

# The Creation of States in International Law



# The Creation of States in International Law

SECOND EDITION

JAMES CRAWFORD

*SC, FBA, BA, LLB (Adel), DPhil (Oxon), LL.D (Cantab)*  
*Whewell Professor of International Law, University of Cambridge*  
*Former Member of the International Law Commission*

CLARENDON PRESS • OXFORD

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi  
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi  
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece  
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore  
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press  
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States  
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© James Crawford 2006

The moral rights of the author have been asserted  
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

Crown copyright material is reproduced under Class Licence  
Number C01P0000148 with the permission of OPSI  
and the Queen's Printer for Scotland

First published 2006

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,  
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate  
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction  
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,  
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover  
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data  
Data available

Typeset by Newgen Imaging Systems (P) Ltd., Chennai, India  
Printed in Great Britain  
on acid-free paper by  
Biddles Ltd., King's Lynn

ISBN 0-19-826002-4 978-0-19-826002-8

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

## *Preface to the Second Edition*

The first edition of this book was based on a thesis, supervised by Ian Brownlie, which was submitted in 1976 for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Oxford. At around 180,000 words the thesis was almost too long to be examined; it was also too long to be published in full. An abbreviated version, updated as far as possible to 31 December 1977, was published by Oxford University Press in 1979. It was awarded the American Society of International Law's Certificate of Merit in 1981.

Since the first edition much has happened in international relations and international law, not least in relation to the subject matter of this book. If its argument—that the creation of States is a matter in principle governed by international law and not left to the discretion of individual States—is now widely accepted, the illustrations and the specific instances that could be used to substantiate and illustrate that argument have multiplied. Some outstanding disputes then pending (South-West Africa (Namibia); Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe); the 'divided States', especially Germany; the micro-States; East Timor; Hong Kong, the Baltic States) have been more or less resolved. With a few exceptions (Palestine and Western Sahara the most significant) decolonization has been largely achieved. But new situations have arisen, especially those resulting from the dissolution of States in Central and Eastern Europe. The case law is still not rich but there have been major additions to it. Although the first edition remained the only comprehensive treatment of statehood in international law in the English language and although there were frequent requests for a reprint, this did not seem appropriate when so much had changed and when so much new material was available. I also came to regret some of the suppressions from the original thesis.<sup>1</sup> Given complete latitude by the Press in terms of the length of a second edition I have taken the opportunity of restoring some of the material and of updating and revising all of it.

At one level, this was easier to do because I still maintain the basic argument. I do not see how international law can coherently leave these issues to be decided as a matter of discretion by individual States, as the rhetoric of recognition implies. I believe that international law is, at least to this minimal extent, a

<sup>1</sup> For example a whole section on Palestine was omitted, producing puzzlement among reviewers who reasonably expected to find it among the cases studied. See now Crawford, 'Israel (1948–49) and Palestine (1998–99): Two Studies in the Creation of States' in Goodwin-Gill and Talmon (eds), *Reality of International Law*, 95–124, and Chapter 9 below.

coherent system. Moreover, the values that international law in this context represents—self-determination, non-annexation of territory by force, fundamental human rights—cannot be protected if the only basis for statehood is ‘effectiveness’, if power grows, irrespective, out of the barrel of some or many guns. For international law to concede that its most fundamental concept is purely a question of fact would amount to a form of unilateral disarmament, given its now-parallel profession that these basic values are peremptory.

At another level it has been a major exercise, because so much has happened and so much more has been written. The result of the revision is a much longer book than the first edition, even if one still faithful to its main themes and arguments. I also hope this edition corrects some of the faults of the first edition. A fellow Australian, Hedley Bull (who I regret never meeting) commented in his *Times Literary Supplement* review of the first edition that it was infuriatingly indecisive. I agree, and I have tried to come off some of the fences on which the young scholar rather awkwardly sat. But some might now complain that even longer discussions of past problems are unnecessary in an era of universal United Nations membership, where formal equality is the order of the day and all the forms of dependence are now expressed in different, mostly extra-legal ways. Why go at length, it may be asked, into the status of special entities such as Transkei or Berlin or Danzig or Tangier or the British Dominions whose like we will never see again? Here I disagree. There is a wealth of historical experience which is, in the first place, interesting in itself. The periods of colonization and decolonization, of Great Power world-making and remaking, of the dissolution of Empires and Cold War-waging were expressed in a variety of specific forms, and the conflicts over them cannot be understood if their actual expression is ignored. The past was experienced—and experienced as present—not in swathes but in particulars, and a careful account of the particulars still carries useful lessons even if we believe our circumstances to be new ones. And anyway we are more likely to fall into errors of the past if we are ignorant of it. When the government of the United States sought to detain aliens without trial on the ‘perpetual leasehold’ of Guantanamo Bay, it was helpful to be reminded of the English Court of Appeal’s decision in 1960 that for habeas corpus what matters is present territorial administration, not the location of residual sovereignty.<sup>2</sup> Thus the old law of protectorates re-emerged in the brave new world of the ‘war against terror’.

<sup>2</sup> ‘Later cases confirmed that the reach of the writ depended not on formal notions of territorial sovereignty, but rather on the practical question of “the extent and nature of the jurisdiction or dominion exercised in fact by the Crown”.’ *Rasul v Bush* 124 S Ct 2686, 2696–7 (Stevens J) (2004), quoting *Ex parte Mwenya* [1960] 1 QB 241, 303; 28 ILR 48, 79–1 (CA) (Lord Evershed MR); and see Chapter 7.

So while I repent indecisions and equivocations, I defend the history. But I recommend starting with the index for those seeking their way to, or around, particular questions. The basic argument of the thesis is contained, as it was from the beginning, in the first three chapters.

So far as possible the work is current as at 30 June 2005.

James Crawford  
Lauterpacht Centre for International Law  
University of Cambridge  
1 August 2005

## *Acknowledgements*

I am immensely grateful to those who assisted in the task of preparing this edition. In particular I owe a special debt of gratitude to my former doctoral student, Dr Tom Grant, who has combined constant support, extraordinary knowledge of the field and meticulous attention to detail. Without his dedication and persistence this edition could not have been completed.

In addition, much help was given by the following students, former students and colleagues: Catherine Bidart, Simon Connal, Angelos Dimopoulos, Catherine Dobson, Shauna Gillan, Edward Guntrip, Jocelynn Liu, Jana McLean, Vipin Narang, Samuel Ollunga, Kate Parlett, Professor Ryszard Piotrowicz; Assistant Professor Michael Reynolds; Christine Ruest, Mark Searl, Elizabeth Stark, Dr Christian Tams, Sue Anne Teo, Dr Ralph Wilde, Marcus Wischik, Sir Michael Wood and Anastasios Xeniadis. Thanks also to William Noblett, Head of Official Publications, University Library, Cambridge and David Wills and his staff at the Squire Law Library for repeated assistance.



## *From the Preface to the First Edition*

Since the development of the modern international system, statehood has been regarded as the paramount type of international personality; indeed, in doctrine if not in practice, States were for a time regarded as the only international persons. This is no longer so; but the political paramountcy of States over other international actors, with whatever qualifications, continues, and statehood remains the central type of legal personality. Problems of definition, and of application of the definition, of statehood thus occupy an important place in the structure of international law. Nonetheless, the topic of statehood has been rather neglected by writers. There is an abundance of practice, a surprising volume of case law, and a large number of studies of particular instances or problems of territorial status. The general treatises all contain the mandatory section on statehood and legal personality, and some of these treatments are of a high order. But, apart from Marek's study on identity and continuity of States (published in 1954 and reissued in 1968), and various accounts of recognition of States in books on recognition generally, there is, to the writer's knowledge, no monograph dealing with the topic of statehood as such, in the light of the substantial modern practice in that field. This observation is not, of course, original: the writer's interest in the topic was engaged by observations in two leading works to this effect.<sup>3</sup> This study attempts to deal with the representative modern doctrine and practice in relation to the public international law of statehood and territorial status; and thus, however inadequately, to contribute to filling the void mentioned by Professors Jennings and Brownlie.

Perhaps the most controversial issue in this area is the relationship between statehood and recognition. The view that recognition is constitutive of State personality derives historically from the positive theory of international obligation. However, this view does not correspond with State practice; nor is it adopted by most modern writers. On the other hand, in this as in other areas, relevant State practice—including recognition practice, especially where recognition is granted or withheld on grounds of the status of the entity in question—is of considerable importance. Against this background, this study examines the criteria for statehood in international law, and the various ways in which new States have been created in the period since 1815.

<sup>3</sup> Jennings, *Acquisition of Territory*, 11–12; Brownlie, *Principles* (2nd edn), 74.

Traditionally, the criteria for statehood have been regarded as resting solely on considerations of effectiveness. Entities with a reasonably defined territory, a permanent population, a more or less stable government and a substantial degree of independence of other States have been treated as States. Other factors, such as permanence, willingness to obey international law and recognition, have usually been regarded as of rather peripheral importance. To some extent this represents the modern position. However, several qualifications are necessary.

In the first place, this standard view is too simple. Much depends on the claims made by the entities in question, and on the context in which such claims are made. In some circumstances, criteria such as independence or stable government may be treated as flexible or even quite nominal; in other cases they will be strictly applied. Apart, however, from the necessary elaboration of the criteria for statehood based on effectiveness, a serious question arises whether new criteria have not become established, conditioning claims based on effectiveness by reference to fundamental considerations of legality. Practice in the field of self-determination territories is the more developed, but the same problem arises in relation to entities created by illegal use of force. These criteria, taken together, are on the whole reflected in United Nations practice; they also provide a flexible but generally applicable standard against which to consider the status of the numerous unusual or 'anomalous' territorial entities (Taiwan, the Holy See, Andorra and so on).

Problems of the creation of States have commonly been regarded as matters 'of fact and not of law'. This view was again simplistic, since it assumed the automatic identification of States, whether by recognition or the application of criteria based on effectiveness. In practice, identification and application of the criteria to specific cases or problems raise interesting and difficult problems, some of which are dealt with in Part II of this study. These problems do not of course occur in isolation; they are classifications, rather than exclusive mandatory 'modes' of the creation of States. However, the problems discussed in each context (dependent States, devolution, secession and so on) have common features that justify such separate classification.

Superimposed on these classifications of the methods of the creation of States are the various more overtly international competences or authorities affecting the creation of States: these are dealt with in Part III. The problem of international powers of disposition has attracted a good deal of practice since 1815. More specifically, the development of self-government of colonial territories under the Mandate and Trusteeship systems, and pursuant to Chapter XI

of the Charter (non-self-governing territories) has attracted a substantial body of practice.

Finally, certain incidents of the creation of States, such as commencement or acquisition of territory by new States, and certain related problems (identity, continuity, reversion and extinction) are discussed in a concluding section.

Whereas the States of the world form a community governed by international law . . .

*Draft Declaration on Rights and Duties of States*, preambular paragraph 1,  
annexed to GA Resolution 375 (IV), 6 December 1949

# *Contents—Summary*

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| <i>Table of Cases</i>                                 | xxix  |
| <i>Select Table of Treaties and Other Instruments</i> | xlix  |
| <i>Select List of Abbreviations</i>                   | lxvii |

## PART I: THE CONCEPT OF STATEHOOD IN INTERNATIONAL LAW 1

1. Statehood and Recognition 3
2. The Criteria for Statehood: Statehood as Effectiveness 37
3. International Law Conditions for the Creation of States 96
4. Issues of Statehood Before United Nations Organs 174
5. The Criteria for Statehood Applied: Some Special Cases 196

## PART II: MODES OF THE CREATION OF STATES IN INTERNATIONAL LAW 255

6. Original Acquisition and Problems of Statehood 257
7. Dependent States and Other Dependent Entities 282
8. Devolution 329
9. Secession 374
10. Divided States and Reunification 449
11. Unions and Federations of States 479

## PART III: THE CREATION OF STATES IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS 501

12. International Dispositive Powers 503
13. Mandates and Trust Territories 565
14. Non-self-governing Territories: The Law and Practice of Decolonization 602

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| PART IV: ISSUES OF COMMENCEMENT,<br>CONTINUITY AND EXTINCTION                            | 649 |
| 15. The Commencement of States   | 651 |
| 16. Problems of Identity, Continuity and Reversion                                       | 667 |
| 17. The Extinction of States   | 700 |
| <br>   |     |
| <b>Conclusions</b>   | 718 |
| <br>   |     |
| Appendices:  |     |
| 1. List of States and Territorial Entities Proximate to States                           | 727 |
| 2. League Mandates and United Nations Trusteeships                                       | 741 |
| 3. The United Nations and Non-Self-Governing Territories,<br>1946 to 2005                | 746 |
| 4. Consideration by the International Law Commission<br>of the Topic of Statehood (1996) | 757 |
| <br>   |     |
| <i>Select Bibliography</i>   | 760 |
| <i>Index</i>   | 851 |

# Contents

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| <i>Table of Cases</i>                                 | xxix  |
| <i>Select Table of Treaties and Other Instruments</i> | xlix  |
| <i>Select List of Abbreviations</i>                   | lxvii |

## PART I: THE CONCEPT OF STATEHOOD IN INTERNATIONAL LAW 1

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>1. Statehood and Recognition</b>                                   | 3  |
| 1.1 Introduction  | 4  |
| 1.2 Statehood in early international law                              | 6  |
| (1) Doctrine  | 6  |
| (2) Statehood in early international law: aspects of State practice   | 10 |
| 1.3 Recognition and Statehood   | 12 |
| (1) The early view of recognition                                     | 12 |
| (2) Positivism and recognition  | 13 |
| (3) Statehood in nineteenth-century international law                 | 14 |
| 1.4 Recognition of States in modern international law                 | 17 |
| (1) Recognition: the great debate                                     | 19 |
| (i) The constitutive theory   | 19 |
| (ii) The declaratory theory   | 22 |
| (2) Conclusions   | 26 |
| 1.5 Certain basic concepts  | 28 |
| (1) International personality   | 28 |
| (2) The State   | 31 |
| (3) Sovereignty   | 32 |
| (4) State and government  | 33 |
| (5) State continuity and State succession                             | 35 |
| <b>2. The Criteria for Statehood: Statehood as Effectiveness</b>      | 37 |
| 2.1 Introduction  | 37 |
| 2.2 The classical criteria for statehood: <i>ex factis jus oritur</i> | 45 |
| (1) Defined territory   | 46 |
| (2) Permanent population  | 52 |
| (3) Government  | 55 |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| (4) Capacity to enter into relations with other States            | 61        |
| (5) Independence  | 62        |
| (i) Formal independence   | 67        |
| (a) Situations not derogating from formal independence            | 67        |
| (b) Situations regarded as derogating from formal independence    | 71        |
| (ii) Real or actual independence                                  | 72        |
| (a) Situations not derogating from actual independence            | 72        |
| (b) Situations regarded as derogating from actual independence    | 74        |
| (iii) The relation between formal and actual independence         | 88        |
| (6) Sovereignty   | 89        |
| (7) Other criteria  | 89        |
| (i) Permanence  | 90        |
| (ii) Willingness and ability to observe international law         | 91        |
| (iii) A certain degree of civilization                            | 92        |
| (iv) Recognition  | 93        |
| (v) Legal order   | 93        |
| <b>3. International Law Conditions for the Creation of States</b> | <b>96</b> |
| 3.1 Legality and statehood  | 97        |
| (1) Development of the concept of peremptory norms                | 99        |
| (2) Effects of peremptory norms on situations other than treaties | 102       |
| (3) Status of entities created by treaties                        | 105       |
| (4) Legality and statehood: general conclusions                   | 106       |
| 3.2 Statehood and self-determination                              | 107       |
| (1) Self-determination in modern international law                | 108       |
| (i) Self-determination before 1945                                | 108       |
| (ii) Self-determination under the United Nations Charter          | 112       |
| (iii) Identifying the units of self-determination                 | 115       |
| (a) The mandate and trusteeship systems                           | 116       |
| (b) Non-self-governing territories                                | 116       |
| (c) Application to particular territorial disputes or situations  | 117       |
| (d) Criteria for self-determination territories                   | 117       |



|  |            |
|--|------------|
| (e) The 'safeguard clause'   | 118        |
| (iv) The consequences of self-determination                            | 121        |
| (v) Conclusions  | 122        |
| (2) Statehood and the operation of the principle of self-determination | 128        |
| 3.3 Entities created by the unlawful use of force                      | 131        |
| (1) The relation between self-determination and the use of force       | 134        |
| (i) Assistance to established local insurgents                         | 138        |
| (ii) Military intervention to procure self-determination               | 139        |
| (2) Conclusions  | 147        |
| 3.4 Statehood and fundamental human rights                             | 148        |
| (1) General considerations   | 148        |
| (2) Democracy as a continuing condition for statehood                  | 150        |
| (3) <i>Apartheid</i> and the bantustan policy                          | 155        |
| (4) Conclusions  | 155        |
| 3.5 Other cases  | 155        |
| (1) Entities not claiming to be States                                 | 156        |
| (2) Puppet States and the 1949 Geneva Conventions                      | 156        |
| (3) Violation of treaties providing for independence                   | 157        |
| 3.6 Collective non-recognition   | 157        |
| (1) Collective non-recognition and territorial status                  | 158        |
| (2) Consequences of collective non-recognition                         | 162        |
| (i) The <i>Namibia</i> Opinion   | 162        |
| (ii) The ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Articles 40 to 41       | 168        |
| (iii) Subsequent consideration by the International Court              | 168        |
| (iv) Conclusion  | 173        |
| <b>4. Issues of Statehood Before United Nations Organs</b>             | <b>174</b> |
| 4.1 General considerations   | 174        |
| 4.2 League of Nations and United Nations membership                    | 176        |
| (1) Membership practice under the League of Nations                    | 176        |
| (2) The United Nations: original membership                            | 177        |
| (3) The United Nations: admission to membership                        | 179        |
| (i) The criteria for membership: Article 4 in theory and practice      | 179        |
| (ii) The micro-State issue and the move to universality of membership  | 182        |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| (iii) Renewed controversy during the 1990s: the former Yugoslavia                          | 186        |
| (iv) Conclusions   | 189        |
| 4.3 Statehood for other United Nations purposes  | 190        |
| (1) Statehood and dispute settlement: Articles 32 and 35(2)                                | 190        |
| (2) Claims to be parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice              | 191        |
| (3) Other cases  | 192        |
| 4.4 UN observer status   | 193        |
| <b>5. The Criteria for Statehood Applied: Some Special Cases</b>                           | <b>196</b> |
| 5.1 General considerations   | 197        |
| 5.2 Entities unrecognized as separate states: Taiwan                                       | 198        |
| (1) Historical background  | 198        |
| (2) The international relations of Taiwan  | 200        |
| (3) Judicial decisions   | 205        |
| (4) The legal status of Taiwan   | 206        |
| (5) Development of a Taiwanese claim to statehood  | 212        |
| (i) Amendments to the law of Taiwan  | 212        |
| (ii) Statements respecting international policy  | 216        |
| (6) Conclusion   | 219        |
| 5.3 Entities recognized as States 'for special reasons': The Vatican City and the Holy See | 221        |
| (1) The international status of the Vatican City   | 222        |
| (2) The international status of the Holy See   | 225        |
| (3) The relation between the Holy See and the Vatican City                                 | 226        |
| 5.4 'Internationalized Territories': the Free City of Danzig and some modern analogues     | 233        |
| (1) The concept of 'internationalized territory'   | 233        |
| (2) The Free City of Danzig  | 236        |
| (3) Trends in internationalization since 1945: Cyprus                                      | 241        |
| 5.5 Transitional autonomous entities: Hong Kong and Macao                                  | 244        |
| (1) Historical outline   | 245        |
| (2) Arrangements for the government of the HKSAR   | 246        |
| (3) The status of Hong Kong  | 248        |
| (4) Relations between Hong Kong and China  | 250        |
| 5.6 Conclusion   | 252        |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| PART II: MODES OF THE CREATION OF STATES<br>IN INTERNATIONAL LAW          | 255 |
| <b>6. Original Acquisition and Problems of Statehood</b>                  | 257 |
| 6.1 General Considerations  | 257 |
| 6.2 The status of indigenous communities                                  | 260 |
| (1) Statehood of indigenous communities                                   | 260 |
| (2) Legal personality of indigenous communities not<br>regarded as States | 263 |
| 6.3 Acquisition of territory from indigenous communities                  | 268 |
| (1) Status of aboriginal treaties of cession                              | 268 |
| (2) Legal effects of aboriginal treaties                                  | 269 |
| (3) Grants of territory to private persons                                | 270 |
| (4) Conclusions   | 271 |
| 6.4 Original occupation of territory by a new State                       | 274 |
| (1) Liberia   | 274 |
| (2) The Boer Republics  | 275 |
| (3) The Free State of the Congo   | 276 |
| (4) Israel  | 277 |
| (5) Taiwan  | 277 |
| 6.5 Original acquisition and indigenous rights                            | 278 |
| <b>7. Dependent States and Other Dependent Entities</b>                   | 282 |
| 7.1 General principles  | 282 |
| 7.2 Protectorates and protected States                                    | 286 |
| (1) Protected States  | 288 |
| (2) International protectorates   | 294 |
| (3) Colonial protectorates  | 299 |
| (4) Legal effects of protectorates  | 303 |
| (i) Protectorates and domestic jurisdiction                               | 303 |
| (ii) Relations between protectorate and protecting State                  | 305 |
| (iii) Opposability of protectorate arrangements                           | 307 |
| (iv) Protectorates and State succession                                   | 307 |
| (v) Cession of protected territory  | 310 |
| (vi) International responsibility   | 314 |
| (vii) Treaty-making power with respect to protectorates                   | 315 |
| (viii) Belligerency and protectorates                                     | 316 |
| (ix) Nationality in protectorates   | 317 |
| (x) Protectorates and State immunity                                      | 318 |
| (xi) Protectorates and international organizations                        | 318 |
| (xii) Termination of protected status                                     | 318 |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| 7.3 Other Cases   | 320        |
| (1) Special treaty relations  | 320        |
| (2) Vassal States and suzerainty  | 321        |
| (3) Autonomy and residual sovereignty   | 323        |
| (4) Spheres of influence  | 327        |
| <b>8. Devolution</b>  | <b>329</b> |
| 8.1 Introduction  | 330        |
| 8.2 Explicit grants of independence   | 330        |
| (1) Granting partial or incomplete independence   | 332        |
| (2) Grants in violation of self-determination   | 333        |
| (i) Grants to minority or unrepresentative governments<br>within self-determination units       | 333        |
| (ii) Grants disruptive of the territorial integrity of<br>a self-determination unit             | 335        |
| (3) Grants of independence in furtherance of fundamentally<br>unlawful policies: the bantustans | 338        |
| (i) Origins of the bantustan policy   | 338        |
| (ii) Denationalization through State creation   | 340        |
| (iii) The status of the bantustans under international law                                      | 341        |
| (iv) Dismantling the bantustan system   | 345        |
| (4) Colonial enclaves and rights of pre-emption   | 348        |
| (5) Derogations from grants of independence   | 348        |
| 8.3 Relinquishment of sovereignty without grant   | 349        |
| 8.4 The gradual devolution of international personality   | 349        |
| (1) The 'unitary State' theory  | 351        |
| (2) General principles of the status of devolving entities                                      | 353        |
| (3) The principles applied: devolution of States within<br>the British Commonwealth             | 358        |
| (i) The self-governing Dominions  | 358        |
| (ii) British India  | 366        |
| (iii) Subsequent cases of Commonwealth independence   | 368        |
| (iv) Southern Rhodesia pre-1965   | 368        |
| (v) The elimination of post-Imperial links  | 371        |
| (a) Canada  | 371        |
| (b) Australia   | 371        |
| (c) New Zealand   | 372        |
| (4) Other cases of devolution   | 372        |
| (i) The Ottoman Empire  | 372        |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| (ii) The Philippines   | 372        |
| (iii) The French and Netherlands Unions                              | 373        |
| <b>9. Secession</b>  | <b>374</b> |
| 9.1 Secession as a method of the creation of States                  | 375        |
| 9.2 The traditional approach: secession and recognition 1815 to 1945 | 376        |
| (1) The relevance of recognition                                     | 376        |
| (i) Metropolitan recognition   | 376        |
| (ii) Recognition by third States                                     | 379        |
| (iii) Recognition of belligerency                                    | 380        |
| (2) The traditional test of independence in a secessionary situation | 382        |
| 9.3 Independence and secession in modern international law           | 383        |
| (1) The secession of a self-determination unit                       | 384        |
| (i) Secession in furtherance of self-determination                   | 384        |
| (ii) Secession in violation of self-determination                    | 388        |
| (2) Secession outside the colonial context                           | 388        |
| (i) Cases of secession or dismemberment post-1945                    | 391        |
| (a) Senegal  | 392        |
| (b) Singapore  | 392        |
| (c) Bangladesh   | 393        |
| (d) The Baltic States  | 393        |
| (e) Successor States to the USSR                                     | 395        |
| (f) Successor States to the SFRY                                     | 395        |
| (g) Czechoslovakia   | 402        |
| (h) Eritrea  | 402        |
| (ii) Unsuccessful attempts at secession                              | 403        |
| (a) The Faroes   | 404        |
| (b) Katanga  | 404        |
| (c) Biafra   | 406        |
| (d) Republika Srpska   | 406        |
| (e) Kosovo   | 407        |
| (f) Chechnya   | 408        |
| (g) Quebec   | 411        |
| (h) Somaliland   | 412        |
| (iii) Summary of post-1945 practice                                  | 415        |
| 9.4 Certain incidents of secession in international law              | 418        |
| (1) Belligerency and insurgency in secession struggles               | 418        |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| (2) Application of international humanitarian law in internal conflicts  | 420 |
| (3) Military and civil aid to seceding regimes                           | 421 |
| (4) Problems of continuity and commencement                              | 421 |
| 9.5 The Former Palestine Mandate: Israel and Palestine                   | 421 |
| (1) Historical introduction  | 421 |
| (i) The Mandate for Palestine  | 422 |
| (ii) The abandonment of the Mandate and its aftermath                    | 424 |
| (2) The creation of the State of Israel                                  | 425 |
| (i) The validity of the Mandate for Palestine                            | 428 |
| (ii) Validity and legal effects of the Partition Resolution              | 430 |
| (iii) The creation of Israel (1948–9)                                    | 432 |
| (3) The creation of the State of Palestine (1988–)                       | 434 |
| (i) Palestine prior to the Oslo Accords: the 1988 Declaration            | 435 |
| (ii) Alternative conceptions of statehood: Montevideo and other criteria | 436 |
| (iii) The authority of the General Assembly                              | 440 |
| (iv) The position of dissenting or opposing States                       | 442 |
| (v) The road to Palestinian statehood since 1993                         | 442 |
| (vi) Conclusion  | 446 |
| <b>10. Divided States and Reunification</b>                              | 449 |
| 10.1 The category of ‘divided States’                                    | 449 |
| 10.2 The two Germanies   | 452 |
| (1) The quadripartite government of Germany                              | 452 |
| (2) The creation of the Federal Republic of Germany                      | 454 |
| (3) The creation of the German Democratic Republic                       | 455 |
| (4) Residual quadripartite authority over ‘Germany as a whole’           | 458 |
| (5) The status of Berlin   | 459 |
| (6) Conclusions  | 465 |
| 10.3 Other cases of ‘divided States’                                     | 466 |
| (1) Korea after 1947   | 466 |
| (2) Vietnam after 1945   | 472 |
| (3) China after 1948   | 477 |
| 10.4 Conclusions   | 477 |
| <b>11. Unions and Federations of States</b>                              | 479 |
| 11.1 The classification of political unions                              | 479 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 11.2 Federation, confederation and other forms of political union   | 481 |
| (1) Real and personal unions  | 482 |
| (2) Federations and confederations                                  | 483 |
| (3) Unusual formations  | 489 |
| (4) 'Remedial federation': federal solutions in conflict situations | 490 |
| (i) Cyprus  | 490 |
| (ii) Bosnia and Herzegovina   | 491 |
| (5) Associated States   | 492 |
| 11.3 Unions of States in international organizations                | 492 |
| (1) The United Nations organization                                 | 493 |
| (2) The European Union  | 495 |
| 11.4 Regional devolution in previously unitary States               | 500 |

PART III: THE CREATION OF STATES IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS 501

