view of the Government of the United States of America, as a party to The Hague Convention, with respect to the membership of China in the Convention, as follows:
“In the view of the Government of the United States, China has been and will continue to be a party to [The Hague Convention]. The Government of the United States recognizes the People’s Republic of China as the sole legal Government of China, with whom the Government of the United States will have a treaty relationship under [The Hague Convention].”
The Ambassador of the People’s Republic of China to the United States of America addressed a note to the Secretary of State, dated June 3, 1997, an English translation of which reads as follows:

“Your Excellency,
“In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the Question of Hong Kong signed on 19 December 1984, the People’s Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong with effect from 1 July 1997. Hong Kong will, with effect from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defense affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China.
“In this connection, I am instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China to make the following notification:

"The Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft done on 16 December 1970 (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention") to which the Government of the People's Republic of China deposited its instrument of accession on 10 September 1980, will apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997. The Government of the People's Republic of China also makes the following declaration:

"The reservation to Paragraph 1 of Article 12 of the said Convention made by the Government of the People's Republic of China when it deposited its instrument of accession on 10 September 1980 will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

"The Government of the People's Republic of China will assume responsibility for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

"It would be appreciated if the contents of this Note could be placed formally on record and brought to the attention of the other Parties to the Convention.

"Please accept, Your excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration."

The Ambassador of the People's Republic of China to the United States of America addressed a note to the Secretary of State, dated November 29, 1999, which reads as follows:

"Dear Madam Secretary,

"I have the pleasure to bring to your attention the underneath:

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macao signed on 13 April 1987, the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macao with effect from 20 December 1999. Macao will, with effect from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defense affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

"In this connection, I am instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to inform you of the following:

"The Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, done at [T]he Hague on [16] December 1970 (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention"), to which the Government of the People's Republic of China deposited the instrument of accession on 10 September 1980, will apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999. The government of the People's Republic of China also wishes to make the following declaration:

"The reservation made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to Paragraph 1 of Article 12 of the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

"The Government of the People's Republic of China will assume responsibility for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

"It would be appreciated if the contents of the Note could be placed formally on record and brought to the attention of the other Parties to the Convention.

"Please accept, dear Madam Secretary, the assurances of my highest consideration."

10. Notification of succession to the Convention by Croatia is effective October 8, 1991, the date on which Croatia severed all constitutional and legal connections with the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia signed the Convention on December 16, 1970 and deposited an instrument of ratification on October 2, 1972.
11. Notification of succession to the Convention by the Czech Republic is effective January 1, 1993; the former Czechoslovakia signed the Convention on December 16, 1970 and deposited an instrument of ratification on April 6, 1972, with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12. Czechoslovakia withdrew its declaration on April 25, 1991.
12. The instrument of ratification of the Convention by Denmark states that until a later decision the Convention will not be applied to the Faroe Islands or to Greenland.
By note of May 7, 1980, the Royal Danish Embassy informed the Department of State of the withdrawal, effective June 1, 1980, of the reservation regarding Greenland made upon deposit of the instrument of ratification by Denmark.
13. Ecuador signed the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.

14. Egypt acceded to the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
15. Ethiopia ratified the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
16. Fiji signed the Convention at London October 5, 1971.
17. The instrument of ratification by Germany was accompanied by a declaration contained in a note of the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany dated October 11, 1974, which reads as follows:
"Excellency:
"In connection with the deposit today of the instrument of ratification of the Federal Republic of Germany to the Convention of 16 December 1970 for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, I have the honor to declare on behalf of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that the said convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany, on the understanding that:
"The rights and responsibilities of the powers responsible for Berlin in the field of civil aviation shall remain unaffected.
"The respective competent town commandant shall be entitled in each case to decide in accordance with Article 8 of the Convention whether his nationals may be extradited.
"The Allied Kommandatura shall be entitled to determine in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention which authorities will be responsible for reporting to the International Civil Aviation Organization information on seizures of aircraft and any actions taken in connection therewith.
"For the purposes of Article 7 of the Convention Law No. 7 of the Allied Kommandatura and the legislation related thereto shall be an integral part of the law in force in Berlin.
"Accept, Excellency, the expression of my highest consideration."
18. Guatemala signed the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
19. Honduras acceded to the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
20. Hungary ratified the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12. Hungary withdrew its declaration on January 10, 1990.
21. India ratified the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
22. Indonesia ratified the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
23. The instrument of accession to the Convention by Korea was accompanied by a note of the Korean Ambassador, dated January 18, 1973, stating as follows:
"The accession by the Government of the Republic of Korea to the present Convention does not in any way mean or imply the recognition of any territory or regime which has not been recognized by the Government of the Republic of Korea as a State or Government."
24. The instrument of ratification of the Convention by Kuwait was accompanied by an "Understanding", the text of which reads as follows:
"It is understood that the Ratification of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft done at The Hague on the 16th of December 1970, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel."
In accepting the instrument of ratification, the Government of the United States of America made the following statement:
"It is the understanding of the Government of the United States of America that Kuwait's full acceptance of the policy of the Convention is in no way prejudiced by the last sentence of the 'Understanding' attached by Kuwait to its instrument of ratification."

