

normative text dealing with the matter, there is one
these questions. We are therefore of the view that it is not in
coming up with solutions. It is, of course, a matter of
is the aim of the

With this aim in mind, we see the difference with the distinction between
types of immunity indicate different spheres in terms of time and acts
covered, with different consequences. With regard to immunities *personae*
personae, we concur with those commentators who support the idea that
this type of immunity should be accorded, at a maximum, to Heads of
State, Head of Government, Ministers, and Members of Parliament.

Furthermore, we see the point of finding
the contents of it
far more difficult to identify. It is, of course, a matter of
i.e. state officials, there is no doubt in our mind that the sphere of such
persons who are accorded immunities *ratione materiae*
limited to those who exercise governmental authority or find themselves
in the highest echelons of public service.

On a closely connected issue, the Special Representative is right in
identifying a point of convergence between the two spheres of
point of friction between state responsibility and immunities of state
officials. There is therefore room for a convergence of the two
regime on that convergence point, so as to avoid duplication and
confusion with undesirable consequences.

A topic which is being hotly debated, and certainly with
is that of
they may be described, such as
are breaches of *jus cogens* or *ius cogens* obligations." However, their
description as crimes under universal jurisdiction is not done for a
number of reasons, one of them being that universal jurisdiction may also
be applicable to crimes not of the same nature, such as piracy.

Setting aside the principle of immunity even in the face of grave crimes
is not a novelty; of course, it was done by the
Tribunals, under the London Charter, the International Criminal Tribunal for
Control Council Law No. 10. More recently, in the early 1970s,