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>12. International Dispositive Powers</b>                        | <b>503</b> |
| 12.1 Introduction  | 504        |
| 12.2 Territorial dispositions by multilateral treaty               | 505        |
| (1) Dispositions in treaties of peace                              | 505        |
| (i) The nineteenth-century practice                                | 505        |
| (a) The Congress of Vienna, 1815                                   | 505        |
| (b) The Concert of Europe, 1815 to 1848                            | 506        |
| (c) The Treaty of Paris, 1856                                      | 506        |
| (d) The Congress of Berlin, 1878                                   | 508        |
| (e) The Conference of Berlin, 1884 to 1885                         | 509        |
| (f) The International Government of Crete, 1897 to 1913            | 509        |
| (g) The Act of Algeciras, 1906                                     | 510        |
| (h) The Treaty of London, 1913 and the creation of Albania         | 510        |
| (i) The nineteenth-century Congresses and the principle of consent | 512        |
| (ii) The World War I settlements                                   | 516        |
| (iii) The World War II settlements                                 | 518        |
| (a) The re-establishment of annexed or conquered States            | 519        |

|       |   |     |
|-------|---|-----|
| (b)   | Internationalized territories   | 522 |
| (c)   | Poland, 1939 to 1946  | 522 |
| (d)   | Other dispositions  | 522 |
| (iv)  | Peace settlements since 1945  | 523 |
| (a)   | Germany, 1990   | 523 |
| (b)   | Cambodia, 1991  | 526 |
| (c)   | Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1992 to 1995  | 528 |
| (2)   | Dispositions anticipatory of peace treaties   | 530 |
| (3)   | Dispositions delegated to groups of States  | 531 |
| (i)   | The Conference of Ambassadors and Albania   | 532 |
| (ii)  | The Principal Allied and Associated Powers after 1918                                 | 533 |
| (a)   | The Mandate system  | 533 |
| (b)   | Danzig  | 534 |
| (c)   | Memel   | 534 |
| (d)   | Fiume   | 534 |
| (e)   | Luxembourg  | 535 |
| (iii) | The Allied Powers 1945 to 1955  | 535 |
| (4)   | Conclusion: powers of disposition pursuant to multilateral treaties                   | 535 |
| 12.3  | The exercise of dispositive power through collective recognition                      | 539 |
| (1)   | The concept of 'collective recognition'   | 539 |
| (i)   | Greece, 1822 to 1830  | 540 |
| (ii)  | Belgium, 1830 to 1839   | 542 |
| (iii) | Albania, 1913 to 1921   | 544 |
| (iv)  | New States in the former Soviet Union and the dissolution of Yugoslavia, 1990 to 1995 | 544 |
| (2)   | Collective recognition within international organizations                             | 544 |
| (3)   | Collective conditional recognition  | 545 |
| 12.4  | Territorial dispositions by international organizations                               | 546 |
| (1)   | General principles  | 546 |
| (2)   | The Concert of Europe   | 547 |
| (3)   | The League of Nations   | 548 |
| (4)   | The United Nations and territorial dispositions                                       | 549 |
| (i)   | General principles: delegated and inherent authority                                  | 549 |
| (a)   | The General Assembly  | 551 |



|  |            |
|--|------------|
| (b) The Security Council   | 552        |
| (ii) Functions pursuant to the peace treaties                          | 553        |
| (a) Trieste  | 553        |
| (b) Disposition of Italian colonies in Africa                          | 554        |
| (iii) Functions pursuant to the Mandate and<br>Trusteeship systems     | 555        |
| (iv) Other cases   | 555        |
| (a) West Irian   | 555        |
| (b) Namibia  | 556        |
| (c) Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and<br>Western Sirmium                   | 556        |
| (d) Kosovo   | 557        |
| (e) East Timor   | 560        |
| (f) Iraq   | 562        |
| (g) Jerusalem  | 563        |
| (v) Conclusion   | 564        |
| 12.5 The notion of 'international dispositive powers'                  | 564        |
| <b>13. Mandates and Trust Territories</b>                              | <b>565</b> |
| 13.1 Mandates and Trust territories in historical perspective          | 566        |
| 13.2 Sovereignty over Mandates and Trust Territories                   | 568        |
| (1) Sovereignty and 'A' Mandates                                       | 569        |
| (2) Sovereignty and other mandated and trust territories               | 570        |
| (3) Legal personality of mandated and trust territories                | 574        |
| 13.3 Termination of Mandates and Trusteeships                          | 574        |
| (1) Termination of Mandates  | 575        |
| (i) During the period of the League                                    | 575        |
| (ii) After the dissolution of the League                               | 580        |
| (iii) By transfer to Trusteeship                                       | 580        |
| (2) Termination of Trusteeships  | 581        |
| (3) Legal effects of termination                                       | 584        |
| 13.4 Revocation of Mandates and Trusteeships                           | 586        |
| (1) Revocation of Mandates during the League period                    | 586        |
| (2) Revocation of Trusteeships   | 590        |
| (3) Revocation of Mandates by United Nations organs                    | 591        |
| (4) Post-revocation action of the United Nations<br>concerning Namibia | 595        |
| 13.5 Post-independence claims  | 596        |
| (1) Namibia  | 597        |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| (2) Nauru   | 598        |
| (3) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands  | 599        |
| 13.6 The Future of Trusteeship?   | 600        |
| <b>14. Non-self-governing Territories: The Law and Practice of Decolonization</b> | <b>602</b> |
| 14.1 Introduction   | 603        |
| 14.2 The development in practice of Chapter XI of the Charter                     | 606        |
| (1) The definition of 'non-self-governing territories'                            | 606        |
| (2) Competence to determine whether a territory falls under Chapter XI            | 607        |
| (3) The scope of Chapter XI in practice   | 608        |
| (4) Possible extension of Chapter XI beyond colonial territories                  | 610        |
| 14.3 The international status of non-self-governing territories                   | 613        |
| (1) Sovereignty and non-self-governing territories                                | 613        |
| (2) The use of force and non-self-governing territories                           | 616        |
| (3) The legal personality of dependent peoples                                    | 617        |
| (4) Standards for assessing the wishes of a dependent people                      | 620        |
| 14.4 Termination of non-self-governing status: the forms of self-government       | 621        |
| (1) Termination of non-self-governing status: criteria for self-government        | 621        |
| (2) Determination of cessation of non-self-governing status                       | 621        |
| (3) The forms of self-government  | 623        |
| (i) Independence  | 623        |
| (ii) Incorporation in another State   | 623        |
| (iii) Association   | 625        |
| (a) Association arrangements in practice since 1952                               | 626        |
| (b) The international legal status of associated States                           | 632        |
| (4) Remaining non-self-governing territories                                      | 634        |
| (5) Claims by third States against non-self-governing territories                 | 637        |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| PART IV: ISSUES OF COMMENCEMENT,<br>CONTINUITY AND EXTINCTION               | 649 |
| <b>15. The Commencement of States</b>                                       | 651 |
| 15.1 The problem of commencement  | 651 |
| (1) Problems of commencement in national courts                             | 652 |
| (2) Problems of commencement at the international level                     | 653 |
| (3) 'Illegal entities' and problems of commencement                         | 657 |
| 15.2 States <i>in statu nascendi</i>  | 658 |
| 15.3 New States and the acquisition of territorial sovereignty              | 664 |
| (1) The acquisition of statehood as a 'mode of<br>acquisition' of territory | 664 |
| (2) Claims to the entire territory of a new State                           | 665 |
| <b>16. Problems of Identity, Continuity and Reversion</b>                   | 667 |
| 16.1 Identity and continuity of States: general considerations              | 667 |
| 16.2 Some applications of the concept of continuity                         | 672 |
| (1) Territorial changes   | 673 |
| (2) Changes in population   | 678 |
| (3) Changes in government   | 678 |
| (4) Changes in international status   | 680 |
| (5) Belligerent occupation  | 688 |
| (6) Continuity and illegal annexation                                       | 689 |
| (7) Identity without continuity   | 690 |
| (8) Multiple changes and State continuity: the case<br>of Poland after 1945 | 692 |
| 16.3 Reversion to sovereignty   | 695 |
| (1) Rights of reversion by treaty   | 696 |
| (2) Reversion of territorial enclaves                                       | 696 |
| (3) <i>Postliminium</i>   | 696 |
| (4) Reversion to sovereignty  | 697 |
| <b>17. The Extinction of States</b>   | 700 |
| 17.1 General principles   | 700 |
| 17.2 Extinction and illegal annexation                                      | 702 |
| 17.3 State extinction and the possibility of prescription                   | 703 |
| 17.4 Extinction, merger and the creation of new States                      | 705 |
| (1) Voluntary absorption: the German<br>Democratic Republic                 | 705 |
| (2) Extinction by merger: Yemen   | 705 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| (3) Extinction by voluntary dissolution: the Czech<br>and Slovak Federal Republic        | 706 |
| (4) Extinction by involuntary dissolution: the SFRY<br>and its successor States          | 707 |
| 17.5 International law and the survival of States  | 715 |
| <b>Conclusions</b>   | 718 |
| Appendices:  |     |
| 1. List of States and Territorial Entities Proximate to States                           | 727 |
| 2. League Mandates and United Nations Trusteeships                                       | 741 |
| 3. The United Nations and Non-Self-Governing Territories,<br>1946 to 2005                | 746 |
| 4. Consideration by the International Law Commission<br>of the Topic of Statehood (1996) | 757 |
| <i>Select Bibliography</i>   | 760 |
| <i>Index</i>   | 851 |

## *Table of Cases*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <i>A/S Tallinna Laevaühisus &amp; Ors v Tallinna Shipping Co</i> (1945) .....   | 80                                       |
| <i>AB v MB</i> (1951) .....   | 53, 434                                  |
| <i>Abu Dhabi Arbitration</i> (1951) .....   | 269                                      |
| <i>Achievers Investments, Inc v Karalekas</i> (1996) .....  | 343, 348                                 |
| <i>Achikian v Bank of Athens</i> (1923) .....   | 701                                      |
| <i>Acquisition of Polish Nationality</i> (1923) .....   | 545                                      |
| <i>Administration des Douanes v Société Cafés Jacques Valore</i> (1975) .....   | 498                                      |
| <i>Administration of Papua and New Guinea v Guba &amp; Doriga</i> (1973) .....  | 270                                      |
| <i>Administrative Decision No 1 (US-Austrian-Hungarian Claims Commission)</i><br>(1927) .....   | 483                                      |
| <i>Administrative Tribunal of the ILO</i> (1956) .....  | 495                                      |
| <i>Administrator of Customs v Dewulf, Caillert &amp; Sons</i> (1934) .....  | 237                                      |
| <i>Admissibility of Applications 71916/01, 71917/01 and 10260/02</i><br><i>von Maltzan &amp; ors v Germany</i> (2005) .....               | 685                                      |
| <i>Admissibility of Hearings of Petitioners by the Committee on</i><br><i>South West Africa</i> (1956) .....                              | 574, 592                                 |
| <i>Admissions Case (see Conditions of Admission of a State to Membership</i><br><i>in the United Nations (Article 4 of the Charter) )</i> |  |
| <i>Aegean Sea Continental Shelf</i> (1978) .....  | 579                                      |
| <i>Afghan Citizens Case</i> (2000) .....  | 653                                      |
| <i>AG for Canada v AG for Ontario</i> (1937) .....  | 359, 486                                 |
| <i>AG of Israel v El-Turani</i> (1952) .....  | 426                                      |
| <i>AG v Goralschwili</i> (1925) .....   | 570                                      |
| <i>AG v Sheng Fu Shen</i> (1959) .....  | 219                                      |
| <i>Agarwala v Union of India</i> (1980) .....   | 299                                      |
| <i>Agency of Canadian Car and Foundry Co Ltd v American Can Co</i> (1919) .....   | 679                                      |
| <i>Al Odah v United States</i> (2003) .....   | 642                                      |
| <i>Alabama Arbitration</i> (1872) .....   | 381, 388–89                              |
| <i>Al-Adsani v United Kingdom</i> (2002) .....  | 101                                      |
| <i>Åland Islands Case (Commission of Jurists)</i><br>(1920) .....   | 24, 58–59, 108–10, 383, 391, 536–37, 657 |
| <i>Åland Islands Case (Commission of Rapporteurs)</i> (1921) .....  | 58–59, 110–12, 658                       |
| <i>Albanian Frontier Case (see Monastery at St Naoum (Albanian Frontier) )</i>  |  |
| <i>Andrew Allen Case</i> (1799) .....   | 654                                      |
| <i>Anglo Iranian Oil Co Case (First Phase)</i> (1955) .....   | 495                                      |
| <i>Anglo-French Continental Shelf Case</i> (1977) .....   | 351                                      |
| <i>Antarctic Legal Status Case</i> (1991) .....   | 266                                      |

|   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Antolok v United States</i> (1989) .....   | 600                               |
| <i>Applicability of the Obligation to Arbitrate under Section 21 of the United Nations<br/>Headquarters Agreement of 26 June 1947 (Advisory Opinion)</i> (1988) .....   | 195                               |
| <i>Application for Revision of the Judgment of 11 July 1996 in the Case Concerning<br/>Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime<br/>of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Yugoslavia), Preliminary Objections<br/>(Yugoslavia v Bosnia and Herzegovina)</i> (2003) ..... | 189, 708, 710, 711–14             |
| <i>Application of Reyes</i> (1956) .....  | 572                               |
| <i>Aradnas v Hogan</i> (1957) .....   | 572                               |
| <i>Arizona v California</i> (1983) .....  | 486                               |
| <i>Arrest Warrant Case</i> (see <i>Case Concerning the Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000<br/>(Democratic Republic of the Congo v Belgium) (Provisional Measures)</i> )  |                                   |
| <i>Artukovic v Boyle</i> (1952) .....   | 692                               |
| <i>Asakura v City of Seattle</i> (1924) .....   | 486                               |
| <i>Assanidze v Georgia</i> (2004) .....   | 83                                |
| <i>Assessment of Aliens for War Taxation</i> (1965) .....   | 101                               |
| <i>Asylum Case</i> (1950) .....   | 42                                |
| <i>Atlantic Mutual Inc v Northwest Airlines</i> (1992) .....  | 206                               |
| <i>Attorney General for Fiji v House</i> (1989) .....   | 152                               |
| <i>Attorney-General for British Honduras v Bristowe &amp; Hunter</i> (1880) .....   | 302                               |
| <i>Attorney-General v Wellington Newspapers Ltd</i> (1988) .....  | 482                               |
| <i>Austrian Citizens (Entitlement to Compensation) Case</i> (1960) .....  | 459                               |
| <i>Austro-German Customs Union Case</i> (1931) .....  | 19, 45, 63–66, 69,<br>283, 537–38 |
| <i>Autocephalous Greek-Orthodox Church of Cyprus v Goldberg &amp; Feldman<br/>Fine Arts Inc</i> (1990) .....  | 17                                |
| <i>Avena</i> (see <i>Case Concerning Avena and Other Mexican Nationals (Mexico v United<br/>States)</i> )   |                                   |
| <i>Badinter Commission Opinions—</i>  |                                   |
| <i>Opinion 1</i> (1991) .....   | 24, 396–97, 401                   |
| <i>Opinion 2</i> (1992) .....   | 397, 401, 406–07, 644             |
| <i>Opinion 3</i> (1992) .....   | 397                               |
| <i>Opinion 4</i> (1992) .....   | 397, 398                          |
| <i>Opinion 5</i> (1992) .....   | 397–98                            |
| <i>Opinion 6</i> (1992) .....   | 68, 397, 398                      |
| <i>Opinion 7</i> (1992) .....   | 397                               |
| <i>Opinion 8</i> (1992) .....   | 24, 399–400                       |
| <i>Opinion 10</i> (1992) .....  | 24                                |
| <i>Baer Claim</i> (1959) .....  | 91                                |
| <i>Baltzoudis v Souliotis</i> (1920) .....  | 314                               |
| <i>Bank of China v Wells Fargo Bank &amp; Union Trust Co</i> (1953) .....   | 17                                |

|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| <i>Bank of Ethiopia v National Bank of England &amp; Liguori</i> (1937) .....  | 652                        |
| <i>Bank of Hawaii v Balos</i> (1988) .....   | 572                        |
| <i>Banque de l'Union Parisienne v Jaudon</i> (1933) .....  | 679                        |
| <i>Barber v Gonzales</i> (1954) .....  | 373                        |
| <i>Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Ltd (Preliminary<br/>Objections)</i> (1964) .....  | 592                        |
| <i>Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Ltd (Second Phase,<br/>Judgment)</i> (1970) .....  | 101, 103–04, 116, 283, 702 |
| <i>Baronci v Ospedale del Bambino Gesu</i> (1957) .....  | 223                        |
| <i>Baxter v Commissioner of Taxation</i> (1907) .....  | 370                        |
| <i>Bayetto v Administration d'Enregistrement</i> (1946) .....  | 293                        |
| <i>Belgium/Netherlands</i> (see <i>Case Concerning Sovereignty over Certain Frontier Land</i> )  |                            |
| <i>Bishwanath Singh v Income Tax, Central &amp; United</i> (1942) .....  | 284                        |
| <i>Blackburn v AG</i> (1971) .....   | 33                         |
| <i>Blankard v Galdy</i> (1692) .....   | 258                        |
| <i>Boguslawski v Gdynia-Ameryka Linie</i> (1953) .....   | 653, 657                   |
| <i>Bolivar Ry Co Claim</i> (1903) .....  | 658                        |
| <i>Bosnian Genocide Case</i> (see <i>Case Concerning Application of the Convention on the<br/>Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and<br/>Herzegovina v Yugoslavia)</i> ) |                            |
| <i>Botswana/Namibia</i> (see <i>Case Concerning Kasikili/Sedudu Island (Botswana/Namibia)</i> )  |                            |
| <i>Bradford v Chase National Bank</i> (1938) .....   | 373                        |
| <i>Brčko Award</i> (see <i>Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina v Republika Srpska<br/>(Final Award)</i> )   |                            |
| <i>Brehm v Acheson</i> (1950) .....  | 454                        |
| <i>Bremen (Hansa City of) v Prussia</i> (1925) .....   | 486                        |
| <i>Bridgeway Corp v Citibank</i> (1999) .....  | 275                        |
| <i>British Coal Corporation v The King</i> (1935) .....  | 363                        |
| <i>Brunell v United States</i> (1948) .....  | 572                        |
| <i>Buck v Attorney General</i> (1965) .....  | 331–32, 585                |
| <i>Bulamu Arbitration</i> (see <i>Island of Bulamu Arbitration</i> )   |                            |
| <i>Burnet v Chicago Portrait Co</i> (1932) .....   | 43                         |
| <i>Buttes Gas and Oil Co v Hammer</i> (1982) .....   | 292                        |
| <i>Cabet de Chambine v Bessis</i> (1951) .....   | 317                        |
| <i>Caglar v HM Inspector of Taxes</i> (1996) .....   | 17                         |
| <i>Calder v AG of British Columbia</i> (1973) .....  | 270                        |
| <i>Calvin's Case</i> (1608) .....  | 258                        |
| <i>Cameroon v Nigeria</i> (see <i>Land and Maritime Boundary Between Cameroon<br/>and Nigeria (Cameroon v Nigeria: Equatorial Guinea Intervening)</i> )  |                            |
| <i>Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament v Prime Minister and Secretaries<br/>of States</i> (2002) .....  | 562                        |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Campbell v Hall</i> (1774) .....  | 353  |
| <i>Caribtan Corp v OSHRC</i> (1974) .....  | 626  |
| <i>Carl Zeiss Stiftung v Rayner &amp; Keeler Ltd (no 2)</i> (1967) .....   | 17, 91, 343, 455, 456                            |
| <i>Case Concerning Acquisition of Polish Nationality</i> (1923) .....  | 53–54  |
| <i>Case Concerning Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Yugoslavia) (Provisional Measures)</i> (1993) .....   | 100, 131–32, 189, 707                            |
| <i>Case Concerning Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Yugoslavia) (Preliminary Objections)</i> (1996) ..... | 25, 133, 189, 487, 662–63                        |
| <i>Case Concerning Avena and Other Mexican Nationals (Mexico v United States)</i> (2004) .....   | 489  |
| <i>Case Concerning Certain Phosphate Lands in Nauru (Nauru v Australia) (Preliminary Objections)</i> (1992) .....  | 169, 192, 270, 363, 567, 597, 598–99, 663        |
| <i>Case concerning Certain Property (Liechtenstein v Germany) (Preliminary Objections)</i> (2005) .....  | 681  |
| <i>Case Concerning East Timor (Portugal v Australia)</i> (1995) .....  | 101, 103, 116, 168–72, 560–62, 617               |
| <i>Case Concerning Kasikili/Sedudu Island (Botswana/Namibia)</i> (1999) ...  | 99, 311, 328, 464, 596, 615, 704                 |
| <i>Case Concerning Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions Between Qatar and Bahrain (Qatar v Bahrain)</i> (2001) .....  | 291, 310   |
| <i>Case Concerning Right of Passage over Indian Territory (Portugal v India)</i> (1960) ..   | 47, 108, 259, 261, 268, 536, 614–15, 616, 697–98 |
| <i>Case Concerning Sovereignty over Certain Frontier Land (Belgium/Netherlands)</i> (1959) .....   | 47, 544  |
| <i>Case Concerning Sovereignty Over Pulau Ligitan and Pulau Sipidan (Indonesia/Malaysia)</i> (2002) .....  | 296, 640–41, 752                                 |
| <i>Case Concerning the Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of the Congo v Belgium) (Provisional Measures)</i> (2000) .....  | 42   |
| <i>Case Concerning the Constitutionality of the Maastricht Treaty</i> (1994) .....   | 495  |
| <i>Case concerning the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project (Hungary/Slovakia)</i> (1997) .....   | 100, 447, 679, 707                               |
| <i>Case Concerning the Territorial Dispute (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya/Chad)</i> (1994) .....  | 50, 328  |
| <i>Case No 1550 v China (ILO)</i> (1990) .....   | 251  |
| <i>Case No 1652 v China (ILO)</i> (1993) .....   | 251  |
| <i>Case No 1952 HK Confederation of Trade Unions v HKSAR (ILO)</i> (1998) .....  | 251  |
| <i>Case of Gold Looted by Germany from Rome in 1943</i> (1953) .....   | 520  |
| <i>Cayuga Indians Cases</i> (1926) .....   | 263, 267, 270, 488, 597                          |
| <i>Ceara (State of) v D'Archer de Montgascon</i> (1932) .....  | 484  |



|   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| <i>Ceara (State of) v Dorr</i> (1928) .....   | 484                         |
| <i>CEAT v Società Hungaria</i> (1951) .....   | 236                         |
| <i>Certain Expenses of the United Nations (Article 17, Paragraph 2, of the Charter)</i> (1962) .....  | 405–06, 495, 550, 608       |
| <i>Certain German Interests in Polish Upper Silesia</i> (1926) .....  | 19, 349, 657, 661           |
| <i>Certain Phosphate Lands in Nauru (see Case Concerning Certain Phosphate Lands in Nauru (Nauru v Australia) (Preliminary Objections) )</i>          |                             |
| <i>Chagos Islanders v Attorney-General</i> (2003) .....   | 337                         |
| <i>Cham Kam Nga v Director of Immigration</i> (1999) .....  | 252                         |
| <i>Chen Li Hung v Tong Lei Mao</i> (2000) .....   | 18, 221, 251                |
| <i>Cherokee Nation v Georgia</i> (1831) .....   | 273–74                      |
| <i>Chief Tschekedi Khama v Ratshosa</i> (1931) .....  | 318                         |
| <i>Chisholm v Georgia</i> (1793) .....  | 485                         |
| <i>City of Sherrill, NY v Oneida Indian Nation of New York</i> (2005) .....   | 270                         |
| <i>Civil Aeronautics Administrations v Singapore Airlines Ltd</i> (2004) .....  | 205, 219                    |
| <i>Civil Air Transport Inc v Central Air Transport Inc</i> (1953) .....   | 199, 653                    |
| <i>Civil Air Transport Inc v Chennault &amp; Willauer</i> (1952) .....  | 199                         |
| <i>Claimants of the Brig General Armstrong v United States</i> (1858) .....   | 41                          |
| <i>Clement v Agent Judicataire du Trésor Public</i> (1961) .....  | 453                         |
| <i>Clipperton Island Arbitration</i> (1932) .....   | 269                         |
| <i>Coe v Commonwealth</i> (1978) .....  | 265                         |
| <i>Coe v Commonwealth of Australia</i> (1979) .....   | 272                         |
| <i>Colony of the Belgian Congo v Lehideux</i> (1933) .....  | 277, 509                    |
| <i>Colorado v New Mexico</i> (1982) .....   | 486                         |
| <i>Commission of the European Communities v Hellenic Republic (interim measures)</i> (1994) .....   | 68                          |
| <i>Commission v Austria &amp; others (Re the ‘Open Skies’ Agreements with the USA)</i> (2003) .....   | 499                         |
| <i>Commission v Council (AETR)</i> (1971) .....   | 499                         |
| <i>Commonwealth v Queensland</i> (1975) .....   | 482                         |
| <i>Community Competence to Conclude Certain International Agreements</i> (1994) ....  | 61                          |
| <i>Competence of the ILO to regulate, incidentally, the work of the Employer</i> (1926) ...   | 42                          |
| <i>Competence of the ILO with respect to Agricultural Labour</i> (1922) .....   | 42                          |
| <i>Concordat (Germany) Case</i> (1957) .....  | 681                         |
| <i>Conditions of Admission of a State to Membership in the United Nations (Article 4 of the Charter)</i> (1948) .....                                 | 42, 174, 179, 180, 318, 546 |
| <i>Congo v Belgium (see Case Concerning the Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of the Congo v Belgium) (Provisional Measures) )</i> |                             |
| <i>Consistency of Certain Danzig Legislative Decrees with the Constitution of the Free City</i> (1935) .....  | 239                         |
| <i>Constitutionality of Treaty Relations (FRG)</i> (1973) .....   | 459                         |
| <i>Cooper v Stuart</i> (1889) .....   | 265                         |

|  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| <i>Corfu Channel Case</i> (1949) .....   | 6, 135, 154               |
| <i>Costa v ENEL</i> (1964) .....   | 497                       |
| <i>Costa v Military Service Commission of Genoa</i> (1939) .....   | 673                       |
| <i>Couvertier v Gil Bonar</i> (1999) .....   | 43                        |
| <i>Cuculla v Mexico</i> (1868) .....   | 23                        |
| <i>Customs Union Case</i> (see <i>Austro-German Customs Union Case</i> )   |                           |
| <i>Cyprus v Turkey</i> (2001) .....  | 81–82, 133, 146, 147, 167 |
| <i>Dabrai v Air India Ltd</i> (1953) .....   | 367                       |
| <i>Danube Commission</i> (see <i>Jurisdiction of the European Commission of the Danube between Galatz and Braila</i> )   |                           |
| <i>Danzig and the ILO</i> (1930) .....   | 318, 359                  |
| <i>Danzig Legislative Decrees</i> (see <i>Consistency of Certain Danzig Legislative Decrees with the Constitution of the Free City</i> )                         |                           |
| <i>Danzig Pension Case</i> (1929) .....  | 240                       |
| <i>Danzig Railway Officials Case</i> (1928) .....  | 28                        |
| <i>Date of Entry into Force of Versailles Treaty (Germany) Case</i> (1961) .....   | 53                        |
| <i>Delagoa Bay Arbitration</i> (1875) .....  | 258                       |
| <i>Delgamuukw v British Columbia</i> (1997) .....  | 270                       |
| <i>Delimitation of the Polish-Czechoslovakian Frontier</i><br>( <i>Question of Jaworzina</i> ) (1923) .....  | 48, 483, 514, 532         |
| <i>Democratic Republic of the Congo v Belgium</i> (see <i>Case Concerning the Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of the Congo v Belgium)</i> ) |                           |
| <i>Deutsch Continental Gas Gesellschaft v Polish State</i> (1929) .....  | 24, 49–50,<br>531, 656    |
| <i>Difference Relating to Immunity from Legal Process of a Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights (Advisory Opinion)</i> (1999) .....              | 43                        |
| <i>Director of Immigration v Chong Fung Yuen</i> (2001) .....  | 252                       |
| <i>Ditzler, Reith &amp; Buess v Customs Administration</i> (1940) .....  | 293                       |
| <i>Dix Claim</i> (1903) .....  | 658                       |
| <i>Doe v Bush</i> (2003) .....   | 562                       |
| <i>Dubai-Sharjah Border Arbitration</i> (1981) .....   | 486                       |
| <i>Duff Development Co v Government of Kelantan</i> (1924) .....   | 17, 72, 76–78, 318        |
| <i>Dupire v Dame DuPire-Constantinoff</i> (1937) .....   | 354                       |
| <i>DuToit v Strategic Minerals Corp (re Gur Corporation)</i> (1991) .....  | 343                       |
| <i>East Timor Case</i> (see <i>Case Concerning East Timor (Portugal v Australia)</i> )   |                           |
| <i>Eastern Carelia Opinion</i> (1923) .....  | 41                        |
| <i>Eastern Greenland Case</i> (1933) .....   | 267–68                    |
| <i>Ecoffard v Cie Air France</i> (1964) .....  | 316                       |
| <i>Efrat Ungar v Palestine Liberation Organization</i> (2004) .....  | 17, 62, 148, 434          |
| <i>El Caso de Belice</i> (1993) .....  | 638, 665                  |