25. The instrument of accession to the Convention by Libya contains a statement, an English translation of which reads as follows:
“This accession should in no way be regarded as recognition of or establishment of relations with Israel.”
26. Lithuania deposited an “instrument of ratification” which was deemed to constitute accession by Lithuania to the Convention.
27. Notification of succession to the Convention by the Republic of Macedonia is effective November 17, 1991; the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia signed the Convention on December 16, 1970 and deposited an instrument of ratification on October 2, 1972.
28. Malawi acceded to the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
29. The instrument of accession to the Convention by Morocco contains the following reservation, an English translation of which reads as follows:
“In case of dispute, all recourse must be made to the International Court of Justice on the basis of the unanimous consent of the parties concerned.”
30. Mozambique acceded to the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
31. The instrument of ratification of the Convention by the Netherlands states that the Convention is ratified
“pour le Royaume en Europe, le Surinam et les Antilles Néerlandaises. The instrument of ratification of the Convention by the Netherlands was accompanied by a declaration, an English translation of which reads as follows:

“The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands,
“With reference to the ratification, for the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam, and the Netherlands Antilles, by Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, done at The Hague on December 16, 1970;
“Bearing in mind that in the Netherlands Antilles the necessary measures to implement the provisions of the aforesaid Convention have not yet been adopted;
“Declares that the Convention, insofar as the Kingdom of the Netherlands is concerned, will not be able to enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles until the thirtieth day after the date on which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has notified the depositary Governments that the necessary measures have been adopted in the Netherlands Antilles to implement the provisions of the aforesaid Convention.
Done at The Hague, August 16, 1973.”

A declaration was deposited by the Netherlands on June 11, 1974, an English translation of which reads as follows:

“The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands;
“In view of the Declaration made on the occasion of the deposit on August 27, 1973, of the instrument of ratification by the Kingdom of the Netherlands of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, concluded at The Hague on December 16, 1970, in which Declaration it was stated that the aforesaid Convention could not enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles until the thirtieth day after the date on which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands had notified the depositary Governments that the measures required to implement the provisions of the said Convention had been taken in the Netherlands Antilles;
“Declares that in the interim the measures required to implement the provisions of the aforesaid Convention have been taken in the Netherlands Antilles and consequently the Convention will enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit of this Declaration.
“The Hague, May 10, 1974”

Suriname became an independent state on November 25, 1975.

The Royal Netherlands Embassy in Washington transmitted to the Department of State a diplomatic note,

dated January 9, 1986, which reads as follows:

“The Royal Netherlands Embassy presents its compliments to the Department of State and has the honor to request the Department’s attention for the following with respect to the Department’s capacity of depositary of [the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft].

“Effective January 1, 1986 the island of Aruba – formerly part of the Netherlands Antilles – obtained internal autonomy as a country within the Kingdom of The Netherlands. Consequently the Kingdom of The Netherlands as of January 1, 1986 consists of three countries, to wit: the Netherlands proper, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

“Since the abovementioned event concerns only a change in internal constitutional relations within the Kingdom of The Netherlands, and as the Kingdom as such, under international law, will remain the subject with which treaties are concluded, the aforementioned change will have no consequences in international law with regard to treaties concluded by the Kingdom, the application of which (treaties) were extended to the Netherlands Antilles, including Aruba.

“These treaties, thus, will remain applicable for Aruba in its new status as autonomous country within the Kingdom of The Netherlands effective January 1, 1986.

“Consequently the [Convention] to which the Kingdom of the Netherlands is a Party, and which [has] been extended to the Netherlands Antilles will as of January 1, 1986 apply to all three countries of the Kingdom of The Netherlands.