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| <i>El Kharbutli v Minister of Defence</i> (1949) .....   | 434                |
| <i>Eritrea-Ethiopia Claims (Civilian Claims) (Eritrea's Claims: Partial Award)</i> (2004) .....  | 54–55, 654–55      |
| <i>Eritrea-Yemen Arbitration, Phase I Award</i> (1998) .....   | 644, 645           |
| <i>Eshugbayi Eleko v Officer Administering the Government of Nigeria</i> (1928) .....  | 302                |
| <i>Etablissements Allart Rousseau et Cie v FRG</i> (1959) .....  | 460                |
| <i>Ethiopia v South Africa</i> (see <i>South West Africa Cases</i> )   |                    |
| <i>European Commission of the Danube</i> (see <i>Jurisdiction of the European Commission of the Danube between Galatz and Braila</i> ) |                    |
| <i>Ex parte Crow Dog</i> (1883) .....  | 273                |
| <i>Ex parte Mwenya</i> (1960) .....  | vi, 302–03         |
| <i>Ex parte O'Dell and Griffen</i> (1953) .....  | 362                |
| <i>Ex parte Sekgome</i> (1910) .....   | 302                |
| <i>Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations</i> (1925) .....  | 69                 |
| <i>Executive Council of the Western Cape Legislature v President of the Republic of South Africa</i> (1995) .....                      | 346                |
| <i>Expenses Opinion</i> (see <i>Certain Expenses of the United Nations (Article 17, Paragraph 2, of the Charter)</i> )                 |                    |
| <i>Ex-Rajah of Coorg v East India Co</i> (1860) .....  | 269, 323           |
| <i>Falco Claim</i> (1959) .....  | 91                 |
| <i>Falla-Nataf v Germany</i> (1927) .....  | 317                |
| <i>Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina v Republika Srpska (re Brčko) (Final Award)</i> (1999) .....                                   | 529                |
| <i>Frost v Stevenson</i> (1937) .....  | 571                |
| <i>Fijian Land Claims (Burt Claim)</i> (1923) .....  | 270                |
| <i>Fisheries Jurisdiction (United Kingdom v Iceland)</i> (1974) .....  | 42, 114            |
| <i>Fogarty v O'Donague</i> (1926) .....  | 658                |
| <i>Forester v Secretary of State</i> (1872) .....  | 323                |
| <i>Foster v Globe Venture Syndicate Ltd</i> (1900) .....   | 262                |
| <i>France v Commission (re EC-US Anti-Trust Agreement)</i> (1994) .....  | 499                |
| <i>Francis v Queen</i> (1956) .....  | 272                |
| <i>Free City of Danzig and the ILO</i> (1930) .....  | 181, 239, 240, 539 |
| <i>Free Zones Case</i> (1932) .....  | 517                |
| <i>Fubini Claim</i> (1959) .....   | 91                 |
| <i>Furundžija Case</i> (see <i>Prosecutor v Furundžija</i> )   |                    |
| <i>Gabčíkovo-Nagymoros Project</i> (see <i>Case Concerning the Gabčíkovo-Nagymoros Project</i> (Hungary/Slovakia))                     |                    |
| <i>Gale v Andrus</i> (1980) .....  | 572, 655           |
| <i>Gastaldi v Lepage Hemery</i> (1929) .....   | 673                |
| <i>German Inter-Zonal Trade Case</i> (1965) .....  | 459                |

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Germany v Reparations Commission (13<sup>th</sup> Question)</i> (1924) .....   | 51, 656       |
| <i>Germany v United States of America</i> (see <i>LaGrand Case</i> )  |               |
| <i>Gibbons v Salii</i> (1986) .....   | 583           |
| <i>Gilmore Steel Corp v Dep't of Revenue</i> (1982) .....   | 43            |
| <i>Go Man Ei v Municipality of Tokyo</i> (1961) .....   | 470           |
| <i>Golovitschiner v Dori</i> (1923) .....   | 679           |
| <i>Gosalia v Agarwal</i> (1981) .....   | 132, 697–98   |
| <i>Government of Morocco v Laurens</i> (1930) .....   | 295, 318      |
| <i>Government of Spain v Chancery Lane Safe Deposit Ltd</i> (1939) .....  | 34–35         |
| <i>Guaranty Trust Co of NY v US</i> (1938) .....  | 653           |
| <i>Gugenheim v State of Vietnam</i> (1955) .....  | 476           |
| <i>Gur Corporation v Trust Bank of Africa Ltd</i> (1987) .....  | 343           |
| <br>  |               |
| <i>Hagi-Salad v Ashcroft</i> (2004) .....   | 414, 722      |
| <i>Haitian Centers Council v McNary</i> (1992) .....  | 642           |
| <i>Harris v Rosario</i> (1980) .....  | 627           |
| <i>Harris v The Minister of the Interior</i> (1952) .....   | 33            |
| <i>Harshaw Chemical Patent Case</i> (1964) .....  | 470           |
| <i>Hartje v Yugoslva Military Mission</i> (1954) .....  | 460, 684      |
| <i>Hearings of Petitioners Case</i> (see <i>Admissibility of Hearings of Petitioners</i><br><i>by the Committee on South West Africa</i> (1956) ) |               |
| <i>Heintschel v Heinegg</i> (1992) .....  | 337           |
| <i>Heller v US</i> (1985) .....   | 32–33         |
| <i>Hesperides Hotels Ltd v Aegean Turkish Holidays Ltd</i> (1977) .....   | 17–18, 147    |
| <i>HKSAR v Ma Wai Kwan</i> (1997) .....   | 252           |
| <i>HKSAR v Ng Kung Siu</i> (1997) .....   | 252           |
| <i>Hoani Te Heuheu Tukino v Aotea District Maori Land Board</i> (1941) . . .  | 265, 269, 272 |
| <i>Hodgson v UESP</i> (1974) .....  | 626           |
| <i>Hoogstraten v Low Lum Seng</i> (1934) .....  | 316           |
| <i>Hopkins Claim</i> (1927) .....   | 23, 167       |
| <i>Hunt v Gordon</i> (1883) .....   | 92            |
| <i>Hunt v The Queen (no 2)</i> (1882) .....   | 92            |
| <i>Huttinger v Upper Congo Ry Co &amp; Ors</i> (1934) .....   | 277           |
| <i>Hyacinth Pellat Case</i> (1929) .....  | 488           |
| <br>  |               |
| <i>Icelandic Fisheries Case (First Phase)</i> (1973) .....  | 131           |
| <i>ICI Ltd v Commission of the European Communities</i> (1972) .....  | 498–99        |
| <i>Idler v Venezuela</i> (see <i>Jacob Idler v Venezuela</i> )  |               |
| <i>Igartúa de la Rosa v United States</i> (2000) .....  | 627           |
| <i>Ilascu v Moldova and Russia</i> (2004) .....   | 83            |
| <i>Ilse Hess v UK</i> (1975) .....  | 685           |
| <i>In re Abdouloussen</i> (1936) .....  | 308           |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <i>In re Al-Fin Corporation's Patent</i> (1970) .....   | 470   |
| <i>In re Bowoon Sangsa Co</i> (1983) .....  | 572   |
| <i>In re Cassèque &amp; Cot</i> (1929) .....  | 570   |
| <i>In re Dalla Torre</i> (1936) .....   | 224   |
| <i>In re Dirks' Patent</i> (1957) .....   | 681   |
| <i>In re Fouad Baddoura</i> (1927) .....  | 570   |
| <i>In re G</i> (1945) .....   | 81  |
| <i>In re G</i> (1997) .....   | 83  |
| <i>In re Grange &amp; LeGlaz</i> (1932) .....   | 295   |
| <i>In re James</i> (1977) .....   | 130   |
| <i>In re Kraussman</i> (1955) .....   | 454, 460  |
| <i>In re Kruger</i> (1951) .....  | 240   |
| <i>In re Labrador Boundary</i> (1927) .....   | 360   |
| <i>In re M (Danzig Conviction Case)</i> (1933) .....  | 240   |
| <i>In re Moriggi</i> (1939) .....   | 222   |
| <i>In re Nepogodin's Estate</i> (1955) .....  | 79  |
| <i>In re Nix</i> (1951) .....   | 240   |
| <i>In re petition of S</i> (1957) .....   | 679   |
| <i>In re Savini</i> (1927) .....  | 701   |
| <i>In re Schwinn Bicycle Co</i> (1995) .....  | 206   |
| <i>In re Société des Phosphates Tunisiens</i> (1929) .....  | 295   |
| <i>In re Southern Rhodesia</i> (1919) .....   | 270, 586  |
| <i>In re Tamasese</i> (1929) .....  | 363   |
| <i>In re Ungarische Kriegsproduktien AG</i> (1920) .....  | 483, 675  |
| <i>In re Wong Hon</i> (1959) .....  | 642   |
| <i>In re YMA</i> (2003) .....   | 43  |
| <i>Indonesia/Malaysia (see Case Concerning Sovereignty over Pulau Ligitan and<br/>Pulau Sipadan (Indonesia/Malaysia))</i> |   |
| <i>Insas BHD v Cumaraswamy</i> (2000) .....   | 43  |
| <i>International Fruit Co NV v Produktschap voor Groeten en Fruit (No 3)</i> (1975) ....                                  | 496   |
| <i>International Registration of Trade Mark (Germany) Case</i> (1959) .....   | 456   |
| <i>International Status of South-West Africa (Advisory Opinion)</i> (1950) ...  | 117, 122, 197,<br>430, 435, 441, 504, 537, 550, 566, 517, 573, 574, 592 |
| <i>Internazionale Handelsgesellschaft mbH v Einfuhr-und Vorratsstelle für<br/>Getreide und Futtermittel</i> (1974) .....  | 495–96  |
| <i>Interpretation of Peace Treaties (Second Phase)</i> (1950) .....   | 41  |
| <i>Interpretation of the Statute of the Memel Territory</i> (1932) .....  | 237–38  |
| <i>Interpretation of the Treaty of Lausanne</i> (1925) .....  | 48, 549, 588, 590   |
| <i>Iraq Airways Company and the Republic of Iraq v Kuwait Airways<br/>Corporation (No 1)</i> (2002) .....                 | 162   |
| <i>Irish Free State v Guaranty Safe Deposit Co</i> (1927) .....   | 658   |
| <i>Island of Bulamu Arbitration</i> (1870) .....  | 258   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Island of Lamu Arbitration</i> (1889) .....   | 262  |
| <i>Island of Palmas</i> (1928) .....   | 46, 62, 258, 263–64, 267,<br>286, 299, 353, 486, 644 |
| <i>Jacob Idler v Venezuela</i> (1885) .....  | 654  |
| <i>Jamar v Kersten</i> (1934) .....  | 277  |
| <i>Jani v Jani</i> (1952) .....  | 299  |
| <i>Jaworzina Case</i> (see <i>Delimitation of the Polish-Czechoslovakian Frontier</i><br>( <i>Question of Jaworzina</i> ))       |  |
| <i>Jayan Nath Sathu v Union of India</i> (1960) .....  | 360  |
| <i>Johnson &amp; Graham's Lessee v McIntosh</i> (1823) .....   | 258, 270, 273  |
| <i>Jolley v Mainka</i> (1933) .....  | 359, 363   |
| <i>JP Morgan Chase Bank v Traffic Stream (BVI) Infrastructure Ltd</i> (2002) .....   | 17   |
| <i>Juda v United States</i> (1987) .....   | 581, 600   |
| <i>Jurisdiction of the Courts of Danzig</i> (1928) .....   | 239  |
| <i>Jurisdiction of the European Commission of the Danube between</i><br><i>Galatz and Braila</i> (1927) .....                    | 14–15, 42, 69, 514–16                                |
| <i>Kaefer and Procacci v France</i> (1990) .....   | 624  |
| <i>Kanda v State of Japan</i> (1961) .....   | 469  |
| <i>Kansas v Colorado</i> (2001) .....  | 486  |
| <i>Kasikili/Sedudu Case (Botswana/Namibia)</i> (see <i>Case Concerning</i><br><i>Kasikili/Sedudu Island (Botswana/Namibia)</i> ) |  |
| <i>Katrantsios v Bulgaria</i> (1926) .....   | 316, 357   |
| <i>Katz &amp; Klump v Yugoslavia</i> (1925) .....  | 692  |
| <i>Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha of Kobe v Bantham Steamship Co Ltd</i><br>(1939) .....  | 17   |
| <i>King</i> (see <i>R</i> )  |  |
| <i>Kletter v Dulles</i> (1953) .....   | 570  |
| <i>Klinghoffer v Achille Lauro</i> (1991) .....  | 438  |
| <i>Knox v Palestine Liberation Organization</i> (2004) .....   | 148  |
| <i>Koowarta v Bjelke-Petersen</i> (1982) .....   | 486  |
| <i>KPMG Peat Marwick v Davison</i> (1996) .....  | 630  |
| <i>Kunstsammlungen zu Weimar v Elicofon</i> (1973) .....   | 458  |
| <i>Kuster v Regierungsrat des Kantons Schwyz</i> (1975)  |  |
| <i>L &amp; JJ v Polish State Rys</i> (1948) .....  | 241  |
| <i>LaGrand Case (Germany v United States of America) (Merits)</i> (2001) .....   | 489  |
| <i>LaGrand Case (Germany v United States of America) (Provisional Measures)</i><br>(1999) .....                                  | 44, 488–89   |
| <i>Laguna del Desierto (Chile-Argentina)</i> (1994) .....  | 241  |
| <i>Lamu Arbitration</i> (see <i>Island of Lamu Arbitration</i> )   |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <i>Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria</i><br>( <i>Cameroon v Nigeria: Equatorial Guinea Intervening</i> )<br>( <i>Merits</i> ) (2002) .....                                      | 311–14, 328, 464, 644, 702   |
| <i>Land and Maritime Boundary Between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v</i><br><i>Nigeria: Equatorial Guinea Intervening) (Preliminary Objections)</i> (1998) ...                                      | .615   |
| <i>Land Registry of Waldsassen v Towns of Eger (Cheb) and</i><br><i>Waldsassen</i> (1965) .....   | .679, 692  |
| <i>Larsen v Hawaiian Kingdom</i> (2001) .....   | .262, 623  |
| <i>Lau Kong Yung v Director of Immigration</i> (2001) .....   | .252   |
| <i>Lazard Bros v Midland Bank Ltd</i> (1933) .....  | .652, 679  |
| <i>Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in</i><br><i>Namibia (South West Africa) Notwithstanding Security Council</i><br><i>Resolution 276 (1970)</i> (1971) ..... | 113, 116, 117,<br>122–23, 162–68, 336, 430, 431, 435,<br>439–40, 441, 493, 494, 536, 551–52,<br>567, 573, 580, 586, 587,<br>591–96, 604–05 |
| <i>Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied</i><br><i>Palestinian Territory (Advisory Opinion)</i> (2004) .....   | .105, 113, 116, 172–73,<br>420–21, 423, 444–45   |
| <i>Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons (Advisory Opinion)</i> (1996) ..  | .42, 104   |
| <i>Legality of Use of Force (NATO Cases)</i> (2004) .....   | .708, 712–14   |
| <i>Lehigh Valley RR Co v State of Russia</i> (1927) .....   | .653   |
| <i>Lei Wei Fang v Kennedy</i> (1963) .....  | .219   |
| <i>Les Verts Case</i> (1986) .....  | .496   |
| <i>Levantesi v Governor of Rome</i> (1940) .....  | .224   |
| <i>Levi Claim</i> (1957) .....  | .91  |
| <i>Liberia v South Africa</i> (see <i>South West Africa Cases</i> )   |  |
| <i>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya/Chad</i> (see <i>Case Concerning the Territorial Dispute</i><br>( <i>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya/Chad</i> ))   |  |
| <i>Liechtenstein v Germany</i> (see <i>Case concerning Certain Property (Liechtenstein v Germany)</i> )   |  |
| <i>Lighthouses Arbitration</i> (1956) .....   | .357   |
| <i>Lighthouses in Crete and Samos</i> (1937) .....  | .354–57  |
| <i>Ligitan and Sipadan</i> (see <i>Case Concerning Sovereignty Over Pulau</i><br><i>Ligitan and Pulau Sipidan (Indonesia/Malaysia)</i> )  |  |
| <i>Littleton's note</i> (1640) .....  | .258   |
| <i>Liyanage v R</i> (1967) .....  | .331   |
| <i>Loizidou v Turkey</i> (1997) .....   | .146–47  |
| <i>Loizidou v Turkey (Merits)</i> (1996) .....  | .81–82, 162  |
| <i>Lone Wolf v Hitchcock</i> (1903) .....   | .269, 274  |
| <i>Lord Gray's Motion</i> (2002) .....  | .676   |
| <i>Lotus</i> (see <i>The Lotus</i> )  |  |

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| <i>Louisiana v Mississippi</i> (1984) .....  | 486                         |
| <i>Lovelace v Canada</i> (1981) .....  | 624                         |
| <i>Lowinsky v Receiver in Bankruptcy</i> (1932) .....  | 679                         |
| <i>Lubicon Lake Band</i> (see <i>Ominayak &amp; Lubicon Lake Band</i> )  |                             |
| <i>Luigi Monta of Genoa v Ceckofracht Ltd</i> (1956) .....   | 17, 219                     |
| <i>Luther v Sagor</i> (1921) .....   | 17, 652                     |
| <br>   |                             |
| <i>M v ONU &amp; Etat Belge</i> (1966) .....   | 494                         |
| <i>Maastricht Urteil</i> (see <i>Case Concerning the Constitutionality of the Maastricht Treaty</i> )                    |                             |
| <i>Mabo v Queensland (No 2)</i> (1992) .....   | 92, 259, 268, 278, 281, 676 |
| <i>Madaha Resena v Independent State of Papua New Guinea</i> (1991) .....  | 270                         |
| <i>Madzimabamuto v Lardner-Burke</i> (1968–9) .....  | 130, 358, 362, 369–70       |
| <i>Magher Singh v Principal Secretary of the Jammu &amp; Kashmir Government</i> (1953) .....                             | 284                         |
| <i>Maharaja Bikram Kishore of Tripura v Province of Assam</i> (1948) .....   | 322                         |
| <i>Maharajah of Tripura v Province of Assam</i> (1948) .....   | 284                         |
| <i>Mangope v Van der Walt</i> (1994) .....   | 347                         |
| <i>Matimak Trading Co v Khalily</i> (1997) .....   | 17                          |
| <i>Matthews v UK</i> (1999) .....  | 624                         |
| <i>Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions</i> (1924) .....  | 429–30                      |
| <i>McDonough's Executors v Murdoch</i> (1853) .....  | 275                         |
| <i>Mellenger v New Brunswick Development Corporation</i> (1971) .....  | 485, 486                    |
| <i>Ménier v PLM Ry Co</i> (1938) .....   | 295                         |
| <i>Metropolitan Chapter in Poznań v State Treasury</i> (1963) .....  | 693                         |
| <i>Mexico v United States</i> (see <i>Case Concerning Avena and Other Mexican Nationals (Mexico v United States)</i> )   |                             |
| <i>Mighell v Sultan of Johore</i> (1894) .....   | 78, 318                     |
| <i>Milirrpum v Nabalco Pty Ltd</i> (1971) .....  | 266, 270                    |
| <i>Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v United States of America)</i> (1986) ..... | 40, 41, 69–70, 154          |
| <i>Millen Industries Inc v Coordination Council for N American Affairs</i> (1988) ..                                     | 18, 205                     |
| <i>Mingtai Fire and Marine Insurance Co Ltd v United Parcel Service</i> (1999) ..  | 205–04                      |
| <i>Ministère Public v Nicoleau</i> (1950) .....  | 295                         |
| <i>Ministry of Finance v Association of Italian Knights of the Order of Malta</i> (1978) .....                           | 232                         |
| <i>Ministry of Immigration &amp; Multicultural Affairs v Haji Ibrahim</i> (2000) ....                                    | 414, 722                    |
| <i>Ministry of Immigration &amp; Multicultural Affairs v Jama</i> (1999) .....   | 414, 722                    |
| <i>Minquiers &amp; Erebos Case</i> (1953) .....  | 321, 351                    |
| <i>Mizrihi v Republic of Cyprus</i> (1963) .....   | 242                         |
| <i>Mohegan Indians v Connecticut</i> (1705, 1743, 1773) .....  | 268                         |
| <i>Mokotso v HM King Moshoeshe II</i> (1989) .....   | 357                         |
| <i>Monastery at St. Naoum (Albanian Frontier)</i> (1924) .....   | 48, 511, 514, 549           |



|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| <i>Monetary Gold removed from Rome in 1943</i> (1954) .....  | 41, 169, 520, 585          |
| <i>Montefiore v Belgian Congo</i> (1955) .....   | 277                        |
| <i>Moore v Attorney General</i> (1935) .....   | 362                        |
| <i>Mordovici v General Administration of Posts &amp; Telegraphs</i> (1929) .....   | 518                        |
| <i>Morgan Guaranty Trust Co v Republic of Palau</i> (1986) .....   | 572                        |
| <i>Morgan Guaranty Trust v Republic of Palau</i> (1991) .....  | 583, 655                   |
| <i>Morocco Case (France v USA)</i> (see <i>Rights of Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco (France v United States)</i> )   |                            |
| <i>Muller v Rockling Bros</i> (1923) .....   | 234                        |
| <i>Murarka v Buckrack Bros</i> (1954) .....  | 367–68                     |
| <i>Murray v Parkes</i> (1942) .....  | 54                         |
| <i>Muscat Dhows Arbitration</i> (1904) .....   | 315, 321                   |
| <i>MV Nonsuco Inc v IRC</i> (1956) .....   | 373                        |
| <br>   |                            |
| <i>Namibia Opinion</i> (see <i>Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) Notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276</i> (1970) ) |                            |
| <i>Nankive v Omsk All Russian Government</i> (1932) .....  | 701                        |
| <i>Nanni v Pace &amp; Sovereign Order of Malta</i> (1935) .....  | 44, 231, 233               |
| <i>Naqara v Minister of the Interior</i> (1953) .....  | 52                         |
| <i>National Bank of Egypt v Austria-Hungary Bank</i> (1924) .....  | 317                        |
| <i>National Bank of Egypt v German Government</i> (1925) .....   | 317                        |
| <i>Nationality (Secession of Austria) Case</i> (1954) .....  | 54                         |
| <i>Nationality Decrees in Tunis and Morocco</i> (1923) .....   | 197, 267, 284, 303–04, 307 |
| <i>NATO Cases (Preliminary Objections)</i> (2004) .....  | 189                        |
| <i>Nauru v Australia</i> (see <i>Case Concerning Certain Phosphate Lands in Nauru (Nauru v Australia) (Preliminary Objections)</i> )   |                            |
| <i>Ndlwana v Hofmeyr</i> (1934) .....  | 353                        |
| <i>Nebraska v Wyoming &amp; Colorado</i> (1993) .....  | 486                        |
| <i>New Jersey v Delaware</i> (1934) .....  | 486                        |
| <i>New Jersey v New York</i> (1998) .....  | 486                        |
| <i>New York Chinese TV Programs Inc v UE Enterprises Inc</i> (1992) .....  | 18, 205                    |
| <i>New York v United States</i> (1992) .....   | 488                        |
| <i>New Zealand Maori Council v Attorney-General</i> (1987) .....   | 272                        |
| <i>Newfoundland and Labrador/Nova Scotia Awards</i> (2001–2) .....   | 486                        |
| <i>Ng Fung Hong Ltd v ABC</i> (1998) .....   | 250                        |
| <i>Ng Ka Ling v Director of Immigration</i> (1999) .....   | 252                        |
| <i>Nicaragua Case</i> (see <i>Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v United States of America)</i> )   |                            |
| <i>Nissan v AG</i> (1970) .....  | 243, 494                   |
| <i>Nolan v Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs</i> (1988) .....  | 482                        |
| <i>North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Case</i> (1910) .....  | 536                        |

|  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| <i>North Charterland Exploration Co v R</i> (1931) .....   | 302                                   |
| <i>North Sea Continental Shelf Cases</i> (1969) .....  | 50                                    |
| <i>Northern Cameroons (Cameroons v United Kingdom)</i> (1963) .....  | 429, 567, 584,<br>596–97, 618, 661–62 |
| <i>Nottebohm Case (Second Phase)</i> (1955) .....  | 6, 52                                 |
| <i>NV Algemeine transport- en Expeditie Ondernemning Van Gend en Laos v<br/>Nederlandse Tariefcommissie</i> (1963) .....     | 499                                   |
| <i>NY Hanseatic Corporation v FRG</i> (1960) .....   | 460                                   |
| <i>Nyali Ltd v AG</i> (1955) .....   | 302                                   |
| <i>O’Conner v United States</i> (1986) .....   | 642                                   |
| <i>O’Reilly v Fox Chapel Area School District</i> (1987) .....   | 43                                    |
| <i>Occidental Exploration &amp; Production Co v Republic of Ecuador</i> (2005) .....   | 29                                    |
| <i>Oetjen v Central Leather Co</i> (1918) .....  | 652                                   |
| <i>Officier van Justitie v Kramer &amp; ors</i> (1976) .....   | 499                                   |
| <i>Ol Le Ngojo v AG</i> (1913) .....   | 269                                   |
| <i>Ominayak &amp; Lubicon Lake Band v Canada</i> (1990) .....  | 279                                   |
| <i>‘Open Skies’ Case (see Commission v Austria &amp; others (Re the ‘Open Skies’<br/>Agreements with the USA))</i>           |                                       |
| <i>Oscar Chinn Case</i> (1934) .....   | 277, 538                              |
| <i>Oseri v Oseri</i> (1952) .....  | 434                                   |
| <i>Ottoman Debt Arbitration</i> (1925) .....   | 676                                   |
| <i>Pablo Najera Claim</i> (1928) .....   | 317                                   |
| <i>Padri Benedetti v Nunzi</i> (1957) .....  | 222                                   |
| <i>Panavezys-Saldutiskis Railway</i> (1939) .....  | 51                                    |
| <i>Parent v Singapore Airlines Ltd</i> (2003) .....  | 201, 205, 219–20                      |
| <i>Parounak v Turkish Government</i> (1929) .....  | 288                                   |
| <i>Pauling v McElroy</i> (1958) .....  | 600                                   |
| <i>Peinitsch v Germany</i> (1923) .....  | 90                                    |
| <i>Pellegrini v Italy</i> (2002) .....   | 232                                   |
| <i>People of Saipan v United States Department of Interior</i> (1973) .....  | 572                                   |
| <i>Phosphates in Morocco</i> (1938) .....  | 285, 295, 314, 315                    |
| <i>Piccoli v Association of Italian Knights of the Order of Malta</i> (1978) .....   | 232                                   |
| <i>Pinochet Case (see R v Bow Street Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrate and<br/>Others, Ex part Pinochet Ugarte (No 3))</i> |                                       |
| <i>Polish Postal Service in Danzig</i> (1925) .....  | 240                                   |
| <i>Polish Upper Silesia Case (see Certain German Interests in Polish Upper Silesia)</i>                                      |                                       |
| <i>Polish War Vessels in the Port of Danzig</i> (1931) .....   | 41, 240                               |
| <i>Polish-Czechoslovakian Frontier (see Delimitation of the<br/>Polish-Czechoslovakian Frontier (Question of Jaworzina))</i> |                                       |
| <i>Ponce v Roman Catholic Apostolic Church</i> (1907) .....  | 226                                   |
| <i>Porter v United States</i> (1974) .....   | 572                                   |

|  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| <i>Portugal v Australia</i> (see <i>Case Concerning East Timor (Portugal v Australia)</i> )  |                          |
| <i>Portugal v India</i> (see <i>Case Concerning Right of Passage over Indian Territory (Portugal v India)</i> )                                  |                          |
| <i>Posadas v National City Bank of New York</i> (1936)   | 373                      |
| <i>Poznanski v Lentz &amp; Hirschfeld</i> (1925)   | 53, 656                  |
| <i>Prince Hans-Adam II of Liechtenstein v Germany</i> (2001)   | 685                      |
| <i>Princess Paley Olga v Weisz</i> (1929)  | 653                      |
| <i>Principality of Monaco v Mississippi</i> (1934)   | 485                      |
| <i>Printz v United States</i> (1997)   | 488                      |
| <i>Prosecutor v Furundžija</i> (1998)  | 101                      |
| <i>Prosecutor v Rajić (Trial Chamber)</i> (1996)   | 83, 134                  |
| <i>Prosecutor v Simić</i> (1999)   | 43                       |
| <i>Prosecutor v Tadić (Jurisdiction)</i> (1995)  | 560                      |
| <i>Prosecutor v Tadić (Trial Chamber)</i> (1997)   | 82                       |
| <i>Prosecutor v Tadić (Appeals Chamber)</i> (1999)   | 82, 528                  |
| <i>Qatar v Bahrain</i> (see <i>Case Concerning Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions Between Qatar and Bahrain (Qatar v Bahrain)</i> ) |                          |
| <i>Quebec Secession Reference</i> (1998)   | 119–20, 376, 389, 411–12 |
| <i>Queen</i> (see <i>R</i> )   |                          |
| <i>Queensland v Commonwealth (Daintree Forest)</i> (1989)  | 486                      |
| <i>Questech v Ministry of National Defence of the Islamic Republic of Iran</i> (1985)  | 673, 679                 |
| <i>R (Bancoult) v Foreign Secretary</i> (2001)   | 125, 303, 337, 646       |
| <i>R v Bottrill ex parte Kuechenmeister</i> (1947)   | 453                      |
| <i>R v Bow Street Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrate and Others, Ex part Pinochet Ugarte (No 3)</i> (2000)                                      | 101                      |
| <i>R v Burgess ex parte Henry</i> (1936)   | 486                      |
| <i>R v Christian</i> (1924)  | 571, 587                 |
| <i>R v Graham Campbell, ex p Moussa</i> (1921)   | 287                      |
| <i>R v IRC ex parte Caglar</i> (1994)  | 162                      |
| <i>R v Ketter</i> (1940)   | 570                      |
| <i>R v Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, ex parte SP Anastasiou (Pissouri) Ltd and others</i> (1994)                                  | 146                      |
| <i>R v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs ex parte Indian Association of Alberta</i> (1982)                                 | 274, 371, 482            |
| <i>R v Symonds</i> (1847)  | 262                      |
| <i>Rabang v Boyd</i> (1957)  | 373                      |
| <i>Radio-Orient Company Case</i> (1940)  | 570                      |
| <i>Railway Pension (Austria) Case</i> (1923)   | 675                      |
| <i>Railway Traffic Between Lithuania and Poland</i> (1931)   | 51                       |

|   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <i>Rainoldi v Ministero della Guerra</i> (1946) .....   | 91                              |
| <i>Rajah Salig Ram v Sec of State</i> (1872) .....  | 323                             |
| <i>Rajíc Case</i> (see <i>Prosecutor v Rajíc</i> )  |                                 |
| <i>Randall v Randall</i> (2003) .....   | 43                              |
| <i>Rann of Kutch Arbitration</i> (1968) .....   | 267, 306–07, 322                |
| <i>Rasul v Bush</i> (2004) .....  | vi, 72, 303                     |
| <i>Re an Inquiry by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs</i> (1958) .....  | 563–64                          |
| <i>Re Boedecker &amp; Ronski</i> (1962) .....   | 197                             |
| <i>Re Compagnie des Eaux d'Hanoi</i> (1963) .....   | 476                             |
| <i>Re Delacher</i> (1962) .....   | 459                             |
| <i>Re Esposito</i> (1899) .....   | 222                             |
| <i>Re Hamou</i> (1955) .....  | 295                             |
| <i>Re Ho</i> (1975)   |                                 |
| <i>Re ILO Convention 170 on Chemicals at Work</i> (1993) .....  | 499                             |
| <i>Re Jackson &amp; Roos</i> (1990) .....   | 689                             |
| <i>Re Resolution to Amend the Constitution</i> (1981) .....   | 371                             |
| <i>Re the European Road Transport Agreement</i> (see <i>Commission v Council (AETR)</i> )   |                                 |
| <i>Re the OECD Understanding on a Local Cost Standard</i> (1976) .....  | 499                             |
| <i>Re WTO Agreements</i> (1994) .....   | 499                             |
| <i>Recidivism (Soviet Zone of Germany) Case</i> (1954) .....  | 454                             |
| <i>Reel v Holder</i> (1981) .....   | 205                             |
| <i>Reference re Newfoundland Continental Shelf</i> (1984) .....   | 359, 701                        |
| <i>Reference re Secession of Quebec</i> (see <i>Quebec Secession Reference</i> )  |                                 |
| <i>Reg v Governor of Belmarsh Prison</i> (2001) .....   | 43                              |
| <i>Rendition of Suspected Criminal (Saar Territory) Case</i> (1955) .....   | 234                             |
| <i>Reparation for Injuries Suffered in the Service of the United Nations</i><br>(1949) .....  | 29–30, 32, 43, 438, 493–94, 536 |
| <i>Reparations Commission v German Government</i> (1924) .....  | 675                             |
| <i>Republic of Somalia v Woodhouse Drake &amp; Carey (Suisse) SA</i> (1993) .....   | 413                             |
| <i>Republic of Transkei v Immigration and Naturalization Service</i> (1991) .....   | 343                             |
| <i>Republic of Vietnam v Pfizer, Inc</i> (1977) .....   | 477, 715                        |
| <i>Republic v Felsenstadt</i> (1922) .....  | 691                             |
| <i>Republic v Pantol</i> (1922) .....   | 691                             |
| <i>Republic v Weisholc</i> (1919) .....   | 691                             |
| <i>Restitution of Household Effects belonging to Jews deported from Hungary</i> (1965) ....   | 87–88                           |
| <i>Revision of the Judgment of 11 July 1996</i> (see <i>Application for Revision of the</i><br><i>Judgment of 11 July 1996 in the Case Concerning Application of the</i><br><i>Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide</i><br><i>(Bosnia and Herzegovina v Yugoslavia), Preliminary Objections (Yugoslavia v</i><br><i>Bosnia and Herzegovina)</i> ) |                                 |
| <i>Richardson v Forestry Comm</i> (1988) .....  | 486                             |
| <i>Right of Passage Case</i> (see <i>Case Concerning Right of Passage over Indian Territory</i><br>( <i>Portugal v India</i> ))   |                                 |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Rights of Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco</i><br>( <i>France v United States</i> ) (1952) . . . . .      | 192, 296, 267, 295–96, 262, 308,<br>305–06, 307, 308, 316, 510, 538–39 |
| <i>Robert E Brown Claim</i> (1926) . . . . .   | 276  |
| <i>Rodriguez v Popular Democratic Party</i> (1982) . . . . .   | 627  |
| <i>Rogers v Lu</i> (1958) . . . . .  | 219  |
| <i>Romania v Cheng</i> (1997) . . . . .  | 18   |
| <i>Roselius &amp; Co v Karsten &amp; Turkish Republic</i> (1926) . . . . .   | 676  |
| <i>Rudolf Hess Case</i> (1980) . . . . .   | 685  |
| <i>Russian Government v Lehigh Valley Railroad Co</i> (1919) . . . . .   | 679  |
| <i>Russian Roubles (Attempted Counterfeiting) Case</i> (1919) . . . . .  | 679  |
| <i>S v Carracelas &amp; ors</i> (2) (1992) . . . . .   | 595  |
| <i>S v Marwane</i> (1982) . . . . .  | 343  |
| <i>Sabally &amp; N'jie v Attorney-General</i> (1965) . . . . .   | 332  |
| <i>Saipan Stevedore v Office of Workers' Compensation Programs</i> (1998) . . . . .  | 655  |
| <i>Sale v Haitian Centers Council</i> (1993) . . . . .   | 642  |
| <i>Salimoff v Standard Oil Co</i> (1933) . . . . .   | 17   |
| <i>Santovincenzo v Egan</i> (1931) . . . . .   | 486  |
| <i>Sausser-Hall Arbitration</i> (see <i>Case of Gold Looted by Germany from Rome in 1943</i> )                                   |  |
| <i>Scarfo v Sovereign Order of Malta</i> (1957) . . . . .  | 223, 233   |
| <i>Sec of State in Council for India v Kamachee</i> (1859) . . . . .   | 323  |
| <i>Sechter v Minister of the Interior</i> (1924) . . . . .   | 518  |
| <i>Secretary of State for India v Sardar Rustam Khan</i> (1941) . . . . .  | 272, 327   |
| <i>Shehadeh v Commissioner of Prisons</i> (1947) . . . . .   | 680  |
| <i>Shtraks v Government of Israel</i> (1964) . . . . .   | 564  |
| <i>Simic Case</i> (see <i>Prosecutor v Simic</i> )   |  |
| <i>Simon v Taylor</i> (1975) . . . . .   | 681  |
| <i>Singh v State of Vinhya Pradesh</i> (1953) . . . . .  | 284  |
| <i>Single German Nationality (Teso) Case</i> (1987) . . . . .  | 681–82, 687  |
| <i>Sirkar v Subramania Iyen</i> (1946) . . . . .   | 284  |
| <i>Smith v Attorney-General, Bophuthatswana</i> (1984) . . . . .   | 343  |
| <i>Smith v US</i> (1991) . . . . .   | 43   |
| <i>Sobhuza II v Miller</i> (1926) . . . . .  | 262, 287, 302  |
| <i>Soc Immobiliare Roma-Trieste v Stabilimento Tipografico Triestino e</i><br><i>Soc Editrice del 'Piccolo'</i> (1952) . . . . . | 236  |
| <i>Società ABC v Fontana and Della Rocca</i> (1954) . . . . .  | 572  |
| <i>Società Teatro Puccini v Commissioner-General of the Government</i><br><i>for the Territory of Trieste</i> (1961) . . . . .   | 235–36   |
| <i>Socony Vacuum Oil Co Claim</i> (1954) . . . . .   | 79–80  |
| <i>Sokoloff v National City Bank</i> (1924) . . . . .  | 17   |
| <i>South West Africa (Status)</i> (see <i>International Status of South West Africa (Advisory</i><br><i>Opinion)</i> (1950) )    |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>South West Africa (Hearings of Petitioners)</i> (see <i>Admissibility of Hearings of Petitioners by the Committee on South West Africa</i> (1956) ) |  |
| <i>South West Africa Cases (Ethiopia v South Africa; Liberia v South Africa)</i> (First Phase/Preliminary Objections) (1962) . . . . .                 | 103, 587, 597                                    |
| <i>South West Africa Cases (Ethiopia v South Africa; Liberia v South Africa)</i> (Second Phase/Merits) (1966) . . . . .                                | 103, 108, 345, 359, 532, 580, 581, 587, 594, 597 |
| <i>Southern Cross Overseas Agencies, Inc v Wah Kwong Shipping Group Ltd</i> (1999) . . . .   | 17   |
| <i>Sovereign Order of Malta v Brunelli, Tacali &amp; Ors</i> (1931) . . . . .  | 232  |
| <i>Sovereign Order of Malta v Soc An Commerciale</i> (1954) . . . . .  | 232, 233   |
| <i>Sovereignty over Pulau Ligitan and Pulau Sipadan</i> (see <i>Case concerning Sovereignty Over Pulau Ligitan and Pulau Sipadan</i> )                 |  |
| <i>Spanish Civil War Pension Case</i> (1978) . . . . .   | 35   |
| <i>Spanish Zone of Morocco Claims</i> (1928) . . . . .   | 305, 308, 315                                    |
| <i>State of Missouri v Holland</i> (1920) . . . . .  | 486  |
| <i>State of Spain v Chancery Lane Safe Deposit Ltd</i> (1939) . . . . .  | 34–35  |
| <i>State v Banda and 194 others</i> (1989) . . . . .   | 342–43   |
| <i>State v Dosso</i> (1958) . . . . .  | 679  |
| <i>State v Hynes</i> (1961) . . . . .  | 359  |
| <i>Statham v Statham &amp; Gaekwar of Baroda</i> (1912) . . . . .  | 318, 321   |
| <i>Status of the Saar Territory Case</i> (1930) . . . . .  | 234  |
| <i>Status Opinion (South West Africa)</i> (see <i>International Status of South-West Africa (Advisory Opinion)</i> (1950) )                            |  |
| <i>Statute of the Saar Territory</i> (1955) . . . . .  | 234  |
| <i>Studer Claim</i> (1925) . . . . .   | 315  |
| <i>Sue v Hill</i> (1999) . . . . .   | 482  |
| <i>Sultan of Johore v Abubakar</i> (1952) . . . . .  | 318  |
| <i>Suspine v CTC</i> (1941) . . . . .  | 373  |
| <i>Tadić Case</i> (see <i>Prosecutor v Tadić</i> )   |  |
| <i>Taiwan v United States District Court</i> (1997) . . . . .  | 206  |
| <i>Tangiora v Wellington District Legal Services Committee</i> (1999) . . . . .  | 44   |
| <i>Tasmania v Commonwealth (Tasmanian Dams)</i> (1983) . . . . .   | 486  |
| <i>Tee-Hit-Ton Indians v US</i> (1955) . . . . .   | 270, 274   |
| <i>Temple Case</i> (1962) . . . . .  | 261  |
| <i>Territorial Jurisdiction of the Oder Commission</i> (1929) . . . . .  | 42   |
| <i>Territory (Trade Marks) Case</i> (1934) . . . . .   | 233–34   |
| <i>Teso Case</i> (see <i>Single German Nationality (Teso) Case</i> )   |  |
| <i>Texas v New Mexico</i> (1987) . . . . .   | 486  |
| <i>The Arantzazu Mendi</i> (1939) . . . . .  | 17   |
| <i>The Bathori</i> (1934) . . . . .  | 236  |
| <i>The Blonde</i> (1921) . . . . .   | 240  |
| <i>The Case of Tanistry</i> (1608) . . . . .   | 278, 676   |

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| <i>The Fjeld</i> (1950) .....   | 434             |
| <i>The Flying Trader</i> (1950) .....   | 434             |
| <i>The Helena</i> (1801) .....  | 92–93           |
| <i>The Holy See v Star Bright Sales Enterprises Inc</i> (1994) .....  | 227             |
| <i>The Indian Chief</i> (1801) .....  | 327             |
| <i>The Ionian Ships</i> (1855) .....  | 316             |
| <i>The Jupiter (No 3)</i> (1927) .....  | 653             |
| <i>The Laconia</i> (1863) .....   | 301             |
| <i>The Lotus</i> (1927) .....   | 41–42, 240, 595 |
| <i>The Madonna del Burso</i> (1802) .....   | 262             |
| <i>The Magellan Pirates</i> (1853) .....  | 262             |
| <i>The Sapphire v Napoleon III</i> (1871) .....   | 679             |
| <i>The Wimbledon</i> (1923) .....   | 69, 536         |
| <i>Theodore v Duncan</i> (1919) .....   | 359             |
| <i>Thome Guadalupe v Assoc Italiana di S Cecilia</i> (1937) .....   | 221–22          |
| <i>Thomson v Thomson</i> (1994) .....   | 486             |
| <i>Tinoco Arbitration</i> (1923) .....  | 23, 388, 680    |
| <i>TP Sankara Rao v Municipal Council of Masulipatam</i> (1957) .....   | 367             |
| <i>Trafficante v Ministry of Defence</i> (1961) .....   | 572             |
| <i>Traunik v Lennox</i> (1985) .....  | 685             |
| <i>Treatment of Polish Nationals in Danzig</i> (1932) .....   | 239, 240        |
| <i>Trenta v Ragonesi</i> (1935) .....   | 222             |
| <i>Trésor Public v Air Laos</i> (1960) .....  | 476             |
| <i>Treves Claim</i> (1956) .....  | 91              |
| <i>Trial of Gauleiter Artur Greiser</i> (1946) .....  | 241             |
| <i>Trinh v Citibank</i> (1988) .....  | 476             |
| <i>Tunis and Morocco Nationality Decrees</i> (see <i>Nationality Decrees in Tunis and Morocco</i> )   |                 |
| <br>  |                 |
| <i>Underhill v Hernandez</i> (1897) .....   | 652             |
| <i>United States ex rel Zeller v Watkins</i> (1948) .....   | 240             |
| <i>United States Nationals in Morocco</i> (see <i>Rights of Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco (France v United States)</i> ) |                 |
| <i>United States v Alaska</i> (1997) .....  | 486             |
| <i>United States v Guerrero</i> (1993) .....  | 582, 655        |
| <i>United States v Kagama</i> (1886) .....  | 269, 274        |
| <i>United States v Krupp</i> (1949) .....   | 101–02          |
| <i>United States v Lara</i> (2004) .....  | 486             |
| <i>United States v Murff</i> (1959) .....   | 219             |
| <i>United States v Palestine Liberation Organization</i> (1988) .....   | 195             |
| <i>United States v Pink</i> (1942) .....  | 545, 653        |
| <i>United States v Quinones</i> (1985) .....  | 626             |
| <i>United States v Sanders</i> (1956) .....   | 468             |
| <i>United States v Shaughnessy</i> (1954) .....   | 219             |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>United States v Shell</i> (1957) .....  | 468  |
| <i>United States v Tiede</i> (1979) .....  | 642  |
| <i>United States v Valentine</i> (1968) .....  | 633  |
| <i>United States v Vargas</i> (1974) .....   | 626  |
| <i>United States v Wheeler</i> (1978) .....  | 273  |
| <i>Valk v Kokes</i> (1950) .....   | 702  |
| <i>Vearncombe, Herbst, Clemens, Spielhagen v UK and Federal<br/>Republic of Germany</i> (1989) .....   | 684–85   |
| <i>Veysi Dag v Secretary of State for the Home Dept</i> (2000) .....   | 167  |
| <i>Victoria v Commonwealth</i> (1996) .....  | 486  |
| <i>Voting Procedure Case</i> (1955) .....  | 113, 550–51, 588, 594  |
| <i>Vozneac v Autonomous Admn of Posts &amp; Telegraphs</i> (1931) .....  | 518  |
| <i>Wall Case</i> (see <i>Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied<br/>Palestinian Territory (Advisory Opinion)</i> ) |  |
| <i>Wandeweghe v BCI</i> (1973) .....   | 496  |
| <i>Warman v Francis</i> (1958) .....   | 269–70   |
| <i>Weber v USSR</i> (1942) .....   | 679  |
| <i>Webster Claim</i> (1925) .....  | 270  |
| <i>West Rand Central Gold Mining Co v R</i> (1905) .....   | 276  |
| <i>Western Sahara (Advisory Opinion)</i> (1975) .....  | 41, 60, 116, 123–24, 237,<br>258, 259, 262, 265, 266–67, 384, 432,<br>479, 567, 602, 605, 613, 615, 616–17,<br>620, 621, 639–40, 644, 646, 698 |
| <i>White v McLean</i> (1890) .....   | 265  |
| <i>Wildermann v Stinnes</i> (1924) .....   | 53, 518  |
| <i>Williams v Bruffy</i> (1877) .....  | 652  |
| <i>Williams v Lee</i> (1959) .....   | 273  |
| <i>Winterbottom v Vardan &amp; Sons Ltd</i> (1921) .....   | 265  |
| <i>Wiparata v Bishop of Wellington</i> (1877) .....  | 265–66   |
| <i>Witrong &amp; Blany</i> (1674) .....  | 278, 676   |
| <i>Worcester v State of Georgia</i> (1832) .....   | 269, 273–74, 300   |
| <i>Wulfohn v RSFSR</i> (1923) .....  | 17, 23   |
| <i>Wurtemberg &amp; Prussia v Baden</i> (1927) .....   | 486  |
| <i>Yrisarri v Clement</i> (1825) .....   | 17   |
| <i>Zander Claim</i> (1851) .....   | 658  |
| <i>Zannoni v Sbisà</i> (1920) .....  | 236  |
| <i>Ziat Claim</i> (1924) .....   | 315  |
| <i>Ziv v Gubernik</i> (1948) .....   | 434  |



## *Select Table of Treaties and Other Instruments*

| CE   |        |  | Page Reference |
|------|--------|--|----------------|
| 1373 | 16 Jun | Treaty of Alliance with Portugal<br>(Great Britain–Portugal)   | 676            |
| 1713 | 17 Jul | Treaty of Utrecht (Great Britain–Spain)  | 348, 643       |
| 1763 | 10 Feb | Definitive Treaty of Peace<br>(France–Great Britain–Spain)   | 377, 411       |
| 1774 | 10 Jul | Treaty of Kuçuk Kainardji (Russia–Turkey)  | 507            |
| 1778 | 6 Feb  | Treaty of Amity and Commerce<br>(France–USA)   | 377            |
| 1779 | 10 Mar | Treaty of Ainchik–Kavak (Russia–Turkey)  | 507            |
|      | 4 May  | Treaty of Poona (Portugal–Mahratta Empire)   | 615            |
| 1782 | 4 Oct  | Treaty of Amity and Commerce<br>(USA–Netherlands)  | 377            |
|      | 30 Nov | Preliminary Articles of Peace<br>(Great Britain–USA)   | 377            |
| 1792 | 9 Jan  | Treaty of Jassy (Austria–Russia)   | 507            |
| 1812 | 16 May | Treaty of Bucharest (Russia–Turkey)  | 507            |
| 1814 | 30 May | Treaty of Paris (Austria–Great Britain–<br>Portugal–Prussia–Russia–Sweden–France)                        | 285            |
| 1815 | 9 Jun  | Final Act of the Congress of Vienna<br>(Austria–France–Great Britain–Portugal–<br>Prussia–Russia–Sweden) | 505–6, 542     |
|      | 20 Nov | Definitive Treaty of Peace (Austria,<br>Great Britain, Prussia and Russia–France)                        | 734            |
| 1817 | 7 Nov  | Treaty of Protection (Monaco–Sardinia)   | 734            |
| 1818 | 15 Nov | Protocol of the Conference at Aix-la-Chapelle<br>(Austria–France–Great Britain–<br>Prussia–Russia)       | 543, 547, 548  |
| 1826 | 4 Apr  | St. Petersburg Protocol (Russia–Great Britain)   | 541            |
|      | 25 Sep | Treaty of Akkerman (Russia–Turkey)   | 507            |
| 1827 | 6 Jul  | Treaty for the Pacification of Greece<br>(France–Great Britain–Greece)                                   | 541            |
| 1829 | 14 Sep | Treaty of Adrianople (Russia–Turkey)   | 507, 541       |

| CE   |        |   | Page Reference      |
|------|--------|---|---------------------|
| 1830 | 3 Feb  | Protocol respecting independence of Greece (France–Great Britain–Russia)  | 542                 |
| 1831 | 15 Nov | Treaty for the definitive separation of Belgium from Holland (Austria–France–Great Britain–Prussia–Russia–Belgium)  | 543                 |
| 1839 | 19 Apr | Treaty between Belgium and the Netherlands relative to the separation of their respective territories (Belgium–Netherlands)   | 544                 |
| 1840 | 6 Feb  | Treaty of Waitangi (Great Britain–New Zealand)  | 265, 268–9, 272     |
| 1842 | 29 Aug | Treaty of Nanking (China–Great Britain)   | 245                 |
| 1846 | 15 Apr | Convention between Austria, Prussia and Russia for the Definitive Incorporation of Cracow in Austria (Austria–Prussia–Russia)   | 234                 |
| 1849 | 10 Apr | Articles between Russia and Turkey for the more effective protection of the immunities and privileges of the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia (Treaty of Balta–Liman)                         | 507                 |
| 1852 | 20 Nov | Treaty relative to the Succession to the Crown of Greece (Great Britain–Bavaria–Russia–France–Greece)   | 542                 |
| 1854 | 28 Mar | British Declaration of the Causes of War against Russia   | 506                 |
| 1856 | 30 Mar | Treaty of Paris (General Treaty for the Re-establishment of Peace) (Great Britain–Austria–France–Prussia–Russia–Sardinia–Turkey)  | 14, 507–8, 514, 536 |
| 1862 | 22 Mar | Convention of Good Neighbourship (Italy–San Marino)   | 736                 |
| 1865 | 7 May  | International Telegraph Union   | 493                 |
| 1867 | 11 May | Treaty relative to the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg (Austria, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, Netherlands, Prussia, Russia)   | 733                 |
| 1871 | 13 Mar | Treaty for the revision of the stipulations of the Treaty of 30 March 1856 (Navigation of the Black Sea and Danube) (Austria–Hungary, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Prussia, Russia, Turkey) | 508                 |
|      | 22 Dec | Treaty of Commerce (US–Orange Free State)   | 276                 |

| CE   |        |  | Page Reference               |
|------|--------|--|------------------------------|
| 1874 | 1 Apr  | Treaty of Friendship, Establishment & Commerce (Belgium–Orange Free State)   | 276                          |
|      | 9 Oct  | Treaty of Berne (General Postal Union)   | 493                          |
| 1878 | 3 Mar  | Treaty of San Stefano (Russia–Turkey)  | 508–9                        |
|      | 13 Jul | Treaty of Berlin (Treaty for the Settlement of Affairs in the East) (Great Britain, Austria–Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Turkey) | 504, 509, 514, 285, 508, 735 |
| 1881 | 3 Aug  | Convention between Great Britain and the Transvaal Burghers  | 276, 690                     |
| 1883 | 10 Mar | Treaty relative to the navigation of the Danube (Treaty of London) (Austria–Hungary, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Russia, Turkey)  | 514–5                        |
| 1884 | 27 Feb | Convention for the Settlement of the Transvaal Territory (Convention of London) (Great Britain–South African Republic)                       | 276, 690                     |
| 1885 | 26 Feb | General Act of the Conference respecting the Congo   | 301, 307, 509                |
| 1888 | 17 Sep | Protectorate Agreement (Great Britain, Datus and Chiefs of Rembau (Malay States) )   | 297–8                        |
| 1892 | 22 Mar | Treaty Between Great Britain and the Chief of Bahrain  | 291                          |
| 1895 | 17 Apr | Treaty of Shimonoseki (China–Japan)  | 198, 207                     |
| 1900 | 18 May | Treaty of Amity (Tonga–United Kingdom)   | 290                          |
| 1903 | 23 Feb | Agreement for Coaling and Naval Stations (Cuba–USA)  | 642                          |
|      | 22 May | Treaty between Cuba and the United States determining their relations  | 72                           |
|      | 18 Nov | Convention for the Construction of a Ship Canal) (Isthmian Canal Convention) (Panama–USA)  | 642                          |
| 1905 | 17 Nov | Protectorate Agreement (Japan–Korea)   | 466                          |
| 1906 | 7 Apr  | General Act of the International Conference at Algeciras relating to the Affairs of Morocco  | 285, 294, 510                |
|      | 27 Apr | Convention between Great Britain and China (relating to Tibet)   | 324                          |
| 1907 | 31 Aug | Convention between Great Britain and Russia relating to Persia, Afghanistan, and Thibet  | 324, 327                     |

| CE   |        | Page Reference   |  |
|------|--------|--|--|
| 1908 | 20 Apr | Agreement of 1908 amending Trade Regulations in Tibet between Great Britain, China and Tibet | 324  |
| 1910 | 22 Aug | Treaty of Annexation (Japan–Korea)   | 466  |
| 1912 | 30 Mar | Treaty for the Organisation of the Protectorate (Treaty of Fez) (France–Morocco)             | 294–6, 307,<br>734   |
|      | 27 Nov | Convention Respecting Relations in Morocco (France–Spain)                                    | 734  |
| 1913 | 30 May | Treaty of Peace (Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey)                            | 357, 510, 727  |
|      | 17 Dec | Protocol of Florence (Albania–Greece–Serbia)   | 511  |
| 1914 | 3 Jul  | Simla Convention (China–Great Britain–Tibet)   | 325  |
| 1915 | 26 Apr | Treaty of London (Secret Treaty of London) (France–Great Britain–Italy–Russia)               | 511, 516, 532,<br>541  |
| 1916 | 16 May | Sykes–Picot Agreement (France–Great Britain)   | 422  |
| 1917 | 2 Nov  | Balfour Declaration  | 361–2, 364,<br>366, 422–3  |
| 1918 | 3 Mar  | Treaty of Brest–Litovsk (Austria–Hungary, Bulgaria, Germany, Turkey, Russia)                 | 518  |
|      | 17 Jul | Treaty of Protective Amity (Monaco–France)   | 292–3, 517   |
| 1919 | 28 Apr | Covenant of the League of Nations  |  |
|      |        | art 1(2)   | 176–7  |
|      |        | art 4  | 545  |
|      |        | art 5  | 545  |
|      |        | art 16(4)  | 587  |
|      |        | art 22   | 116, 422,<br>425–6, 428–9,<br>436, 441, 519,<br>533–4, 566,<br>568–70, 597,<br>574–5, 579,<br>587–8, 604–6 |
|      | 28 Jun | Treaty of Versailles   | 237–8, 240,<br>360–1, 363–4,<br>515–7, 520–1,<br>531, 533–5,<br>537, 545, 665,<br>692, 742–3               |
|      | 8 Aug  | Treaty of Peace (Afghanistan–Great Britain)  | 727  |