“The Embassy would appreciate if the other Parties concerned would be notified of the above.

“The Royal Netherlands Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Department of State the assurance of its highest consideration.”

The Royal Netherlands Embassy in Washington transmitted to the Department of State a diplomatic note, dated October 6, 2010, which reads in pertinent part as follows:

“The Kingdom of the Netherlands currently consists of three parts: the Netherlands, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. The Netherlands Antilles consists of the islands of Curaçao, Sint Maarten, Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba.

“With effect from 10 October 2010, the Netherlands Antilles will cease to exist as a part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. From that date onwards, the Kingdom will consist of four parts: the Netherlands, Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten. Curaçao and Sint Maarten will enjoy internal self-government within the Kingdom, as Aruba and, up to 10 October 2010, the Netherlands Antilles do.

“These changes constitute a modification of the internal constitutional relations within the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The Kingdom of the Netherlands will accordingly remain the subject of international law with which agreements are concluded. The modification of the structure of the Kingdom will therefore not affect the validity of the international agreements ratified by the Kingdom for the Netherlands Antilles; these agreements will continue to apply to Curaçao and Sint Maarten.

“The other islands that have until now formed part of the Netherlands Antilles – Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba – will become part of the Netherlands, thus constituting ‘the Caribbean part of the Netherlands’. The agreements that now apply to the Netherlands Antilles will also continue to apply to these islands; however, the Government of the Netherlands will now be responsible for implementing these agreements.”

32. Date of receipt of notification of succession to the Convention by Papua New Guinea. Papua New Guinea succeeded to the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
33. Peru acceded to the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
34. Poland ratified the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12. Poland withdrew its declaration on June 23, 1997.
35. Qatar acceded to the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
36. Romania signed and ratified the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the

Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.

37. The former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed and ratified the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12. By a note dated January 13, 1992, the Russian Federation informed the United States Government that it “continues to perform the rights and fulfil the obligations following from the international agreements signed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.”
38. Saudi Arabia acceded to the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12. The instrument of accession by Saudi Arabia contains a statement, an English translation of which reads as follows: “the approval of the said Convention by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not mean or imply, and shall not be interpreted as, recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention”.
39. Notification of succession to the Convention by Serbia and Montenegro is effective April 27, 1992, the date upon which Serbia and Montenegro, formerly the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, assumed responsibility for its international relations; the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia signed the Convention on December 16, 1970 and deposited an instrument of ratification on October 2, 1972.
40. Notification of succession to the Convention by the Slovak Republic is effective January 1, 1993; the former Czechoslovakia signed the Convention on December 16, 1970 and deposited an instrument of ratification on April 6, 1972, with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12. Czechoslovakia withdrew its declaration on April 25, 1991.
41. Date of receipt of notification of succession to the Convention by Slovenia; the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia signed the Convention on December 16, 1970 and deposited an instrument of ratification on October 2, 1972.
42. South Africa ratified the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
43. Date of receipt of notification of succession to the Convention by Suriname.
44. Syria acceded to the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
45. Tunisia acceded to the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
46. The former Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic signed the Convention with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
47. The instrument of ratification of the Convention by the United Kingdom states that the Convention is ratified “in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, as well as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate.”
The British Ambassador to the United States of America addressed a note, dated June 11, 1997, to the Secretary of State which reads as follows:
“I am instructed by Her Britannic Majesty’s Principal Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs to refer to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft done at The Hague on 16 December 1970 (hereinafter referred to as the “Convention”) which applies to Hong Kong at present.
“I am also instructed to state that, in accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People’s Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong signed on 19 December 1984, the Government of the United Kingdom will restore Hong Kong to the People’s Republic of China with effect from 1 July 1997. The Government of the United Kingdom will continue to have international responsibility for Hong Kong until that date. Therefore, from that date the Government of the United Kingdom will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to Hong Kong.
“I should be grateful if the contents of this Note could be placed formally on record and brought to the attention of the other Parties to the Convention.

“I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.”

48. An instrument of accession to the Convention was deposited at Washington by the former Republic of Vietnam on January 3, 1974. On September 17, 1979, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam ratified the Convention at Moscow with a declaration under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 12.
49. The former Yemen Arab Republic acceded to the Convention at Washington on September 30, 1986. The former People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen acceded to the Convention at Moscow on April 20, 1988. The Yemen Arab Republic and the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen merged on May 22, 1990 to form the Republic of Yemen.