| CE   |   | Page Reference                                     |
|------|---|--|
|      | 10 Sep Treaty of St Germain-en-Laye<br>(Principal Allied and Associated Powers<br>and Austria)  | 63–4, 517, 531,<br>535, 538, 549,<br>665, 675, 728 |
|      | 13 Oct Paris Convention for the Regulation of<br>Aerial Navigation  | 365  |
|      | 27 Nov Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine (Principal Allied<br>and Associated Powers and Bulgaria)   | 516–7, 531   |
| 1920 | 9 Feb Treaty concerning the Archipelago of<br>Spitsbergen (Norway–USA–Denmark–France–<br>Italy–Japan–Netherlands–Great Britain–<br>Sweden) (Svalbard Treaty)  | 266  |
|      | 4 Jun Treaty of Trianon (Principal Allied and<br>Associated Powers and Hungary)   | 516–7, 531,<br>534–5, 549,<br>665, 675             |
|      | 10 Aug Treaty of Sèvres (Principal Allied Powers<br>and Turkey)   | 422–3,<br>516–7, 533                               |
|      | 25 Sep Treaty of Sib (Muscat–Oman)  | 325–6  |
|      | 14 Oct Treaty of Peace between Finland and Russia<br>(Treaty of Dorpat)   | 531  |
|      | 28 Oct Treaty of Paris (respecting Bessarabia)<br>(Romania and the Principal Allied Powers)   | 518  |
|      | 9 Nov Treaty of Paris (Danzig–Poland)   | 239  |
|      | 12 Nov Treaty of Rapallo (Italy–Yugoslavia)   | 534  |
| 1921 | 24 Jun Resolution of the League of Nations (approving<br>Agreement between Sweden and Finland<br>relative to special rights in the Åland Islands)   | 111  |
|      | 23 Jul Definitive Statute of the Danube   | 515  |
|      | 25 Jul Treaty for Customs Union between<br>Luxembourg and Belgium   | 535  |
|      | 24 Aug Treaty of Peace (Austria–USA)  | 516  |
|      | 25 Aug Treaty of Peace (Germany–USA)  | 516  |
|      | 29 Aug Treaty of Peace (Hungary–USA)  | 516  |
|      | 20 Oct Convention relating to the Status of the<br>Åland Islands (neutrality provisions and<br>League guarantee) (British Empire, Denmark,<br>Esthonia, Finland, France, Germany, Italy,<br>Latvia, Poland, Sweden) | 111  |
|      | 6 Dec Articles of Agreement for a Treaty between<br>Great Britain and Ireland   | 331  |
|      | 6 Dec Irish State Treaty (Great Britain–Ireland)  | 356, 363   |

| CE   |          |   | Page Reference   |
|------|----------|---|--|
| 1922 | 24 Jul   | Mandate Agreement (France in Lebanon and Syria)   | 570  |
|      | 24 Jul   | Palestine Mandate (Great Britain in Palestine)  | 570  |
|      | 4 Oct    | Protocol of Geneva (respecting Austro–German political union)   | 63–4, 537–8  |
|      | 10 Oct   | Treaty of Alliance (Great Britain–Iraq)   | 575  |
| 1923 | 2 Mar    | Halibut Fisheries Treaty (Canadian–United States)   | 360  |
|      | 24 Jul   | Treaty of Peace with Turkey (Treaty of Lausanne)  | 288, 354,<br>364–5, 423,<br>430, 516–7,<br>531, 534,<br>588–9, 741 |
| 1924 | 27 Jan   | Treaty respecting Fiume (Italy–Yugoslavia)  | 534–5  |
|      | 8 May    | Convention Concerning the Territory of Memel (British Empire, France, Italy, Japan and Lithuania)   | 237  |
|      | 27 Sep   | Decision of the Council of the League (confirming Mandate of Great Britain in Iraq)   | 569, 575   |
| 1925 | 5–16 Oct | Treaties of Locarno (Belgium–Czechoslovakia–Germany–Great Britain–France–Poland)  | 364  |
| 1926 | 13 Jan   | Treaty amending the Treaty of Alliance of 1922 (Great Britain–Iraq)   | 569  |
|      | 22 Jun   | Boundary Agreement (South Africa–Portugal)  | 568  |
| 1928 | 20 Feb   | Agreement between the United Kingdom and Transjordan respecting the Administration of the Latter (United Kingdom–Transjordan)                     | 423, 578   |
|      | 20 Feb   | Treaty between Great Britain and Emir Abdullah (respecting Transjordan)   | 571, 578   |
|      | 27 Aug   | Treaty between the United States and other Powers providing for the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy (Kellogg–Briand Pact) | 519  |
| 1929 | 11 Feb   | Treaty between the Holy See and Italy establishing the Vatican State (Lateran Treaty)   | 222–5  |
|      | 12 Oct   | Convention for the Unification of certain rules regarding International Transport (Warsaw Convention)   | 206, 316   |

| CE   |        | Page Reference  |
|------|--------|---|
| 1930 | 30 Jun | Treaty of Alliance (Great Britain–Iraq) 73, 575, 741  |
| 1932 | 9 Dec  | International Telecommunications Convention 493, 570  |
| 1933 | 26 Dec | Convention on the Rights and Duties of States (Montevideo Convention) 46, 436–40, 484                                 |
| 1934 | 29 May | Treaty of Relations (United States–Cuba) 642  |
| 1936 | 9 Sep  | Treaty of Alliance (France–Syria) 570, 741  |
|      | 13 Nov | Treaty of Alliance (France–Lebanon) 570, 742  |
| 1939 | 31 Mar | Treaty of Friendship and Bon Voisinage (Italy–San Marino) 289   |
|      | 23 Aug | Secret Protocol to the Non-Aggression Pact (Germany–USSR) 522   |
| 1941 | 14 Aug | Atlantic Charter (UK–USA) 112, 519  |
| 1942 | 29 Jan | Tripartite Treaty of Alliance (UK–USSR–Iran) 86   |
| 1943 | 30 Oct | Moscow Declaration (UK–USA–USSR) 520  |
| 1944 | 12 Sep | Protocol on the Zones of Occupation in Germany and the Administration of ‘Greater Berlin’ (UK–USA–USSR) 452, 459, 461 |
| 1945 | 4 Jun  | Berlin Declaration (France–UK–USA–USSR) 453, 457, 523   |
|      | 26 Jun | Charter of the United Nations 157, 170, 172, 504, 523, 545, 551, 677  |
|      |        | art 1 639   |
|      |        | art 1(2) 112, 114   |
|      |        | art 2(4) 6, 131–47, 147   |
|      |        | art 2(7) 304  |
|      |        | art 3 177   |
|      |        | art 4 174, 179–80, 190, 192   |
|      |        | art 11 405  |
|      |        | art 11(2) 175   |
|      |        | art 17 550  |
|      |        | art 17(2) 405, 557  |
|      |        | art 23(1) 705   |
|      |        | art 24 164  |
|      |        | art 25 164  |
|      |        | art 32 129, 175, 190–1, 385   |

|        |  |  |
|--------|--|--|
| 26 Jun | Charter of the United Nations ( <i>cont.</i> ) |  |
|        | art 33   | 220  |
|        | art 35   | 326  |
|        | art 35(2)                                      | 175, 190–1, 323  |
|        | art 39   | 405, 522   |
|        | art 42   | 552  |
|        | art 51   | 131, 475   |
|        | art 55   | 112, 114, 639  |
|        | art 73   | 116–7, 603–6,<br>608, 611–3, 621   |
|        | art 73(b)                                      | 114, 621   |
|        | art 73(c)                                      | 621, 631   |
|        | art 73(e)                                      | 117–8, 607–11,<br>622, 627, 746  |
|        | art 74   | 606–7, 611   |
|        | art 76(b)                                      | 114, 116, 566,<br>584  |
|        | art 77(2)                                      | 117  |
|        | art 77(1)(c)                                   | 117, 589, 600  |
|        | art 78   | 601, 611   |
|        | art 79   | 581  |
|        | art 80   | 428–9, 436,<br>441–2   |
|        | art 81   | 494  |
|        | art 82   | 581, 590   |
|        | art 85   | 590  |
|        | art 85(1)                                      | 581  |
|        | art 87(b)                                      | 574  |
|        | art 93(1)                                      | 191  |
|        | art 93(2)                                      | 175, 191–2   |
|        | art 105  | 494  |
|        | art 108  | 601  |
|        | Chapter VI                                     | 527  |
|        | Chapter VII                                    | 160, 162, 190,<br>403, 405, 494,<br>527, 557–8,<br>560, 563, 666,<br>689 |
|        | Chapter IX                                     | 606  |
|        | Chapter XI                                     | 113, 116–8,<br>125, 127, 129,<br>142, 169, 249,                          |



| CE   |  | Page Reference   |
|------|--|--|
|      | Chapter XI ( <i>cont.</i> )  | 373, 390, 573,<br>603, 604–5,<br>606–12, 622,<br>624, 626,<br>632–4, 637,<br>642, 644–6, 750 |
|      | Chapter XII  | 113, 117, 390,<br>560, 566, 591,<br>600, 604,<br>611–2, 614, 622                             |
|      | Chapter XIII   | 116, 560, 566,<br>600, 622   |
|      | 9 Jul Agreement on the Zones of Occupation in Austria and the Administration of the City of Vienna (USA–USSR–UK–France)  | 521  |
|      | 14 Aug Treaty of Alliance and Friendship (China–USSR)  | 199  |
| 1946 | 6 Mar Franco–Vietnamese Preliminary Convention and Annex (France–Vietnam)  | 472  |
|      | 22 Mar Treaty of Alliance (United Kingdom–Transjordan)   | 423–4, 578,<br>741   |
|      | 11 Jun Headquarters Agreement between the United Nations and Switzerland   | 185  |
|      | 28 Jun Agreement on the machinery of control in Austria (UK–USA–USSR–France)   | 521  |
|      | 26 Jul Agreement regarding amendments to the Protocol of 12 September 1944 on the zones of occupation in Germany and the administration of ‘Greater Berlin’ (USA–USSR–UK–France) | 452  |
| 1947 | 10 Feb Treaty of Peace with Italy  | 81, 235, 327,<br>519–20, 522,<br>535, 550,<br>553–4, 657, 744                                |
|      | 10 Feb Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria   | 519  |
|      | 10 Feb Treaty of Peace with Finland  | 519  |
|      | 10 Feb Treaty of Peace with Hungary  | 519  |
|      | 10 Feb Treaty of Peace with Roumania   | 519, 522   |
|      | 2 Apr Trusteeship Agreement for the former Japanese Mandated Islands (USA–Security Council)  | 530, 581–3,<br>589–91  |
|      | 30 Oct General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade  | 251  |

| CE   |   | Page Reference                               |
|------|---|--|
|      | 31 Oct Agreement between the United States and the United Nations Regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations  | 194  |
|      | 29 Nov Future Government of Palestine, GA Res 181 (II) (Partition Resolution)   | 424–36                                       |
| 1948 | 24 Jan Franco–Lebanese Agreement (France–Lebanon)   | 577  |
|      | 4 Feb Protocol to Specify the Line of the State Boundary between the People’s Republic of Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics   | 178  |
|      | 5 Jun Declaration Regarding the Independence of Viet-Nam  | 739  |
|      | 10 Dec Universal Declaration on Human Rights, GA res 217(III)   | 491, 604                                     |
| 1949 | 7 Feb Franco–Syrian Financial Agreement (France–Syria)  | 577  |
|      | 4 May Agreement relating to the removal of restrictions on communication, transportation and trade between Berlin and the Eastern and Western Zones of Germany (France–UK–USA)  | 459  |
|      | 14 May Principles Governing the relationship between the Allied Kommandatura and Greater Berlin   | 460  |
|      | 8 Aug Treaty of Friendship (Bhutan–India)   | 289  |
|      | 12 Aug Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea; Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War | 82, 156–7, 233, 420, 440, 470, 476, 495, 721 |
|      | 12 Aug Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War  | 172–3, 562                                   |
|      | 2 Nov Round Table Conference Agreement (Netherlands–Indonesia)  | 384  |
|      | 22 Nov Protocol relating to the incorporation of Germany into the European Community of Nations   | 454  |

| CE   |        | Page Reference   |   |
|------|--------|--|---|
| 1950 | 6 Jul  | Agreement concerning the demarcation of the established and existing Polish–German State frontier (Poland–GDR) (Treaty of Görlitz) | 525, 682  |
|      | 4 Nov  | European Convention on Human Rights  | 491   |
|      | 2 Dec  | Trusteeship Agreement (Italian Somaliland)   | 572   |
| 1951 | 12 Jan | Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide   | 663   |
|      | 2 Feb  | Treaty of Cession of the Territory of the Free Town of Chandernagore (France–India)  | 748   |
|      | 18 Apr | Treaty Establishing the European Coal and Steel Community  | 496–7   |
|      | 23 May | Agreement on Administration of Tibet (China–Tibet)   | 325   |
|      | 8 Sep  | Treaty of Peace with Japan   | 78–9, 199–200, 207–11, 277, 468, 470, 477, 519–20, 522, 530, 589, 744 |
| 1952 | 28 Apr | Treaty of Peace (China–Japan)  | 200, 220  |
|      | 26 May | Convention on Relations between the Three Powers and the FRG (France–UK–USA–FRG)   | 454–5   |
|      | 26 May | The Quadripartite Declaration on Berlin (France–UK–USA–USSR)   | 460   |
| 1954 | 21 Jul | Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference (accepted by France, UK, USSR, Cambodia, Laos, China, North Vietnam (DRVN))             | 474   |
|      | 5 Oct  | Memorandum of Understanding regarding the Free Territory of Trieste (Italy–UK–USA–Yugoslavia)                                      | 235–6   |
|      | 11 Nov | Trade and Payments Agreement (Great Britain–Poland)  | 693   |
|      | 2 Dec  | Mutual Defence Treaty (USA–China)  | 200, 220  |
| 1955 | 15 May | State treaty for the re-establishment of an independent and democratic Austria (Austria–France–USSR–UK–USA)                        | 33, 65, 106, 519, 521, 728  |
|      | 20 Sep | Treaty concerning relations between the USSR and the GDR   | 455, 459  |
| 1956 | 28 May | Treaty ceding French Establishments in India (France–India)  | 748   |
|      | 19 Oct | Joint Declaration (USSR–Japan)   | 200   |

| <b>CE</b> |        |  | <b>Page Reference</b>            |
|-----------|--------|--|----------------------------------|
| 1957      | 25 Mar | Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community  | 293, 351, 461, 496–7, 499        |
|           | 25 Mar | Treaty Establishing the European Atomic Energy Community   | 496–7                            |
| 1960      | 29 Jun | Treaty of Friendship, Assistance and Co-operation (Belgium–Congo)  | 56, 659                          |
|           | 16 Aug | Treaty of Guarantee (Cyprus–Greece–Turkey–UK)  | 28, 106, 143–5, 242–3, 490       |
|           | 16 Aug | Treaty of Alliance (Cyprus–Greece–Turkey–UK)   | 242–3, 490                       |
|           | 14 Dec | Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, GA res 1514 (XV)          | 604, 638–9                       |
| 1963      | 31 Jul | Manila Accord (Singapore–Sarawak–Sabah–Malaysia)   | 640                              |
| 1964      | 12 Jun | Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Co-operation (USSR–GDR)                                      | 455, 463                         |
| 1965      | 15 Nov | Convention on the service abroad of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil and commercial matters | 206, 250                         |
|           | 4 Dec  | Agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank  | 203                              |
|           | 21 Dec | International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination                        | 345                              |
| 1966      | 16 Dec | International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights   | 112, 125, 491                    |
|           | 16 Dec | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights   | 112–3, 120–1, 125, 157, 248, 491 |
| 1969      | 23 May | Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties   |                                  |
|           |        | art 3  | 487                              |
|           |        | arts 34–7  | 661                              |
|           |        | arts 40–1  | 102                              |
|           |        | art 44   | 105                              |
|           |        | art 52   | 131                              |
|           |        | art 53   | 100–2, 131                       |
|           |        | art 59   | 102                              |
|           |        | art 64   | 155                              |
|           |        | arts 65–6  | 101                              |
|           |        | art 71   | 105                              |

| CE   |        |  | Page Reference          |
|------|--------|--|-------------------------|
| 1970 | 12 Aug | Non-Aggression Treaty (FRG–USSR)   | 458                     |
|      | 24 Oct | Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (Friendly Relations Declaration) | 335, 418, 450, 622, 636 |
|      | 7 Dec  | Treaty of Warsaw (Poland–FRG)  | 525                     |
| 1971 | 3 Sep  | Quadrupartite Agreement and Associated Arrangements (France–UK–USA–USSR)   | 461–3, 525              |
| 1972 | 3 Jun  | Final Quadrupartite Protocol respecting Berlin (France–UK–USA–USSR)  | 461                     |
|      | 4 Jul  | Joint Communiqué on Basic Principles of National Unity (North Korea–South Korea)   | 471                     |
|      | 21 Dec | Treaty on the Basis of Intra-German Relations (FDR–GDR)  | 458–9, 681              |
| 1973 | 27 Jan | Paris Peace Agreement (United States–Vietnam)  | 474–6                   |
|      | 30 Nov | International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid   | 345                     |
| 1974 | 14 Mar | Protocol on the Exchange of Permanent Missions (FRG–GDR)   | 458                     |
|      | 26 Aug | Agreement Granting Independence (Portugal, Guinea-Bissau)  | 181, 386                |
|      | 31 Dec | Treaty on recognition of India's sovereignty over Goa, Daman, Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and related matters (India–Portugal)   | 138                     |
| 1975 | 15 Feb | Covenant of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands with the United States  | 582–3                   |
|      | 1 Oct  | Treaty of Osimo (Italy–Yugoslavia)   | 236                     |
| 1977 | 8 Jun  | Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts  | 136, 420–1              |
|      | 7 Sep  | Panama Canal Treaty (USA–Panama)   | 642                     |
| 1978 | 23 Aug | Vienna Convention on Succession of States in Respect of Treaties   | 36, 132, 671            |
|      |        | art 2(1)(b)  | 39                      |
|      |        | art 8  | 660                     |
|      |        | art 15   | 481, 673                |

| CE   |        | Page Reference   |
|------|--------|--|
|      | 23 Aug | Vienna Convention on Succession of States in Respect of Treaties ( <i>cont.</i> )                  |
|      |        | art 16 310   |
|      |        | arts 16–33 481   |
|      |        | art 34(1) 714  |
|      |        | arts 34–5 391  |
|      |        | arts 35–8 481  |
| 1979 | 7 Jan  | Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation (Brunei–UK) 320   |
|      | 5 Aug  | Peace Treaty Between the Polisario Front and the Islamic Republic of Mauritania 647                |
|      | 13 Nov | Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution 463   |
| 1981 | 19 Jan | Claims Settlement Declaration (USA–Iran) 679   |
|      | 27 Jun | African Charter on Human and People’s Rights 125–6   |
|      | 14 Nov | Agreements on a Proposed Confederation (Senegal–Gambia) 490  |
|      | 17 Dec | Agreement concerning the Establishment of a Senegambia Confederation 490                           |
|      | 17 Dec | Protocols Concerning the Establishment of a Senegambia Confederation 490                           |
| 1982 | 10 Dec | United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea 47   |
| 1983 | 7 Apr  | Vienna Convention on Succession of States in Respect of State Archives, Property and Debts 36, 671 |
|      |        | art 11 348   |
|      |        | art 14 481   |
|      |        | art 15 481   |
|      |        | art 16 481, 673  |
|      |        | art 17 391, 481, 714   |
|      |        | art 18 391, 481, 741   |
|      |        | art 27 481, 673  |
|      |        | art 28 481   |
|      |        | art 29 481   |
|      |        | arts 30–1 481, 714   |
|      |        | art 37 481, 673  |
|      |        | art 38 481   |
|      |        | art 39 481   |
|      |        | arts 40–1 481, 714   |

| CE   |        |   | Page Reference    |
|------|--------|---|-------------------|
| 1984 | 13 Aug | Libya–Morocco Federation Agreement  | 490               |
|      | 19 Dec | 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 | 246–9, 642        |
| 1986 | 21 Mar | Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties Between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations  | 101               |
| 1988 | 15 Dec | Question of Palestine, GA res 43/177  | 435–6, 440        |
| 1989 | 27 Jun | ILO Convention No 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries   | 121, 280–1        |
|      | 11 Dec | Treaty on the Zone of Cooperation in an area between the Indonesian Province of East Timor and Northern Australia, Timor Sea (Australia–Indonesia)                                | 169–70            |
| 1990 | 22 Apr | Agreement on the Establishment of the Republic of Yemen (North Yemen–South Yemen)   | 706               |
|      | 18 May | Treaty Establishing a Monetary, Economic and Social Union (FRG–GDR)   | 523, 525, 687     |
|      | 28 Aug | Framework for a Comprehensive Political Settlement of the Cambodia Conflict   | 527               |
|      | 31 Aug | Treaty on the Establishment of German Unity (FRG–GDR)   | 523–4, 526, 686–8 |
|      | 12 Sep | Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany (FRG–GDR–UK–France–USA–USSR)   | 524, 685–8        |
|      | 25 Sep | Agreement on the Settlement of Certain Matters Relating to Berlin (FRG–France–UK–USA)   | 525, 685          |
|      | 14 Nov | Agreement in Relation to Ratification of the Border Between Them (FRG–Poland)   | 526               |
|      | 19 Nov | Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe   | 409               |
| 1991 | 15 Apr | Headquarters Agreement of 15 April 1991 between UK and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development   | 30                |

| CE   |   | Page Reference                     |
|------|---|------------------------------------|
|      | 3 Jun Treaty Establishing the African Economic Community  | 493                                |
|      | 23 Oct Agreement on a Comprehensive Political Settlement of the Conflict in Cambodia  | 527, 600                           |
| 1992 | 7 Feb Treaty on European Union (Maastricht Treaty)  | 496–7                              |
|      | 18 Dec Declaration on Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic and Religious and Linguistic Minorities, GA res 47/135                        | 492                                |
| 1993 | 10 May Convention for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna   | 220                                |
|      | 25 Jun Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (United Nations World Conference on Human Rights)   | 118                                |
|      | 13 Sep Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements (Israel–PLO)   | 444                                |
| 1994 | 15 Apr Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization  | 250                                |
|      | 26 Oct Treaty of Peace (Israel–Jordan)  | 424, 578                           |
| 1995 | 10 Nov Agreed Principles for the Interim Statute for the City of Mostar   | 529                                |
|      | 21 Nov General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Dayton Agreement) (Bosnia and Herzegovina–Croatia–FRY)                        | 25, 106, 400, 407, 491, 528–9, 600 |
|      | 21 Nov Agreement on Military Aspects of the Peace Settlement (Dayton Agreement Annex 1-A)   | 529                                |
| 1996 | 23 Aug Agreement on the Normalization of Relations between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Croatia                             | 529, 690–1                         |
|      | 31 Aug Joint Declaration and Principles for Determining the Fundamentals for Mutual Relations between the Russian Federation and the Chechen Republic | 409                                |
| 1998 | 5 May Nouméa Accord (New Caledonia)   | 334, 632                           |
|      | 23 Oct Wye River Memorandum (Israel–PLO)  | 444                                |
| 1999 | 5 May Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Portuguese Republic on the question of East Timor (Indonesia–Portugal)                      | 561                                |



| CE   |        | Page Reference  |
|------|--------|---|
|      | 9 Jun  | Military Technical Agreement between the International Security Force (KFOR) and the Governments of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Serbia (KFOR–Yugoslavia–Serbia) 558–9  |
|      | 7 Dec  | Statute of the Brčko District of Bosnia and Herzegovina 529   |
| 2000 | 10 Feb | Exchange of Notes constituting an Agreement between Australia and UNTAET concerning the continued Operation of the Treaty between Australia and the Republic of Indonesia on the Zone of Cooperation in an Area between the Indonesian Province of East Timor and Northern Australia (UNTAET–Australia) 562 |
|      | 11 Jul | Constitutive Act of the African Union 493   |
|      | 15 Oct | Townsville Peace Agreement (respecting Solomon Islands) 490   |
|      | 7 Dec  | Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union 496   |
|      | 12 Dec | Articles on Nationality of Natural Persons in Relation to Succession of States 714  |
| 2001 | 26 Feb | Treaty of Nice amending the Treaty on European Union, the Treaties Establishing the European Communities and certain related acts 496   |
|      | 20 Jun | Framework Agreement on the Status of Western Sahara (proposed by UN Secretary-General but rejected by Polisario) 647  |
|      | 29 Jun | Agreement on Succession Issues (Bosnia and Herzegovina–Croatia–Macedonia–Slovenia–FRY) 710  |
|      | 12 Dec | Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts (ARSIWA)   |
|      |        | art 4 480, 488  |
|      |        | art 8 63  |
|      |        | art 10 659  |
|      |        | art 11 63   |
|      |        | arts 14, 15 481   |
|      |        | arts 16, 17, 18 63, 481   |

| CE   |        |  | Page Reference  |
|------|--------|--|-----------------|
|      |        | arts 19–24   | 481             |
|      |        | art 25   | 481, 704–5      |
|      |        | art 26   | 101, 481        |
|      |        | arts 27–32   | 481             |
|      |        | art 33   | 44, 481, 495    |
|      |        | arts 34–7  | 481             |
|      |        | art 40   | 101, 168        |
|      |        | art 41   | 168             |
|      |        | art 48   | 597, 663, 704–5 |
|      |        | art 50(1)(d)   | 101             |
|      |        | art 57   | 495             |
| 2002 | 24 Oct | Treaty Intended to Adapt and Confirm the Relations of Amity and Cooperation between the French Republic and the Principality of Monaco | 328             |
| 2004 | 14 Apr | Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly Opinion No 250 (relating to application of Monaco for membership)                             | 328             |
|      | 29 Oct | Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe  | 497             |
|      | 2 Dec  | Convention on Jurisdictional Immunity of States and Their Property   | 485             |

## Select List of Abbreviations

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| AdV                                 | <i>Archiv des Völkerrechts</i>   |
| AFDI                                | <i>Annuaire Français de Droit International</i>  |
| AJ                                  | <i>American Journal of International Law</i>   |
| <i>AJ Supp</i>                      | <i>American Journal of International Law, Supplement</i>   |
| Akehurst, <i>Modern</i>             | M Akehurst, <i>A Modern Introduction to International Law</i> (London, 6th edn, 1993)  |
| Al-Baharna                          | H Al-Baharna, <i>The Legal Status of the Arabian Gulf States</i> (2nd edn, 1975)   |
| <i>ALJ</i>                          | <i>Australian Law Journal</i>  |
| ALR                                 | <i>Australian Law Reports</i>  |
| <i>Am Pol Sc R</i>                  | <i>American Political Science Review</i>   |
| <i>Annuaire</i>                     | <i>Annuaire de l'Institut de Droit International</i>   |
| Arangio-Ruiz                        | G Arangio-Ruiz, <i>L'État dans le sens de droit des gens et la notion du droit international</i> (Bologna, 1975; and in (1975) 26 <i>OzfoR</i> 3, 265) |
| ARSIWA                              | International Law Commission, Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts   |
| <i>ASCL</i>                         | <i>Annual Survey of Commonwealth Law</i>   |
| <i>BFSP</i>                         | <i>British and Foreign State Papers</i>  |
| <i>Bibl Viss</i>                    | <i>Bibliotheca Visseriana, Dissertationum Ius Internationale Illustrantium</i>   |
| <i>BPIL</i>                         | <i>British Practice in International Law</i>   |
| Brierly, <i>Collected Papers</i>    | (ed H Lauterpacht and CHM Waldock, Oxford, 1958)   |
| Brierly, <i>Basis of Obligation</i> | JL Brierly, <i>The Basis of Obligation in International Law</i>  |
| Briggs, <i>Law of Nations</i>       | HW Briggs, <i>The Law of Nations. Cases, Nations Documents and Notes</i> (2nd edn, NY, 1952)   |
| Brownlie, <i>Principles</i>         | Brownlie, <i>Principles of Public International Law</i> (Oxford, 6th edn, 2003)  |
| Brownlie, <i>Use of Force</i>       | Brownlie, <i>International Law and the Use of Force by Force States</i> (Oxford, 1963)   |
| <i>BY</i>                           | <i>British Yearbook of International Law</i>   |
| <i>California WJIL</i>              | <i>California Western Journal of International Law</i>   |
| <i>Can BR</i>                       | <i>Canadian Bar Review</i>   |
| <i>Can YIL</i>                      | <i>Canadian Yearbook of International Law</i>  |
| CFSP                                | Common Foreign and Security Policy   |
| Charpentier                         | J Charpentier, <i>La Reconnaissance internationale et l'évolution du droit des gens</i> (Paris, 1956)  |

- Chen, *Recognition* TC Chen, *The International Law of Recognition* (ed LC Green, London, 1951)
- CILSA *Comparative and International Law Journal of Southern Africa*
- CMLR Common Market Law Reports
- CMLR *Common Market Law Review*
- ColJTL *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law*
- Crawford, *Selected essays* J Crawford, *International Law as an Open System: Selected essays* (London, Cameron May, 2002)
- Crawford, (2002) J Crawford (ed), *The International Law Commission's articles on state responsibility: introduction, text, and commentaries* (Cambridge, 2002)
- CTS *Consolidated Treaty Series*
- DDR German Democratic Republic
- Dir Int* *Diritto Internazionale*
- DPRK Democratic People's Republic of Korea
- DRVN Democratic Republic of Vietnam
- DSB *Department of State Bulletin*
- Duursma, *Microstates* JC Duursma, *Fragmentation and the International Relations of Micro-States: Self-determination and Statehood* (Cambridge, 1996)
- ECJ Rep European Court of Justice, *Reports of the Jurisprudence of the Court*
- EJIL* *European Journal of International Law*
- EPLF Eritrean People's Liberation Front
- Fawcett, *British Commonwealth* JES Fawcett, *The British Commonwealth in international law* (London, 1963)
- For Aff *Foreign Affairs* (Washington)
- FRG Federal Republic of Germany
- FRY Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
- FYROM Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- GAOR *General Assembly Official Records*
- GDR German Democratic Republic
- Grotius ST* *Transactions of the Grotius Society*
- Grotius SP* CH Alexandrowicz, ed, *Grotius Society Papers*
- Hackworth, *Digest* GH Hackworth, *Digest of International Law* (15 vols, Washington, 1940–4)
- HR Académie de Droit International, *Recueil des cours*
- HC Deb* *House of Commons Debates* (5th series unless otherwise stated)
- HL Deb* *House of Lords Debates*
- Higgins, *Development* R Higgins, *The Development of International Law through the Political Organs of the United Nations* (London, 1963)

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| ICJ Rep                         | International Court of Justice, <i>Reports of Judgements, Advisory Opinions and Orders</i>   |
| <i>ICJ Rev</i>                  | <i>Review of the International Commission of Jurists</i>   |
| ICTY                            | International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia  |
| <i>ICLQ</i>                     | <i>International and Comparative Law Quarterly</i>   |
| IFOR                            | Implementation Force   |
| ILC                             | International Law Commission   |
| INTERFET                        | International Force in East Timor  |
| <i>HKLJ</i>                     | <i>Hong Kong Law Journal</i>   |
| <i>ILC Ybk</i>                  | <i>Yearbook of the International Law Commission</i>  |
| ILM                             | <i>International Legal Materials</i>   |
| <i>ILQ</i>                      | <i>International Law Quarterly</i>   |
| ILR                             | International Law Reports  |
| <i>Indian JIL</i>               | <i>Indian Journal of International Law</i>   |
| <i>Indian YIA</i>               | <i>Indian Yearbook of International Affairs</i>  |
| <i>Int Aff</i>                  | <i>International Affairs</i> (London)  |
| <i>Int Conc</i>                 | <i>International Conciliation</i>  |
| <i>Int Org</i>                  | <i>International Organization</i>  |
| IR                              | Irish Reports  |
| <i>Is Yb HR</i>                 | <i>Israeli Yearbook of Human Rights</i>  |
| <i>JDI</i>                      | <i>Journal du Droit International (Clunet)</i>   |
| Jennings, <i>Acquisition</i>    | RY Jennings, <i>The Acquisition of Territory in International Law</i> (Manchester, 1963)   |
| JNA                             | Yugoslav National Army   |
| Kamanda, <i>Legal</i>           | AM Kamanda, <i>A Study of the legal status of Status of Protectorates protectorates in public international law</i> (Geneva, 1961) |
| <i>Keesing's</i>                | <i>Keesing's Contemporary Archives</i>   |
| Kelsen, <i>Principles</i>       | Hans Kelsen, <i>Principles of International Law</i> (2nd edn, rev RW Tucker, NY, 1966)   |
| Kiss, <i>Pratique</i>           | AC Kiss, <i>Repertoire de la pratique française en matière de droit intentionnal public</i> (7 vols, Paris, 1962–72)               |
| KLA                             | Kosovo Liberation Army   |
| Lauterpacht, <i>Papers</i>      | E Lauterpacht, ed., <i>International Law. Being the Collected Papers of Hersch Lauterpacht</i> (Cambridge, vols 1–5, 1970–2004)    |
| Lauterpacht, <i>Recognition</i> | H Lauterpacht, <i>Recognition in International Law</i> (Cambridge, 1948)   |
| Lauterpacht, <i>Development</i> | H. Lauterpacht, <i>Development of International Law by the International Court</i> (London, 1958)                                  |
| LNOJ                            | League of Nations <i>Official Journal</i>  |
| LNTS                            | League of Nations <i>Treaty Series</i>   |

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <i>LQR</i>                         | <i>Law Quarterly Review</i>   |
| Marek, <i>Identity</i>             | K. Marek, <i>Identity and Continuity of States in Public International Law</i> (Geneva, 1954)   |
| Mendelson                          | MH Mendelson, 'Acquisition of Membership in Selected International Organizations' (Oxford, M.S.D. Phil d 5229, 1971)  |
| <i>MLR</i>                         | <i>Modern Law Review</i>  |
| Moore, <i>Digest</i>               | JB Moore, <i>A Digest of International Law</i> (Washington, 8 vols, 1906)   |
| Moore, <i>IA</i>                   | JB Moore, <i>International Arbitrations</i>   |
| Moore, <i>Int Adj</i>              | JB Moore, <i>International Adjudications (Modern (MS) Series)</i>   |
| <i>NILR</i>                        | <i>Netherlands International Law Review</i>   |
| <i>NRG</i>                         | GF de Martens, <i>Nouveau Recueil Général de Traités</i>  |
| <i>NYIL</i>                        | <i>Netherlands Yearbook of International Law</i>  |
| <i>NYUJILP</i>                     | <i>New York University Journal of International Law and Politics</i>  |
| <i>NZULR</i>                       | <i>New Zealand Universities Law Review</i>  |
| OAS                                | Organization of American States   |
| OAU                                | Organization of African Unity   |
| O'Brien, <i>New Nations</i>        | WV O'Brien, ed, <i>The New Nations in International Law and Diplomacy</i> (NY, 1965)  |
| O'Brien & Goebel, 'Recognition'    | WV O'Brien & J Goebel, 'U.S. Recognition Policy and the New Nations', in O'Brien, ed, op. cit. 98–228   |
| O'Connell, <i>State Succession</i> | DP O'Connell, <i>State Succession in Municipal Law and International Law</i> (Cambridge, 2 vols, 1967)  |
| Oppenheim                          | L Oppenheim, <i>International Law—A Treatise</i> (1st edn, London, 1905; Vol I, 8th edn (ed Lauterpacht), 1955; Vol II, 7th edn, 1952; Vol I (9th edn, 1992)) |
| <i>OZföR</i>                       | <i>Österreichische Zeitschrift für öffentliches Recht</i>   |
| PA                                 | Palestine Authority   |
| <i>PAS</i>                         | <i>Proceedings of the American Society of International Law</i>   |
| PLO                                | Palestine Liberation Organization   |
| PRC                                | People's Republic of China  |
| PRK                                | People's Republic of Kampuchea  |
| <i>RDI</i>                         | <i>Revue de Droit International (de la Pradelle)</i>  |
| <i>Rdi</i>                         | <i>Rivista di Diritto Internazionale</i>  |
| <i>RDILC</i>                       | <i>Revue de Droit International et de Legislation Comparée</i>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <i>RDISDP</i>                             | <i>Revue de Droit International, de Sciences Diplomatiques et Politiques</i>  |
| <i>Répertoire suisse</i>                  | P Guggenheim, ed, <i>Répertoire suisse de droit international public (1914–1939)</i> , I–IV (Basle, 1975)                                     |
| <i>Rep MA T</i>                           | <i>Reports of Decisions of Mixed Arbitral Tribunals</i>   |
| <i>Restatement 2nd</i>                    | American Law Institute, <i>Restatement, Second. Foreign Relations Law of the United States</i> (1965)   |
| <i>Restatement 3rd</i>                    | American Law Institute, <i>Restatement, Third. Foreign Relations Law of the United States</i> (1987)  |
| <i>RGDIP</i>                              | <i>Revue Général de Droit International Public</i>  |
| <i>RIAA</i>                               | <i>Reports of International Arbitral Awards</i>   |
| <i>RJPIC</i>                              | <i>Revue Juridique et Politique Indépendance et Cooperation</i>   |
| <i>ROC</i>                                | Republic of China   |
| <i>ROK</i>                                | Republic of Korea   |
| <i>Rollet</i>                             | H Rollet, <i>Liste des engagements bilatéraux et multilatéraux au 30 juin 1972; accords et traités souscrits par la France.</i> (Paris, 1973) |
| <i>Rousseau, DIP II</i>                   | Charles Rousseau, <i>Droit international public</i> , Tome II <i>Les sujets de droit</i> (Paris, 1974)  |
| <i>RVN</i>                                | Republic of Vietnam   |
| <i>SAR</i>                                | Special Administrative Region   |
| <i>Schwarzenberger, International Law</i> | G Schwarzenberger, <i>International Law as applied by International Courts and Tribunals</i> (3 vols, London, 1957–1976)                      |
| <i>Schwarzenberger, Manual</i>            | G Schwarzenberger, <i>A Manual of International Law</i> (6th edn, London, 1976) <i>SCOR Security Council Official Records</i>                 |
| <i>SFRY</i>                               | Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia  |
| <i>Smith, GB &amp; LN</i>                 | HA Smith, <i>Great Britain and the Law of Nations</i> (2 vols, London, 1932)  |
| <i>SNC</i>                                | Supreme National Court  |
| <i>SNM</i>                                | Somali National Movement  |
| <i>Sørensen, Manual</i>                   | M Sørensen, ed, <i>Manual of Public International Law</i> (London, 1968)  |
| <i>SWAPO</i>                              | South West African People's Organization  |
| <i>Talmon, Recognition</i>                | S Talmon, <i>Recognition of Governments</i> (2001)  |
| <i>TTPI</i>                               | Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands  |
| <i>UDI</i>                                | Unilateral Declaration of Independence  |
| <i>UNAMET</i>                             | United Nations Mission in East Timor  |
| <i>UNAMI</i>                              | United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq  |

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| UNCIO                            | <i>United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco, 1945</i>  |
| United Nations, <i>Repertory</i> | <i>Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs</i>  |
| <i>UN Jur Ybk</i>                | <i>United Nations Juridical Yearbook</i>   |
| UNMC                             | <i>United Nations Monthly Chronicle Repertory</i>  |
| UNMIK                            | United Nations Interim Administrative Mission in Kosovo  |
| UNTAC                            | United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia  |
| UNTAET                           | United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor   |
| UNTAG                            | United Nations Transitional Assistance Group   |
| UNTEA                            | United Nations Temporary Executive Authority   |
| UNTS                             | <i>United Nations Treaty Series</i>  |
| <i>US Digest</i>                 | <i>Digest of United States Practice in International Law</i>   |
| <i>USFR</i>                      | <i>Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States</i>   |
| <i>U Tol LR</i>                  | <i>University of Toledo Law Review</i>   |
| Verhoeven, <i>Reconnaissance</i> | J Verhoeven, <i>La Reconnaissance internationale dans la pratique contemporaine: les relations publiques internationales</i> (Paris, 1975) |
| Whiteman, <i>Digest</i>          | MM Whiteman, <i>Digest of International Law</i> (Washington, 15 vols, 1963–1973)   |
| <i>Ybk AAA</i>                   | <i>Association des Auditeurs et Anciens Auditeurs de l'Académie de Droit International de la Haye, Annuaire</i>                            |
| YBWA                             | <i>Yearbook of World Affairs</i>   |
| <i>ZaöRV</i>                     | <i>Zeitschrift für Ausländisches Öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht</i>  |



# Chapter 1

## STATEHOOD AND RECOGNITION

---

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>1.1 Introduction</b>  | 4  |
| <b>1.2 Statehood in early international law</b>                        | 6  |
| (1) Doctrine   | 6  |
| (2) Statehood in early international law:<br>aspects of State practice | 10 |
| <b>1.3 Recognition and statehood</b>                                   | 12 |
| (1) The early view of recognition                                      | 12 |
| (2) Positivism and recognition   | 13 |
| (3) Statehood in nineteenth-century international law                  | 14 |
| <b>1.4 Recognition of states in modern international law</b>           | 17 |
| (1) Recognition: the great debate                                      | 19 |
| (i) The constitutive theory  | 19 |
| (ii) The declaratory theory  | 22 |
| (2) Conclusions  | 26 |
| <b>1.5 Certain basic concepts</b>                                      | 28 |
| (1) International personality  | 28 |
| (2) The State  | 31 |
| (3) Sovereignty  | 32 |
| (4) State and government   | 33 |
| (5) State continuity and State succession                              | 35 |

---

The formation of a new State is . . . a matter of fact, and not of law.<sup>1</sup>

[T]he existence of a State is a question of fact and not of law. The criterion of statehood is not legitimacy but effectiveness . . .<sup>2</sup>

[N]otre pays s'est toujours fondé, dans ses décisions de reconnaissance d'un État, sur le principe de l'effectivité, qui implique l'existence d'un pouvoir responsable et indépendant s'exerçant sur un territoire et une population.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 264, §209; (8th edn), vol 1, 544, §209. See also 9th edn vol 1, 677, §241.

<sup>2</sup> Foreign Minister Eban (Israel), arguing against a request for an advisory opinion of the International Court on the status of Palestine: *SCOR* 340th mtg, 27 July 1948, 29–30.

<sup>3</sup> President Mitterand (France), with respect to Palestinian statehood, reported in *Le Monde*, 24 November 1988, 7, col 1.

## 1.1 Introduction

At the beginning of the twentieth century there were some fifty acknowledged States. Immediately before World War II there were about seventy-five. By 2005, there were almost 200—to be precise, 192.<sup>4</sup> The emergence of so many new States represents one of the major political developments of the twentieth century. It has changed the character of international law and the practice of international organizations. It has been one of the more important sources of international conflict.

But the fact that some development is of importance in international relations does not entail that it is regulated by international law. And it has long been asserted that ‘The formation of a new State is . . . a matter of fact, and not of law.’<sup>5</sup> This position was supported by a wide spectrum of legal opinion. For example, one of the most common arguments of the declaratory theory (the theory that statehood is a legal status independent of recognition) is that, where a State actually exists, the legality of its creation or existence must be an abstract issue: the law must take account of the new situation, despite its illegality.<sup>6</sup> Equally, so it is said, where a State does not exist, rules treating it as existing are pointless, a denial of reality. The criterion must be effectiveness, not legitimacy. On the other hand, according to the constitutive theory (the theory that the rights and duties pertaining to statehood derive from recognition by other States), the proposition that the existence of a State is a matter of fact seems axiomatic. If ‘a State is, and becomes, an International Person

<sup>4</sup> That is to say, 191 UN Members plus the Vatican City. This does not include Taiwan, Palestine or various claimant entities discussed in Chapter 9. See Appendix I, p 725 for a complete list.

<sup>5</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 264, §209(1); cf Erich (1926) 13 *HR* 427, 442; Jones (1935) 16 *BY* 5, 15–16; Marston (1969) 18 *ICLQ* 1, 33; Arangio-Ruiz (1975–6) 26 *OzfoR* 265, 284–5, 332. See also the formulation in Willoughby, *Nature of the State*, 195: ‘Sovereignty, upon which all legality depends, is itself a question of fact, and not of law.’ See also Oppenheim (8th edn), vol 1, 544, §209; and the somewhat different formulation in Oppenheim (9th edn), vol 1, 120–3, §34.

<sup>6</sup> Cf Chen, *Recognition*, 38 (‘a State, if it exists in fact must exist in law’). This proposition is a tautology, and the problem of separate non-State entities was not in issue in the passage cited. Elsewhere Chen accepts the view that statehood is a legal concept not a ‘physical existence’ (ibid, 63), as well as the possibility of the illegality of the creation or existence of a ‘State’ (ibid, 8–9). Cf Charpentier, *Reconnaissance*, 160–7. Lauterpacht’s formulation is preferable: ‘The guiding juridical principle applicable to all categories of recognition is that international law, like any other legal system, cannot disregard facts and that it must be based on them provided they are not in themselves contrary to international law’ (*Recognition*, 91). But in view of the gnomic character of this proposition, it can hardly be regarded as a ‘guiding juridical principle’. For Lauterpacht’s interpretation of the formula that the existence of a State is a matter of fact only see ibid, 23–4. ‘To predicate that a given legal result is a question of fact is to assert that it is not a question of arbitrary discretion . . . The emphasis . . . on the principle that the existence of a State is a question of fact signifies that, whenever the necessary factual requirements exist, the granting of recognition is a matter of legal duty’.

through recognition only and exclusively',<sup>7</sup> and if recognition is discretionary, then rules granting to an unrecognized community a 'right to statehood' are excluded.

Neither theory of recognition satisfactorily explains modern practice. The declaratory theory assumes that territorial entities can readily, by virtue of their mere existence, be classified as having one particular legal status: it thus, in a way, confuses 'fact' with 'law'.<sup>8</sup> For, even if effectiveness is the dominant principle, it must nonetheless be a *legal* principle. A State is not a fact in the sense that a chair is a fact; it is a fact in the sense in which it may be said a treaty is a fact: that is, a legal status attaching to a certain state of affairs by virtue of certain rules or practices.<sup>9</sup> And the declaratory theorist's equation of fact with law also obscures the possibility that the creation of States might be regulated by rules predicated on other fundamental principles—a possibility that, as we shall see, now exists as a matter of international law. On the other hand, the constitutive theory, although it draws attention to the need for cognition, or identification, of the subjects of international law, and leaves open the possibility of taking into account relevant legal principles not based on 'fact', incorrectly identifies that cognition with diplomatic recognition, and fails to consider the possibility that identification of new subjects may be achieved in accordance with general rules or principles rather than on an ad hoc, discretionary basis.

Fundamentally the question is whether international law is itself, in one of its most important aspects, a coherent or complete system of law.<sup>10</sup> According to predominant nineteenth-century doctrine there were no rules determining what were 'States' for the purposes of international law; the matter was within the discretion of existing recognized States.<sup>11</sup> The international law of that

<sup>7</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 109, §71; (8th edn), vol 1, 125–7, §71 (modified with emphasis on limits to the discretion of the recognising State). Cf Jennings and Watts, *Oppenheim*, 130–1, §40.

<sup>8</sup> Cf Lauterpacht, *Recognition*, 45–50 for an effective critique of the 'State as fact' dogma. His dismissal of the declaratory theory results in large part from his identifying the declaratory theory with this dogma.

<sup>9</sup> Cf Kelsen (1929) 4 *RDI* 613, 613. Waldock (1962) 106 *HR* 5, 146 correctly describes the problem as a 'mixed question of law and fact'.

<sup>10</sup> Cf Chen, *Recognition*, 18–19: 'to argue that a State can become a subject of international law without the assent of the existing States, it is necessary to assume the existence of an objective system of law to which the new State owes its being.' The point is that if the State owes its existence to a system of law, then that existence is not, or not only, a 'fact'.

<sup>11</sup> Cf Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 108, §71; *contra* (8th edn), vol 1, 126, §71: 'Others hold the view that it is a rule of International Law that no new State has a right towards other States to be recognized by them, and that no State has the duty to recognize a new State . . . [A] new State before its recognition cannot claim any right which a member of the Family of Nations has as against other members.' Cf the heavily qualified statement in the 9th edn, vol 1, 132–3, §40.

period exhibited a formal incoherence that was an expression of its radical decentralization.<sup>12</sup>

But if international law is still, more or less, decentralized in terms of its basic structures, it is generally assumed that it is a formally complete system of law. For example this is taken to be the case with respect to the use of force<sup>13</sup> and nationality,<sup>14</sup> fields closely related to the existence and legitimacy of States. This work investigates the question whether, and to what extent, the formation and existence of States is regulated by international law, and is not simply a 'matter of fact'.

## 1.2 Statehood in early international law

### (1) Doctrine<sup>15</sup>

It is useful to review the changing opinions on the topic since the seventeenth century. Grotius, for example, defined the State as 'a complete association of free men, joined together for the enjoyment of rights and for their common interest'.<sup>16</sup> His definition was philosophical rather than legal: the existence of States was taken for granted; the State, like the men who compose it, was automatically bound by the law of nations which was practically identical with the law of nature: 'outside of the sphere of the law of nature, which is also frequently called the law of nations, there is hardly any law common to all nations.'<sup>17</sup> So the existence of States as distinct subjects of that universal law posed no problem. Much the same may be said of Pufendorf, who defined the State as 'a compound moral person, whose will, intertwined and united by the pacts of a number of men, is considered the will of all, so that it is able to make use of the strength and faculties of the individual members for the common peace and security.'<sup>18</sup> Pufendorf agreed both with Grotius and Hobbes<sup>19</sup> that natural law and the law of nations were the same:

Nor do we feel that there is any other voluntary or positive law of nations which has the force of law, properly so-called, such as binds nations as if it proceeded from a

<sup>12</sup> The same incoherence has been noted in respect of the legality of war: Lauterpacht, *Recognition*, v–vi, 4–5; and the discretionary character of nationality: Brownlie (1963) 39 *BY* 284, 284; *Principles* (2nd edn), 73; (6th edn), 69. Cf Briggs (1950) 44 *PAS* 169, 172.

<sup>13</sup> Cf Charter Art 2(4); *Corfu Channel Case*, ICJ Rep 1949 p 4, 35.

<sup>14</sup> Cf *Nottebohm Case*, ICJ Rep 1955 p 4.

<sup>15</sup> Cf Guggenheim (1971) 3 *U Tol LR* 203.

<sup>16</sup> *De Iure Belli ac Pacis* (1646), Bk I, ch I, §xiv.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.* Grotius excepts certain regional customs. For discussion of State sovereignty in Grotius see Dickinson, *Equality of States*, 55–60; Kennedy (1986) 27 *Harv ILJ* 1, 5; Tuck, *Rights of War and Peace*, 82–96.

<sup>18</sup> *De Iure Naturae et Gentium Libri Octo*, Bk VII, ch 2, §13, para 672.

<sup>19</sup> *De Cive*, ch 14, paras 4–5.

superior . . . [Convergences of State behaviour] belong either to the law of nature or to the civil law of different nations . . . But no distinct branch of law can properly be constituted from these, since, indeed, those laws are common to nations, not because of any mutual agreement or obligation, but they agree accidentally, due to the individual pleasure of legislators in different states. Therefore, these laws can be and many times are changed by some people without consulting others.<sup>20</sup>

By contrast Vitoria, lecturing a century earlier, gave a definition of the State much more legal in expression and implication than either Grotius or Pufendorf, though one still based on scholastic argument:

A perfect State or community . . . is one which is complete in itself, that is, which is not a part of another community, but has its own laws and its own council and its own magistrates, such as is the Kingdom of Castile and Aragon and the Republic of Venice and the like . . . Such a state, then, or the prince thereof, has authority to declare war, and no one else.<sup>21</sup>

Here we can detect the criteria of government and independence. Moreover, Vitoria is writing not a general moral–theological treatise but one with a specific purpose; his definition is also for a purpose, that is, to determine which entities may declare war. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that the writers of the naturalist school were not concerned with the problem of statehood: any ruler, whether or not independent, was bound by the law of nations, which was merely the application of the natural law to problems of government.

The same may be said, although with some reservations and for different reasons, of the writers of the early positivist period, of which Vattel was the most influential. His *Le Droit des gens, ou principes de la loi naturelle, appliqués à la conduite et aux affaires des nations et des souverains* is an extraordinary amalgam of earlier views with deductions from the sovereignty and equality of States that tended to overturn those views. For Vattel, ‘Nations or States are political bodies, societies of men who have united together and combined their forces, in order to procure their mutual welfare and security.’<sup>22</sup> The basic criterion is that such nations be ‘free and independent of one another’.<sup>23</sup> But a distinction is now drawn between States, as defined, and ‘sovereign States’, even if the difference is still largely terminological:

Every Nation which governs itself, under whatever form, and which does not depend on any other Nation, is a *sovereign State*. Its rights are, in the natural order, the same as those of every other State. Such is the character of the moral persons who live together

<sup>20</sup> Bk II, ch 3, §156.

<sup>21</sup> *De Indis ac de Iure Belli Relectiones* (publ 1696, ed Simon); *De Iure Belli*, para 7, §§425–6.

<sup>22</sup> *Le Droit des Gens* (1758), vol I, Introduction, §1; ch I, §1. <sup>23</sup> Introduction, §15.

in a society established by nature and subject to the law of Nations. To give a Nation the right to a definite position in this great society, it need only be truly sovereign and independent; it must govern itself by its own authority and its own laws.<sup>24</sup>

The novel element in this definition is the wide-reaching implications Vattel draws from the notion of the equality of States, the effect of which is to make each State the sole judge of its rights and obligations under the law of nations. Thus, 'the Law of Nations is in its origin merely the *Law of Nature applied to Nations* . . . We use the term *necessary Law of Nations* for that law which results from applying the natural law to Nations . . .'<sup>25</sup> Although the positive law of nations may not, in principle, conflict with this necessary law, the latter is 'internal' to the State while the positive law is 'external', and other sovereigns are only entitled and able to judge the actions of other independent States by this external standard: 'A Nation is . . . free to act as it pleases, so far as its acts do not affect the perfect rights of another Nation, and so far as the Nation is under merely obligations without any *perfect external* obligation. If it abuses its liberty it acts wrongfully; but other Nations can not complain, since they have no right to dictate to it.'<sup>26</sup> Here a deduction from 'sovereignty' overturns what has previously been held to be the basis of the law of nations. But as yet, no further deduction is drawn from this independence or sovereignty to deny the juridical existence of new States; sovereignty is inherent in a community and is thus independent of the consent of other States: 'To give a Nation the right to a definite position in this great society, it need *only* be truly sovereign and independent . . .'<sup>27</sup>

The link between these earlier views and the nineteenth-century positivist view of statehood may be illustrated from Wheaton's classic *Elements of International Law*. Under the influence of Hegel,<sup>28</sup> he came to regard statehood for the purposes of international law as something different from actual independence:

Sovereignty is acquired by a State, either at the origin of the civil society of which it is composed, or when it separates itself from the community of which it previously

<sup>24</sup> Introduction, Bk I, ch I, §4. But he subsequently states that authority and laws are not enough for sovereignty where there is no control over foreign affairs (treaties, making war, alliances): *ibid*, §11.

<sup>25</sup> Introduction, §§6–7 (original emphasis). The 'necessary Law of Nations' was thus peremptory, i.e. permanent and imprescriptible (§9).

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid*, §20.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid*, Bk I, ch I, §4 (emphasis added).

<sup>28</sup> *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Recht*, vol VIII; Hegel, *Werke* (1854) VIII, Pt 3, para 331; cited by Alexander (1958) 34 *BY* 176, 195: In Nisbet's translation the passage reads: 'The state has a primary and absolute entitlement to be a sovereign and independent power *in the eyes of others*, i.e. *to be recognized* by them. At the same time, however, this entitlement is purely formal, and the requirement that the state should be recognized simply because it is a state is abstract. Whether the state does in fact have

formed a part, and on which it was dependent. This principle applies as well to internal as to external sovereignty. But an important distinction is to be noticed . . . between these two species of sovereignty. The internal sovereignty of a State does not, in any degree, depend upon its recognition by other States. A new State, springing into existence, does not require the recognition of other States to confirm its internal sovereignty . . . The external sovereignty of any State, on the other hand, may require recognition by other States in order to render it perfect and complete . . . [I]f it desires to enter into that great society of nations . . . such recognition becomes essentially necessary to the complete participation of the new State in all the advantages of this society. Every other State is at liberty to grant, or refuse, this recognition . . .<sup>29</sup>

As was to be expected, this view was combined with a denial of the universality of international law<sup>30</sup> and of the law of nature as its foundation.<sup>31</sup>

It will be noted that, although Wheaton reproduces Vattel's 'internal/external' terminology, he puts it to a different use. For Vattel the 'internal' law was the law of nature, the necessary though imperfect element of the law of nations. Wheaton, having dispensed with the law of nature, means by 'internal' those aspects of the government of a State confined to its own territory and distinguished from 'foreign affairs'.<sup>32</sup> By Wheaton's time the positive law of nations was concerned essentially with the latter; nor could there be any

being in and for itself depends on its content—on its constitution and condition; and recognition, which implies that the two [i.e. form and content] are identical, also depends on the perception and will of the other state. Without relations with other states, the state can no more be an actual individual than an individual can be an actual person without a relationship with other persons. [On the one hand], the legitimacy of a state, and more precisely—in so far as it has external relations—of the power of its sovereign, is a purely *internal* matter (one state should not interfere in the internal affairs of another). On the other hand, it is equally essential that this legitimacy should be *supplemented* by recognition on the part of other states . . . When Napoleon said before the Peace of Campo Formio "the French Republic is no more in need of recognition than the sun is," his words conveyed no more than that strength of existence which itself carries with it a guarantee of recognition, even if this is not expressly formulated.' Hegel, *Elements* (1991), 366–67.

<sup>29</sup> *Elements* (3rd edn, 1846), Pt I, ch II, §6. For his earlier hesitations see the 1st edn (1836), Pt I, ch II, §§15–18.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid*, Pt I, ch I, §11: 'The law of nations or international law, as understood among civilized, christian nations, may be defined as consisting of those rules of conduct which reason deduces, as consonant to justice, from the nature of the society existing among independent nations; with such definitions and modifications as may be established by general consent.' In the 3rd edition (1846), the definition was retained, as §14, but with the qualification 'christian' omitted. This is consonant with treaty practice involving the Ottoman Empire in the 1840s, which Wheaton discussed in the 3rd edition, Pt I, ch I, §13.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid*, Pt I, ch I, §5 (quoting Hobbes on the law of nature and international law). There was no change between the 1836 and 1846 editions.

<sup>32</sup> Vattel made the same distinction, although it is not developed and is inconsistent with other elements of his work. For Vattel's influence see Ruddy, *International Law in the Enlightenment*, 119–44; Tourmé-Jouannet, *Emer de Vattel et l'émergence doctrinale du droit international classique*, 319–40.

necessary obligations owed to States by virtue of their mere 'political existence'. The law of nations was becoming an artificial system studied in basically consensual areas of inter-State relations such as treaties, diplomatic relations and commerce. Basic relations between States as such (in particular, the legality of resort to war, and the very existence and survival of the State) were excluded from its scope.<sup>33</sup>

## (2) Statehood in early international law: aspects of State practice

Despite its claims to universality, the early law of nations had its origins in the European State-system, which existed long before its conventional date of origin in the Peace of Westphalia (1648), ending the Thirty Years' War.<sup>34</sup> The effect of the Peace of Westphalia was to consolidate the existing States and principalities (including those whose existence or autonomy it recognized or established) at the expense of the Empire, and ultimately at the expense of the notion of the *civitas gentium maxima*—the universal community of mankind transcending the authority of States.<sup>35</sup>

Within that system, and despite certain divergences, writers of both naturalist and positivist schools had at first little difficulty with the creation of States. New States could be formed by the union of two existing States. More common was the linking of States in a personal union under one Crown (for example, Poland and Lithuania in 1385; Aragon and Castile in 1479; England and Scotland in 1603); such unions often became permanent. Equally, it was agreed that princes or rulers could create new States by division of existing ones. In Pufendorf's words, '[A] king can convert one of his provinces into a kingdom, if he separates it entirely from the rest of the nation, and governs it with its own administration, and one that is independent from the other.'<sup>36</sup> New States could also be formed by revolution, as when Portugal (1640–8) and

<sup>33</sup> Thus international law abandoned the 'just war' doctrine and left the question whether to wage war to the domestic jurisdiction of States. Hall, *Treatise* (8th edn), 82: 'International law has . . . no alternative but to accept war, independently of the justice of its origin, as a relation which the parties to it may set up if they choose, and to busy itself only in regulating the effects of the relation'; Röling, in Miller and Feindrider, *Nuclear Weapons and the Law*, 181; Dinstein, *War, Aggression and Self-Defence* (3rd edn), 71.

<sup>34</sup> On competing views as to the starting point of the European States system, see Koskeniemi (1990) 1 *EJIL* 4.

<sup>35</sup> On the Peace of Westphalia see Nussbaum, *Concise History of the Law of Nations*, 115–18; Rapisardi-Mirabelli (1929) 8 *Bib Viss* 5; Gross (1948) 42 *AJIL* 20; Braubach, *Acta pacis Westphalicae*; Harding and Lim, *Renegotiating Westphalia*, 1; Steiger (1999) 59 *ZaöRV* 609; Ziegler (1999) 37 *Archiv der Völkerrechts* 129. For the conventional view, see, e.g., Schrijver (1999) 70 *BY* 65, 69; Osiander (2001) 55 *Int Org* 251.

<sup>36</sup> Cf Pufendorf, *De jure Naturae et Gentium*, Bk VII, ch 3, §9, para 690.



the Netherlands (1559–1648)<sup>37</sup> broke away from Spain. What was unclear was whether the revolutionary entity could be treated as an independent State before its recognition by the parent State. Pufendorf thought not, on the grounds that ‘... if a man who, at the time, recognized the sovereignty of another as his superior, is to be able to become a king, he must secure the consent of that superior who will both free him and his dominions from the bond by which they were tied to him.’<sup>38</sup> Vattel was less categorical: a subject remained bound to the sovereign ‘without other conditions than his observance of the fundamental laws’, and thus, in most cases, secession was contrary to the basic compact that was the foundation of the State. However, if a sovereign refused to come to the aid of part of the nation, it might provide for its own safety by other means.

It was for [this] reason that the Swiss as a body broke away from the Empire, which had never protected them in any emergency. Its authority had already been rejected for many years when the independence of Switzerland was recognized by the Emperor and by all the German States in the Treaty of Westphalia.<sup>39</sup>

The Swiss cantons, referred to by Vattel, retained tenuous links with the Empire until their complete independence was recognized at the Peace of Westphalia. Part IV of the Treaty of Osnabrück stated:

And whereas His Imperial Majesty ... did, by a Particular Decree ... declare the said city of *Bazil*, and the other *Swiss* Cantons to be in possession of a *quasi*-full Liberty and Exemption from the Empire, and so no way subject to the Tribunals and Sentences of the said Empire, it has been resolved that this same Decree shall be held as included in this Treaty of Peace ...<sup>40</sup>

In practice other States tended to conduct relations on an international plane with the entity in revolt before its recognition by the parent State. The point was clearly established in this sense following the breakaway of the South American provinces from Spain in the 1820s.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>37</sup> See Blok and Vetter (1986) 34 *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 708; Borschberg, *Hugo Grotius ‘Commentaries in theses XI’* (1994), 180–1.

<sup>38</sup> Pufendorf, *De jure Naturae et Gentium* (1688), Bk VII, ch 3, §9, para 690.

<sup>39</sup> *Le Droit des Gens*, Bk I, ch 17, §202; cf Gentili, *On the Law of War* (1612), Bk I, ch XXIII, §§185–7.

<sup>40</sup> I CTS 119. Cf the unconditional reference to the Netherlands in Art 1: ‘Premièrement declare ledit Seigneur Roy et reconnoit que lesdits Seigneurs États Generaux des Pays-Bas Unis, et les Provinces d’iceux respectivement avec leurs Pays associés, Villes et Terres y appartenants sont libres et Souverains États ...’.

<sup>41</sup> See Frowein (1971) 65 *AJ* 568; Smith, *GB & LN*, vol I, 115–70; Bethell (ed), *The Independence of Latin America*. See also de Martens, *Nouvelles Causes celebre du droit des gens* (1843), vol 1, 113–209, 370–498 (American War of Independence). Cf Wheaton, *Principles*, Pt I, ch II, §26.

The impression given by this brief review is that, despite the limited amount of State practice, nothing in early international law precluded the solution of the legal problems raised by the creation and existence of States. That impediment, as we shall see, arose later with the application by nineteenth-century writers of a thoroughgoing positivism to the concept of statehood and the theory of recognition.

### 1.3 Recognition and statehood

#### (1) The early view of recognition

Although the early writers occasionally dealt with problems of recognition, it had no separate place in the law of nations before the middle of the eighteenth century. The reason for this was clear: sovereignty, in its origin merely the location of supreme power within a particular territorial unit (*suprema potestas*), necessarily came from within and did not require the recognition of other States or princes. As Pufendorf stated: ‘... just as a king owes his sovereignty and majesty to no one outside his realm, so he need not obtain the consent and approval of other kings or states, before he may carry himself like a king and be regarded as such... [I]t would entail an injury for the sovereignty of such a king to be called in question by a foreigner.’<sup>42</sup> The doubtful point was whether recognition by the parent State of a new State formed by revolution from it was necessary, and that doubt related to the obligation of loyalty to a superior, which, it was thought, might require release: the problem bore no relation to constitutive theory in general. The position of recognition towards the end of the eighteenth century was as stated by Alexandrowicz: ‘In the absence of any precise and formulated theory, recognition had not found a separate place in the works of the classic writers whether of the naturalist or early positivist period...’<sup>43</sup>

When recognition did begin to attract more detailed consideration, about the middle of the eighteenth century, it was in the context of recognition of monarchs, especially elective monarchs: that is, in the context of recognition of governments. Von Steck<sup>44</sup> and later Martens<sup>45</sup> discussed the problem and reached similar conclusions. Recognition, at least by third States in the case of secession from a metropolitan State, was either illegal intervention or it was

<sup>42</sup> *De Iure Naturae et Gentium*, Bk VII, ch 3, §9, para 689.

<sup>43</sup> (1958) 34 *BY*176, 176.

<sup>44</sup> *Versuche über verschiedene Materien politischer und rechtlicher Kenntnisse* (1783).

<sup>45</sup> *A Compendium of the Law of Nations* (1789), 18 ff.

unnecessary.<sup>46</sup> As one writer put it, ‘... in order to consider the sovereignty of a State as complete in the law of nations, there is no need for its recognition by foreign powers; though the latter may appear useful, the *de facto* existence of sovereignty is sufficient.’<sup>47</sup> Thus, even after the concept of recognition had become a separate part of the law, the position was still consistent with the views held by the early writers.

The writers of the early period of eighteenth century positivism, whenever faced with the eventuality of recognition as a medium of fitting the new political reality into the law, on the whole rejected such a solution, choosing the solution more consistent with the natural law tradition. Even if the law of nations was conceived as based on the consent of States, this anti-naturalist trend was not yet allowed to extend to the field of recognition.<sup>48</sup>

## (2) Positivism and recognition

But this was a temporary accommodation. According to positivist theory, the obligation to obey international law derived from the consent of individual States. If a new State subject to international law came into existence, new legal obligations would be created for existing States. The positivist premiss seemed to require consent either to the creation of the State or to its being subjected to international law so far as other States were concerned. It would be interesting to trace the evolution of international law doctrine from the essentially declaratory views of Martens and von Steck to the essentially constitutive ones of Hall and Oppenheim.<sup>49</sup> The important point, however, is that the shift in doctrine did happen, although it was a gradual one, in particular because, while States commonly endorsed the positivist view of international law, their practice was not always consistent with this profession. Thus unrecognized States and native peoples with some form of regular government were given the benefit of, and treated as obliged by, the whole body of international law.<sup>50</sup> The problem was largely doctrinal, but doctrine was, nonetheless, influential. For if one starts from the premiss that ‘Le droit des gens est un droit contractuel entre des États’,<sup>51</sup> the conclusion as to recognition and statehood seems inevitable:

... le droit international, qui est contractuel et qui a par conséquent la liberté immanente de s’étendre aux partenaires de son choix, comprend tels États dans sa communauté et

<sup>46</sup> Alexandrowicz (1958) 34 *BY* 176, 180 ff and authorities there cited.

<sup>47</sup> Saalfeld, *Handbuch des positivism Voikerrechts*, 26; cited by Alexandrowicz, (1958) 34 *BY* 176, 189.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid, 191. Cf also Alexandrowicz (1961) 37 *BY* 506.

<sup>49</sup> Wheaton’s view that the ‘external’ sovereignty of a State is, but its ‘internal’ sovereignty is not dependent upon recognition may be taken as an intermediate point.

<sup>50</sup> Smith, *GB & LN* vol I, 14–18; Davidson (1994) 5 *Canterbury LR* 391. See also Chapter 6.

<sup>51</sup> Redslob (1934) 13 *RDI* 429, 430.

n'y accueille pas tels autres... [L]a reconnaissance est un accord. Elle signifie l'extension de la communauté de droit international à un nouvel État.<sup>52</sup>

### (3) Statehood in nineteenth-century international law

It is useful to attempt a summary of the position with regard to statehood and recognition in the late nineteenth century. There was of course no complete unanimity among text-writers: nevertheless what we find is an interrelated series of doctrines, based on the premiss of positivism, the effect of which was that the formation and even the existence of States was a matter outside the accepted scope of international law. Oppenheim's *International Law* provides the clearest as well as the most influential expression of these interrelated doctrines.

The main positions relevant here were as follows:

(1) International law was regarded as the law existing between civilized nations. In 1859 the British Law Officers spoke of international law 'as it has been hitherto recognized and now subsists by the common consent of Christian nations'.<sup>53</sup> Members of the society whose law was international law were the European States between whom it evolved from the fifteenth century onwards and those other States accepted expressly or tacitly by the original members into the society of nations<sup>54</sup>—for example the United States of America and Turkey.<sup>55</sup>

As the basis of the Law of Nations is the common consent of the civilized States, statehood alone does not imply membership of the Family of Nations. Those States which are

<sup>52</sup> Redslob (1934) 13 *RDI*, 431. The essential problem related to the duties of the new State rather than its rights. Existing States could consent to the rules of law in respect of yet-to-be-created States, but those States could not for their part so consent (e.g., Anzilotti, *Corso di Diritto Internazionale* (3rd edn), vol I, 163–6 cited Jaffé, *Judicial Aspects of Foreign Relations*, 90n) and mutuality was required, as in any contract. Cf, however, Lauterpacht, *Recognition*, 2. See further Devine (1984) 10 *S Af YBIL* 18, Hillgruber (1998) 9 *EJIL* 491, 499–502.

<sup>53</sup> Cited by Smith, *GB & LN*, vol I, 12, 14.

<sup>54</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol I, 17, §12; (8th edn), 18, §12: 'New States which came into existence and were through express or tacit recognition admitted into the Family of Nations thereby consented to the body of rules for international conduct [1st edn: 'in existence'; 8th edn: 'in force'] at the time of their admittance.' The 9th edition treats the matter as follows: 'Thus new states which come into existence and are admitted into the international community thereupon become subject to the body of rules for international conduct in force at the time of their admittance.' *Ibid*, vol I, 14, §5; see also *ibid*, vol I, 29, §10.

<sup>55</sup> On Turkey's 'membership' see General Treaty between Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia and Turkey for Re-establishment of Peace, Paris, 30 March 1856, 46 BFSP 12, esp para VII, in which the allied monarchs 'déclarent la Sublime Porte admise à participer aux avantages du droit public et du concert Européens.' See also Smith, *GB & LN*, vol I, 16–17; Hall, *International Law* (2nd edn), 40; Wood (1943) 37 *AJ* 262; Hillgruber, *Die Aufnahme neuer Staaten in die Völkerrechtsgemeinschaft*, 394. In *European Commission of the Danube*, PCIJ ser B no 14 (1927), 40,

members are either original members because the Law of Nations grew up gradually between them through custom and treaties, or they are members as having been recognized by the body of members already in existence when they were born.<sup>56</sup>

(2) States as such were not necessarily members of the society of nations. Recognition, express or implied, made them members and bound them to obey international law.<sup>57</sup> States not so accepted were not (at least in theory) bound by international law, nor were the 'civilized nations' bound in their behaviour towards them, as was implied by their behaviour with regard to Africa and China.<sup>58</sup>

(3) Only States then, or rather only those entities recognized as States and accepted into international society, were bound by international law and were international persons. Individuals and groups were not subjects of international law and had no rights as such under international law. 'Since the Law of Nations is based on the common consent of individual States, and not of individual human beings, States solely and exclusively are the subjects of International Law'.<sup>59</sup>

(4) The binding force of international law derived from this process of seeking to be recognized and acceptance.

Thus new States which come into existence and are admitted into the international community thereupon become subject to the body of rules for international conduct in force at the time of their admittance.<sup>60</sup>

International Law does not say that a State is not in existence as long as it is not recognized, but it takes no notice of it before its recognition. Through recognition only and exclusively a State becomes an International Person and a subject of International Law.<sup>61</sup>

Art VII of the Treaty of Paris was said to have effected 'the elevation of the position of Turkey in Europe'. Among the enormous literature on the extension of international law beyond Europe see Andrews (1978) 94 *LQR* 408; Grewe (1982) 42 *ZaöRV* 449; Fisch, *Die europäische Expansion und das Völkerrecht*; Sinha, *Legal Polycentricity and International Law*; Onuma (2000) 2 *J Hist IL* 1. On international law in relation to specific regions and States, see, e.g., Eick, *Indianerverträge in Nouvelle-France: ein Beitrag zur Völkerrechtsgeschichte*; Ziegler (1997) 35 *Archiv des Völkerrechts* 255; Ando (ed), *Japan and International Law*.

<sup>56</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 17, §12; (8th edn), vol 1, 125, §71. See also 9th edition, vol 1, 14, §5.

<sup>57</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 17, §12, 108, §71; (9th edn), vol 1, 14, §5, 128, §39.

<sup>58</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 34, §28; (8th edn), vol 1, 50, §28. Lauterpacht omitted the sentence 'It is discretion, and not International Law, according to which the members of the Family of Nations deal with such States as still remain outside that family' and characterized 'the question of membership of the "Family of Nations" ... a matter of purely historical interest.' Cf *ibid* (9th edn), vol 1, 87, §22.

<sup>59</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 18 (§12). By 'States' Oppenheim presumably meant 'recognized States'.

<sup>60</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 17, §12; (9th edn), 14, §5.

<sup>61</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 110, §71. The second sentence only is in the 8th edn, vol 1, 125, §71. US Secretary of State Webster put it as follows: 'Every nation, on being received at her own request, into the circle of civilized governments, must understand that she not only attains rights of

This satisfied the positivist canon that could discover the obligation to obey international law only with the consent of each State.

(5) Accordingly how an entity became a State was a matter of no importance to international law, which concentrated on recognition as the agency of admission into ‘civilized society’—a sort of juristic baptism, entailing the rights and duties of international law. Unrecognized entities had not consented to be bound by international law, and neither had the existing community of recognized States accepted them or agreed to treat them as such. Nascent States (States ‘*in statu nascendi*’) were not international persons. How they acquired territory, what rights and duties they had or owed to others as a result of events before they were recognized, these were irrelevant to international law: they were matters ‘of fact and not of law’.

The formation of a new State is, as will be remembered from former statements, a matter of fact, and not of law. It is through recognition, which is a matter of law, that such new States become a member of the Family of Nations and subject to International Law. As soon as recognition is given, the new State’s territory is recognized as the territory of a subject of International Law, and it matters not how this territory is acquired before the recognition.<sup>62</sup>

Likewise Phillimore: ‘The question as to the origin of States belongs rather to the province of Political Philosophy than of International Jurisprudence.’<sup>63</sup>

Hence the acquisition of territory by a new State was not regarded as a mode of acquisition of territory in international law, though revolt was a method of losing territory. ‘Revolt followed by secession has been accepted as a mode of losing territory to which there is no corresponding mode of acquisition.’<sup>64</sup>

sovereignty and the dignity of national character, but that she binds herself also to the strict and faithful observance of all those principles, laws and usages which have obtained currency among civilized states . . .’. Letter to Mr Thompson, Minister to Mexico, 15 April 1842. *Moore’s Digest*, vol I, s 1, 5–6.

<sup>62</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 264, §209; (8th edn), vol 1, 544, §209. In the 9th edition, vol 1, 677, §241, the position is reformulated thus: ‘When a new state comes into existence, its title to its territory is not explicable in terms of the traditional “modes” of acquisition of territory . . . The new state’s territorial entitlement is more to do with recognition; for, as soon as recognition is given, the new state’s territory is recognised as the territory of a subject of international law; although, questions of succession and of the legal history of the territory may also be involved where particular boundaries, or the precise extent of the territory, are doubtful or disputed.’ See also *ibid* (9th edn), vol 1, 120, §34: ‘A state proper is in existence when a people is settled in a territory under its own sovereign government.’

<sup>63</sup> Phillimore, *Commentaries on International Law* (2nd edn), vol 1, 79.

<sup>64</sup> Oppenheim (1st edn), vol 1, 297–8, §246; (9th edn), vol 1, 717, §276. See also *ibid* (9th edn), vol 1, 717, §276, to similar effect but with the following qualification: ‘It is perhaps now questionable whether the term revolt is entirely a happy one in this legal context. It would seem to indicate a particular kind of political situation rather than a legal mode of the loss of territorial sovereignty. If a revolt as a matter of fact results in the emergency of a new state, then this matter is the situation discussed [under the category ‘acquisition’].’

## 1.4 Recognition of States in modern international law

It is against this background that the modern law of statehood and its relation with recognition must be examined. The effect of positivist doctrine was to place all the emphasis, in matters of statehood, on the question of recognition. Indeed the courts of many States still refuse to determine for themselves any questions of statehood, even where the matter is between private parties,<sup>65</sup> on the ground that status is necessarily determined by executive recognition.<sup>66</sup> They will sometimes be able to avoid the harmful effects on private rights of the political act of recognition by means of construction.<sup>67</sup> The executive may leave the matter for the courts to decide.<sup>68</sup> But as a matter of the common law, at least, where the international status of any entity is squarely in issue executive certification is binding.<sup>69</sup>

This has led courts to seek to distinguish between the ‘external’ and ‘internal’ consequences of non-recognition. In *Hesperides Hotels*, Lord Denning asked

<sup>65</sup> And even where the results are unfortunate: the Second Circuit of the US Court of Appeals held that, absent recognition, notified to the court by the executive branch, Hong Kong could not be treated as a State for jurisdictional purposes, and a corporation organized under the laws of Hong Kong, thus ‘stateless’, was unable to maintain an action in US federal court. *Matimak Trading Co v Khalily*, 118 F 3d 76 (2nd Cir, 1997, McLaughlin, CJ). The Third Circuit took the view that Hong Kong corporations could be treated as UK subjects and the problem thus avoided: *Southern Cross Overseas Agencies, Inc v Wah Kwong Shipping Group Ltd*, 181 F 3d 410 (3rd Cir 1999, Becker, CJ). The Supreme Court resolved the matter in favour of federal jurisdiction: *JP Morgan Chase Bank v Traffic Stream (BVI) Infrastructure Ltd*, 536 US 88, 122 S Ct 2054 (Souter J 2002).

<sup>66</sup> This was not always so: *Yrisarri v Clement* (1825) 2 C & P 223, 225. For an illuminating discussion of the cases in which Lord Eldon laid down the orthodox common law rule see Bushe-Foxe (1931) 12 BY 63; (1932) 13 BY 39. See also Jaffé, *Judicial Aspects of Foreign Relations*, 79.

<sup>67</sup> *Luigi Montà of Genoa v Cechofracht Co Ltd* [1956] 2 QB 522 (term ‘government’ in a charter party); *Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd v Bankers Trust Co Ltd* [1939] 2 KB 544 (‘war’), 9 ILR 528. For an extreme case of ‘construction’ see *The Arantzazu Mendi* [1939] AC 256, 9 ILR 60, criticized by Lauterpacht, *Recognition*, 288–94.

<sup>68</sup> *Duff Development Co v Kelantan Government* [1924] AC 797, 825 (Lord Sumner); and cf the certificate in *Salimoff v Standard Oil Co*, 262 NY 220 (1933) just before US recognition of the Soviet government.

<sup>69</sup> *Luther v Sagor* [1921] 3 KB 532; but cf *Carl Zeiss Stiftung v Rayner and Keeler Ltd* (No 2) [1967] 1 AC 853, 953–4 (Lord Wilberforce), 43 ILR 23. For more recent cases, see, e.g., *Caglar v HM Inspector of Taxes*, 1996 *Simon's Tax Cases* 150; 108 ILR 150. The American position was historically less rigid: *Wulfsohn v RSFSR*, 234 NY 372 (1923); *Sokoloff v National City Bank*, 2 ILR 44, 239 NY 158 (1924); *Bank of China v Wells Fargo Bank & Union Trust Co*, 209 F2d 467 (1953). US courts often defer to executive determinations (e.g., *Autocephalous Greek-Orthodox Church of Cyprus v Goldberg & Feldman Fine Arts Inc*, 917 F 2d 278, 291–3 (Ind, 1990) 108 ILR 488; Smith, (1992) 6 *Temple ICLJ* 169, 178–90), but not always: *Efiat Ungar v Palestine Liberation Organization*, 402 F3d 274, 280 (1st Cir, 31 March 2005, Selya, CJ) (slip op), 14: ‘[T]he lower court’s immunity decision neither signaled an official position on behalf of the United States with respect to the political recognition of Palestine nor amounted to the usurpation of a power committed to some other branch of government. After all, Congress enacted the [Anti-Terrorism Act], and the President signed it. The very purpose of the law is to allow the courts to determine questions of sovereign immunity under a legal, as opposed to a political, regime.’

whether the law of the ‘Turkish Federated State of Cyprus’ could be applied to a tort claim even though the Foreign and Commonwealth Office had certified that the United Kingdom did not recognize that entity as a State:

The executive is concerned with the *external* consequences of recognition, vis-à-vis other states. The courts are concerned with the *internal* consequences of it, vis-à-vis private individuals. So far as the courts are concerned, there are many who hold that the courts are entitled to look at the state of affairs actually existing in a territory, to see what is the law which is in fact effective and enforced in that territory, and to give such effect to it—in its impact on individuals—as justice and common sense require: provided always that there are no considerations of public policy against it.

The distinction has also been expressed as one between private international law and the law or practice of foreign relations:

[P]rivate international law is designed to find the most appropriate law . . . and it is not concerned with adjusting the mutual relationship of sovereigns. Therefore, foreign law applied under private international law principles should not be limited to the law only of a recognized State or Government; effectiveness of foreign law should not depend on recognition.<sup>70</sup>

Indeed legislation has sometimes had to be passed authorizing courts to treat unrecognized entities as ‘law areas’ for various purposes, in order to separate non-recognition from its consequences.<sup>71</sup>

However desirable it may be that the courts of a State should speak on matters of statehood with the same voice as the government of that State, in the international sphere the intimate connection established by nineteenth-century doctrine between recognition and statehood has done much harm. A tension is thereby created between the conviction that recognition is at some level a legal act in the international sphere,<sup>72</sup> and the assumption of political

<sup>70</sup> District Court of Kyoto, Judgment of 7 July 1956, quoted in Peterson, *Recognition of Governments*, 149, 243 n 77.

<sup>71</sup> See, e.g., the extended definition of ‘foreign state’ in the Foreign Enlistment Act 1870 (UK). See also Foreign Corporations Act 1991 (UK); Foreign Corporations (Application of Laws) Act 1989 (Cth). These Acts, though general in terms, were passed to deal with the situation of Taiwan, an issue dealt with by the US through special legislation, the Taiwan Relations Act, 22 USC §3301. See *New York Chinese TV Programs, Inc v UE Enterprises, Inc*, 954 F 2d 847 (2d Cir 1992), *cert denied*, 506 US 827 (1992); *Millen Industries Inc v Coordination Council for N American Affairs*, 855 F 2d 879 (1988), 98 ILR 61. Other jurisdictions have simply accepted Taiwan acts and laws without legislative mandate: *Romania v Cheng*, 1997 Carswell NS 424 (Nova Scotia SC); *Chen Li Hung v Tong Lei Mao* [2000] 1 HKC 461. On Taiwan see further Chapters 5 and 10.

<sup>72</sup> E.g., among earlier writers, Kelsen (1941) 35 *AJ* 605; Schwarzenberger, *International Law*, vol I, 127–36, 134; Lauterpacht, *Recognition*, 6 ff.



leaders that they are, or should be, free to recognize or not to recognize on grounds of their own choosing.<sup>73</sup> If this is the case, the international status and rights of whole peoples and territories will seem to depend on arbitrary decisions and political contingencies.

### (1) Recognition: the great debate

Before examining State practice on the matter, it is necessary to refer again to the underlying conflict over the nature of recognition. A further effect of nineteenth-century practice has been to focus attention more or less exclusively on the act of recognition itself, and its legal effects, rather than on the problem of the elaboration of rules determining the status, competence and so on of the various territorial governmental units.<sup>74</sup> To some extent this was inevitable, as long as the constitutive position retained its influence, for a corollary of that position was that there could be no such rules. Examination of the constitutive theory is, therefore, first of all necessary.

#### (i) *The constitutive theory*<sup>75</sup>

The tenets of the strict constitutive position, as adopted by Oppenheim and others, have been referred to already. Many of the adherents of that position are also positivist in outlook.<sup>76</sup> On the other hand, it is possible to reconcile the declaratory theory with some versions of positivism, and many writers have adhered both to positivism and the declaratory theory.<sup>77</sup> Moreover, Lauterpacht, who was not a positivist, was one of the more subtle proponents

<sup>73</sup> Cf the statements of Sir Percy Spender, Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs, cited in O'Connell (ed), *International Law in Australia*, 32; and US Ambassador Warren Austin, SCOR 3rd yr 294th mtg, 16. See also MJ Peterson (1982) 34 *World Politics* 324.

<sup>74</sup> Cf Bot, *Non-Recognition and Treaty Relations*, 1.

<sup>75</sup> Constitutive writers include the following: Le Normand, *La Reconnaissance Internationale et ses Diverses Applications*; Jellinek, *Allgemeine Staatslehre* (5th edn), 273; Anzilotti, *Corso di Diritto Internazionale* (3rd edn); Kelsen (1941) 35 *AJ* 605; Lauterpacht, *Recognition*; Schwarzenberger, *International Law* (3rd edn), vol I, 134; Patel, *Recognition in the Law of Nations*, 119–22; Jennings (1967) 121 *HR* 327, 350; Verzijl, *International Law*, vol II, 587–90 (with reservations); Devine [1973] *Acta Juridica* 1, 90–145. Hall's position is of interest: 'although the right to be treated as a state is independent of recognition, recognition is the necessary evidence that the right has been acquired': *International Law* (8th edn, 1924, Higgins ed), 103. Cf also the German argument in the *Customs Union Case*, PCIJ ser C no 53, 52–3. Schachter argues that Secretariat practice (in one case, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in 1947) is implicitly constitutive: 25 *BY* (1948) 91, 109–15. This is doubtful. It is also argued that the Permanent Court adopted a constitutive position in *Certain German Interests in Polish Upper Silesia*, PCIJ Ser A No 7 (1926), 27–9, but this was in the context of the belligerency of the Polish National Committee, not the existence of Poland as a State.

<sup>76</sup> Lauterpacht, *Recognition*, 38–9; but cf Jaffé, 80–1.

<sup>77</sup> Cf Chen, *Recognition*, 18 n 41.

of a form of the constitutive position.<sup>78</sup> He expressed the most persuasive argument for that position in the following way:

[T]he full international personality of rising communities . . . cannot be automatic . . . [A]s its ascertainment requires the prior determination of difficult circumstances of fact and law, there must be *someone* to perform that task. In the absence of a preferable solution, such as the setting up of an impartial international organ to perform that function, the latter must be fulfilled by States already existing. The valid objection is not against the fact of their discharging it, but against their carrying it out as a matter of arbitrary policy as distinguished from legal duty.<sup>79</sup>

In other words, in every legal system some organ must be competent to determine with certainty the subjects of the system. In the present international system that can only be done by the States, acting individually or collectively. Since they act in the matter as organs of the system, their determinations must have definitive legal effect.

It should be stressed that this argument is not generally applicable in international law. Determining the legality of State conduct or the validity of the termination of a treaty often involves 'difficult circumstances of fact and law', but it has never been suggested that the views of particular States are 'constitutive'. If individual States were free to determine the legal status or consequences of particular situations and to do so definitively, international law would be reduced to a form of imperfect communications, a system for registering the assent or dissent of individual States without any prospect of resolution. Yet it is, and should be, more than this—a system with the potential for resolving problems, not merely expressing them.

It may be argued that determining the subjects of international law is so important that, exceptionally, there must exist some method of conclusive determination for this purpose. Yet there is nothing conclusive or certain (as far as other States were concerned) about a conflict between different States as to the status of a particular entity, and there is no reason why they should be bound either by the views of the first State to recognize or of the last to refuse to do so. Does the fact that Belize was not recognized by Guatemala,<sup>80</sup> Macedonia by

<sup>78</sup> Lauterpacht, *Recognition*, 2 distinguishes two assertions of orthodox constitutive theory: viz 'that, prior to recognition, the community in question possesses neither the rights nor the obligations which international law associates with full statehood; [and] . . . that recognition is a matter of absolute political discretion as distinguished from a legal duty owed to the community concerned.' He adopts the first but not the second of these. In fact neither is distinctly positivist: what is so is their combination. cf Kunz (1950) 44 *AJ* 713; Higgins, *Development*, 136.

<sup>79</sup> *Recognition*, 55 (emphasis in original). Cf Kelsen, (1941) 35 *AJ* 605, 606–7.

<sup>80</sup> See (1992) 63 *BY* 633–4; 243 *HC Debs*, vol 243, WA, col 5, 9 May 1994.

Greece<sup>81</sup> or Liechtenstein by Czechoslovakia and its successors<sup>82</sup> mean that these entities did not exist, were not States, had no rights at the time?

Moreover, questions of status do not seem qualitatively different, either in theory or practice. International law has relatively few subjects, and the status of most of them is not open to doubt. By contrast problems relating, for example, to the legality of the use of force occur frequently and are often difficult and controversial. It is not suggested that individual State pronouncements on that subject are 'constitutive' of legality, for the recognizing State or more generally.

Two further arguments add decisive support to the rejection of the constitutive position. First, if State recognition is definitive then it is difficult to conceive of an illegal recognition and impossible to conceive of one which is invalid or void. Yet the nullity of certain acts of recognition has been accepted in practice, and rightly so;<sup>83</sup> otherwise recognition would constitute an alternative form of intervention, potentially always available and apparently unchallengeable. Lauterpacht himself allowed the possibility of an *invalid* act of recognition,<sup>84</sup> but if that is the case then the test for statehood must be extrinsic to the act of recognition. And that is a denial of the constitutive position.

A second difficulty with the constitutive position is its relativism. As Kelsen points out, it follows from constitutivist theory that '... the legal existence of a state ... has a relative character. A state exists legally only in its relations to other states. There is no such thing as absolute existence.'<sup>85</sup> No doubt international relations are full of contingency, but to those who do not share Kelsen's premisses this seems a violation of common sense.<sup>86</sup> Lauterpacht, who accepts the relativity of recognition as inherent in the constitutive position, nevertheless refers to it as a 'glaring anomaly',<sup>87</sup> a 'grotesque spectacle' casting 'grave

<sup>81</sup> Even after the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (known as FYROM) was admitted to the UN (GA res 225, 8 April 1993) it remained for a time unrecognized by Greece. See Riedel (1996) 45 *Südöst-Europa* 63; Craven (1995) 16 *AYIL* 199; Pazartzis (1995) 41 *AFDI* 281.

<sup>82</sup> For the Czech position, see Statement by the Czech Republic in reply to the Statement by the Principality of Liechtenstein, Plenary meeting of the 10th OSCE Economic Forum, 29 May 2002; for the Liechtenstein position, see Review of the Implementation of OSCE Commitments in the Economic and Environmental Dimension, Statement of Agenda Point OSCE document EFDEL/12/04, 4 June 2004.

<sup>83</sup> See *Restatement (Third) Foreign Relations Law of the US*, §202, Comment f, 'Unlawful recognition or acceptance', and further Chapter 3.

<sup>84</sup> *Recognition*, 234 n3 (Italian and German recognition of the Franco regime 'illegal *ab initio*'); cf *ibid*, 95 n2.

<sup>85</sup> Kelsen (1941) 35 *AJ* 605, 609. On Kelsen's position see Pauly, in Diner and Stolleis (eds), *Hans Kelsen and Carl Schmitt*, 45, 46–7.

<sup>86</sup> Cf Verhoeven, *Reconnaissance*, 714–15. Kelsen himself was previously a declaratist: (1929) 4 *RDI* 613, 617–18: 'en présence des règles positives incontestables du droit international, [on] ne peut nier que l'État nouveau ait des droits et des obligations internationales avant même d'être reconnu par les anciens États.'

<sup>87</sup> *Recognition*, 67.

reflection upon international law'.<sup>88</sup> Moreover, in his view '[i]t cannot be explained away . . . by questionable analogies to private law or to philosophical relativism.'<sup>89</sup> But if a central feature of the constitutive position is open to such criticism the position itself must be flawed.<sup>90</sup>

Aside from other objections,<sup>91</sup> Lauterpacht's own position is dependent on a straightforward assertion about State practice:

. . . much of the available evidence points to what has here been described as the legal view of recognition. Only that view of recognition, coupled with a clear realization of its constitutive effect, permits us to introduce a stabilizing principle into what would otherwise be a pure exhibition of power and a negation of order . . .<sup>92</sup>

But State practice demonstrates neither acceptance of a duty to recognize,<sup>93</sup> nor a consistent constitutive view of recognition. Moreover, Lauterpacht's argument, which in the passage cited was plainly *de lege ferenda*,<sup>94</sup> assumes the insufficiency of the declaratory view of recognition.

### (ii) *The declaratory theory*

According to the declaratory theory, recognition of a new State is a political act, which is, in principle, independent of the existence of the new State as a subject of international law.<sup>95</sup> In Charpentier's terminology, statehood is opposable to non-recognizing States.<sup>96</sup> This position has the merit of avoiding the logical

<sup>88</sup> *Recognition*, 78.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.* Lauterpacht proposed the collectivization of recognition as a solution. Developments in that direction are addressed in Chapters 4 and 12, below.

<sup>90</sup> A hybrid position would be to require recognition by one or some States as a prerequisite: e.g., Green, *International Law*, 34: 'Unless recognized by at least one State, the entity will have no claim to be considered as a subject of international law.' But why should any one State be allowed to change the legal position of others by an isolated and perhaps aberrant act of recognition? And what should the first recognizing State do, if it is seeking to act in accordance with international law? On Green's view, the first State to recognize acts unlawfully—in which case the origins of every State must be illegitimate.

<sup>91</sup> E.g., the difficulty of a duty to recognize an entity that has, prior to recognition, *ex hypothesi* no rights: see *Recognition*, 74–5, 191–2. In Lauterpacht's view the duty is owed to the society of States at large: that society is 'entitled to claim recognition', but this is an unenforceable or imperfect right. This is a mere construct, bearing no relationship to State practice or general legal opinion. Cf Chen, *Recognition*, 52–4.

<sup>92</sup> *Recognition*, 77–8. But cf *ibid.*, 78: 'We are not in a position to say . . . that there is a clear and uniform practice of States in support of the legal view of recognition . . .'.

<sup>93</sup> The United Kingdom alone seems to have accepted a duty to recognize: (1951) 4 *ILQ* 387–8, and even its statement is not an assertion of the constitutive theory. Cf Verhoeven, *Reconnaissance*, 576–86; Rich (1993) 4 *EJIL* 36.

<sup>94</sup> Cf *Recognition*, 78.

<sup>95</sup> See Chen, *Recognition*, for a full discussion of this position. Green's annotations to the published edition are consistently constitutivist: in this respect Green follows Schwarzenberger rather than Chen.

<sup>96</sup> Charpentier, *Reconnaissance*, 15–68, 160–7.

and practical difficulties involved in constitutive theory, while still accepting a role for recognition as a matter of practice. It has the further, essential, merit of consistency with that practice, and it is supported by a substantial body of opinion. The following passage of Taft CJ's in the *Tinoco Arbitration* is frequently cited as the classic statement of the declaratory position:

The non-recognition by other nations of a government claiming to be a national personality, is usually appropriate evidence that it has not attained the independence and control entitling it by international law to be classed as such. But when recognition *vel non* of a government is by such nations determined by enquiry, not into its *de facto* sovereignty and complete governmental control, but into its illegitimacy or irregularity of origin, their non-recognition loses something of evidential weight on the issue with which those applying the rules of international law are alone concerned . . . Such non-recognition for any reason . . . cannot outweigh the evidence disclosed . . . as to the *de facto* character of Tinoco's government, according to the standard set by international law.<sup>97</sup>

But this was a case of recognition of governments, and it is arguable that while recognition of governments may be declaratory in effect, recognition of new States goes further. Where an authority in fact exercises governmental functions within an area already accepted as a State, there seems to be nothing for recognition to constitute, at least at the level of international personality. But the establishment of a new State involves the demarcation of a certain area as a 'State-area' for the purposes of international relations, with consequent legal effects. In such a case it might be argued that recognition, at least in the non-formal sense of 'treating like a State', is central rather than peripheral to international capacity.<sup>98</sup>

<sup>97</sup> (1924) 18 *AJ* 147, 154; cf also *Hopkins Claim* (1927) 21 *AJ* 160, 166. The matter was put even more strongly by Commissioner Wadsworth in *Cuculla v Mexico*, Mex-US Cl Com (1868), in respect of the premature and unauthorized recognition by the US Minister of the Zuloaga Government as the *de facto* Government of Mexico: 'Where then, is the evidence of the *de facto* government? The possession of the capital will not be sufficient, nor recognition by the American minister with or without the appraisal of his government. Recognition is based upon the pre-existing fact; does not create the fact. If this does not exist, the recognition is falsified . . . If, therefore, the Zuloaga movement in Mexico was the government *de facto*, it was because the facts existing at the time made it so. If it was a government, the government in Mexico, it was because it claimed and possessed the sovereignty over that independent nation we call 'the Republic of the United Mexican State.' Moore, *IA* III, 2873, 2876-7. See also *Wulfsohn v RSFSR*, 138 NE 24, 25 (1923); app diss 266 US 580 (1924): 'The result we reach depends upon more basic considerations than recognition or non-recognition by the United States. Whether or not a government exists clothed with the power to enforce its authority within its own territory, obeyed by the people over whom it rules, capable of performing the duties and fulfilling the obligations of an independent power, able to enforce its claims by military force, is a fact not a theory. For its recognition does not create the state although it may be desirable.'

<sup>98</sup> See Le Normand, 268, cited by Chen, *Recognition*, 14 n 1.

But neither legal opinion nor State practice draws from this the conclusion that the several acts of recognition by other States constitute the entity being recognized or are conclusive as to its status. As a German–Polish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal stated in reference to the existence of the new State of Poland: ‘... the recognition of a State is not constitutive but merely declaratory. The State exists by itself and the recognition is nothing else than a declaration of this existence, recognized by the States from which it emanates.’<sup>99</sup> Less well known in this context is the Report of the Commission of Jurists on the Åland Islands. The passage of the Report dealing with the independence of Finland enumerated the various recognitions given to Finland, but went on to say that:

these facts by themselves do not suffice to prove that Finland, from this time onwards, became a sovereign State... [T]he same legal value cannot be attached to recognition of new States in war-time, especially to that accorded by belligerent powers, as in normal times... In addition to these facts which bear upon the external relations of Finland, the very abnormal character of her internal situation must be brought out. This situation was such that, for a considerable time, the conditions required for the formation of a sovereign State did not exist.<sup>100</sup>

Evidently the Commission, while accepting the legal value of recognition as evidence, were not prepared to accept it as conclusive, but instead referred to the ‘conditions required for the formation of a sovereign State’.<sup>101</sup>

On this matter the Arbitration Commission established to advise the European Peace Conference on Yugoslavia was categorical. In its first opinion, on 29 November 1991, the Commission stated that ‘the effects of recognition by other States are purely declaratory.’<sup>102</sup> This was reiterated in further opinions.<sup>103</sup> It has, however, been suggested that the actual practice of States respecting the dissolution of Yugoslavia may have been constitutive in effect;

<sup>99</sup> *Deutsch Continental Gas Gesellschaft v Polish State* (1929) 5 ILR 11, 13.

<sup>100</sup> LNOJ, Sp Supp 4 (1920), 8.

<sup>101</sup> The Report of the Commission of Rapporteurs is less explicit. Certain passages are at least capable of a constitutivist interpretation: e.g., ‘The recognition of the Finnish State by the Powers gave her admission into the community of nations, as fulfilling the conditions necessary for this official confirmation of an independent existence, one of the most important of which is the possession of frontiers which are sufficiently determined.’

LN Council Doc B7: 21/68/106 (1921), 23. But the crucial element in the Rapporteurs’ argument was the continuity between the independent State of Finland after 1917, and the autonomous State of Finland before 1917. This continuity was regarded as a continuity of legal personality, despite absence of recognition of pre-1917 Finland: cf the reference to ‘an autonomous Finland which... on the 6th December 1917, proclaimed her full and entire independence of Russia, detached herself from the latter by an act of her own free will, and became thereafter herself a sovereign State instead of a dependent State’ (ibid, 22).

<sup>102</sup> Opinion 1, Badinter Commission, 29 November 1991, 92 ILR 165.

<sup>103</sup> Opinions 8 and 10: 92 ILR 201 (4 July 1992); ibid, 206–8 (4 July 1992).

indeed debate continues to rage between those who attribute the troubles of Yugoslavia to premature recognition and those who blame European governments for not intervening earlier and more decisively.<sup>104</sup> It is difficult to reach a conclusion on this without examining in detail the bases for some of the particular claims to statehood, a matter addressed in Chapters 12 and 17. But overall the international approach to the dissolution of Yugoslavia, unhappy as it has been, does not support the constitutive theory,<sup>105</sup> still less demand that we adopt it as a general matter. The International Court in the *Bosnian Genocide case*, though not addressing the matter of recognition directly,<sup>106</sup> may be seen, by implication, to have favoured the view that statehood and its attendant rights exist independently of the will of other States. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) had argued that the Court was not competent to adjudicate questions under the Genocide Convention, because the FRY and Bosnia-Herzegovina had not recognized one another at the time proceedings were instituted. The Court dismissed this argument on the basis that (as mutual recognition had subsequently been given in the Dayton Accord)<sup>107</sup> any defect was merely procedural and could be repaired simply by refileing the claim, which would relate back to alleged acts of genocide occurring prior to 1995.<sup>108</sup> The result is consonant with the declaratory view: the rights of Bosnia-Herzegovina (under the Genocide Convention or otherwise) were opposable to the FRY from the time the former became a State, whether or not the FRY had yet recognized it as such.

Among writers the declaratory doctrine, with differences in emphasis, predominates. Brownlie states the position succinctly: 'Recognition, *as a public act of state*, is an optional and political act and there is no legal duty in this regard. However, in a deeper sense, if an entity bears the marks of statehood, other states put themselves at risk legally, if they ignore the basic obligations of state relations.'<sup>109</sup>

<sup>104</sup> On recognition of constituent entities emerging from the former SFRY see Hillgruber (1998) 9 *EJIL* 491; Warbrick and Lowe (1992) 41 *ICLQ* 473, Craven (1995) 66 *BY* 333, Crawford, *Selected Essays*, 213–21.

<sup>105</sup> Thus Macedonia was not recognized for some years (due to political problems with Greece), yet it was treated by all as a State. Serbia and Montenegro was not recognized as the continuation of the old SFRY, and most States had limited diplomatic relations with it as a result. But its statehood was never in doubt.

<sup>106</sup> 'For the purposes of determining its jurisdiction in this case, the Court has no need to settle the question of what the effects of a situation of non-recognition may be on the contractual ties between parties to a multilateral treaty.' ICJ Rep 1996 p 595, 613.

<sup>107</sup> General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 14 December 1995, 35 ILM 75.

<sup>108</sup> ICJ Rep 1996 p 595, 612–13.

<sup>109</sup> *Principles* (2nd edn), 94; (6th edn), 89–90 (emphasis in original); see also cf (2nd edn), 90–3; (6th edn), 86–8. Among older authorities, those supporting the declaratory position include: Erich

Moroeover States do not in practice regard unrecognized States as exempt from international law;<sup>110</sup> indeed failure to comply with international law is sometimes cited as a justification for non-recognition. And they do in fact carry on relations, often substantial, with such States, extending even to joint membership of inter-State organizations such as the United Nations.<sup>111</sup> Recognition is usually intended as an act, if not of political approval, at least of political accommodation.<sup>112</sup>

## (2) Conclusions

It is sometimes suggested that the 'great debate' over the character of recognition has done nothing but confuse the issues, that it is mistaken to categorize recognition as either declaratory or constitutive in accordance with some general theory. According to Brownlie:

in the case of 'recognition', theory has not only failed to enhance the subject but has created a *tertium quid* which stands, like a bank of fog on a still day, between the observer and the contours of the ground which calls for investigation. With rare exceptions the theories on recognition have not only failed to improve the quality of thought but have deflected lawyers from the application of ordinary methods of legal analysis.<sup>113</sup>

(1926) 13 *HR* 427, 457–68; Jaffé, *Judicial Aspects of Foreign Relations*, 97–8; Borchard (1942) 36 *AJ* 108; Brown (1942) 36 *AJ* 106; Kunz (1950) 44 *AJ* 713; Chen, *Recognition*; Marek, *Identity and Continuity*, 130–61; Charpentier, *Reconnaissance*, 196–200; Lachs (1959) 35 *BY* 252; Waldock (1962) 106 *HR* 147–51; Brierly, *Law of Nations* (6th edn), 139; Higgins, *Development*, 135–6; Starke, *Studies in International Law*, 91–100; O'Connell, *International Law* (2nd edn), vol I, 128–34; Fawcett, *The Law of Nations* (2nd edn), 49, 55; Akehurst, *Modern Introduction* (3rd edn), 60–3. See also the *Resolutions of the Institut du Droit International* (1936): 'La reconnaissance a un effet déclaratif. L'existence de l'État nouveau avec tous les effets juridiques qui s'attachent à cette existence n'est pas affectée par le refus de reconnaissance d'un ou plusieurs États': Wehberg (ed), *Institut de Droit International, Table Général des Résolutions 1873–1956*, ii; and cf Brown [1934] *Annuaire* 302–57. Among more recent writers see Davidson (1980) 32 *NILQ* 22; Menon, (1989) 67 *RDISDP* 161, 176; Weston, Falk and D'Amato, *International Law and World Order* (2nd edn), 847; Verhoeven (1993) 39 *AFDI* 7; Warbrick, in Evans (ed), *Aspects of Statehood and Institutionalism in Contemporary Europe*, 9; Emanuelli, *Droit international public*, 189 (para 385). See also *Restatement* 3rd, §202, Reporters' Note 7 (1987): 'This section tends towards the declaratory view . . .'; and, *ibid*, §202, comment b: 'An entity that satisfies the requirements of §201 is a state whether or not its statehood is formally recognized by other states.'

<sup>110</sup> Cf the Protocol of the London Conference, 19 February 1831: 18 *BFSP* 779, 781 (concerning Belgium); Marek, *Identity and Continuity*, 140. Non-recognition of North Korea and of Israel was not regarded as precluding the application of international law rules to the Korean and Middle East wars: Brownlie, *Use of Force*, 380. See also Briggs (1949) 43 *AJ* 113, 117–20; Charpentier, *Reconnaissance*, 45–8, 56–8; Whiteman, 2 *Digest*, 604–5.

<sup>111</sup> See Bot, *Non-Recognition and Treaty Relations*; Whiteman, 2 *Digest*, 524–604, and for the older practice see Moore, 1 *Digest*, 206–35; Hackworth, 1 *Digest*, 327–63.

<sup>112</sup> Cf Lachs (1959) 35 *BY* 252, 259; Higgins, *Development*, 164–5; Verhoeven, *Reconnaissance*, 721.

<sup>113</sup> Brownlie (1982) 53 *BY* 197, 197.



Some continental writers, following de Visscher, have tended to regard recognition as combining both declaratory and constitutive elements.<sup>114</sup> One can sympathize with these views, but at a fundamental level a choice has to be made. The question is whether the denial of recognition to an entity otherwise qualifying as a State entitles the non-recognizing State to act as if it was not a State—to ignore its nationality, to intervene in its affairs, generally to deny the exercise of State rights under international law. The answer must be no, and the categorical constitutive position, which implies a different answer, is unacceptable.

But this does not mean that recognition does not have important legal and political effects.<sup>115</sup> Recognition is an institution of State practice that can resolve uncertainties as to status and allow for new situations to be regularized. That an entity is recognized as a State is evidence of its status; where recognition is general, it may be practically conclusive. States, in the forum of the United Nations or elsewhere, may make declarations as to status or ‘recognize’ entities the status of which is doubtful:<sup>116</sup> depending on the degree of unanimity and other factors this may be evidence of a compelling kind.<sup>117</sup> Even individual acts of recognition may contribute towards the consolidation of status: in Charpentier’s terms, recognition may render the new situation opposable to the recognizing State.<sup>118</sup>

In some situations, the term ‘recognition’ may also be used to describe acts that are properly speaking constitutive of a particular State; for example, a multilateral treaty establishing a new State will at the same time extend the

<sup>114</sup> De Visscher, *Problèmes d’interprétation judiciaire en droit international public*, 191; de Visscher, *Théories et Réalités* (4th rev edn), 258; Salmon, *La Reconnaissance d’État*, 19 ff. Cf Charpentier, *Reconnaissance*. Verhoeven, *Reconnaissance*, 548 refers in the same vein to a ‘dialectical relationship’ between recognition and the criteria for statehood, although his basic position remains declaratist: *ibid*, 545, 714–15, 720, esp 547–8: ‘Force est en effet de convenir que pareille aptitude n’est originellement qu’une virtualité qui doit être impérativement présumée dès l’instant où sont réunis les critères traditionnels de l’État, sans réserve d’une vérification de la “viabilité” de l’Etat, sous réserve d’une vérification de la proposition illustre néanmoins indirectement cette caractéristique fondamentale de l’effectivité étatique, d’être principalement une effectivité par rapport à autrui, qui privilégie autant qu’elle problématise l’autorité “externe” par rapport à l’autorité interne. Cette effectivité par rapport à autrui introduit une relation dialectique entre l’effectivité purement matérielle et la reconnaissance qu’elle conditionne, qui complique singulièrement la vérification de celle-là. Il n’est en effet guère douteux que dans la réalité des rapports internationaux la reconnaissance comme fait a fréquemment une portée constitutive et devient l’élément d’une effectivité qui théoriquement la conditionne.’

<sup>115</sup> Cf *Restatement 3rd*, §202, comment c.  
<sup>116</sup> E.g., GA res 195 (III) declaring the Republic of Korea and its government to be representative of the State of Korea.

<sup>117</sup> Admission to the United Nations is a strong form of ‘collective recognition’: see Chapter 4.

<sup>118</sup> Charpentier, *Reconnaissance*, 217–25.

signatories' recognition of that State.<sup>119</sup> But the constitutive acts here are those involving the establishment of the State, the stipulation of its constitution, the definition of its borders, etc. Collective recognition is ancillary and is not a substitute for action by the competent authorities.<sup>120</sup>

The conclusion must be that the status of an entity as a State is, in principle, independent of recognition, although the qualifications already made suggest that the differences between declaratory and constitutive schools are less in practice than has been depicted. But this conclusion assumes that there exist in international law and practice workable criteria for statehood. If there are no such criteria, or if they are so imprecise as to be practically useless, then the constitutive position will have returned, as it were, by the back door.<sup>121</sup> The question whether such criteria exist will be discussed in the next chapter.

## 1.5 Certain basic concepts

Certain basic concepts—personality, sovereignty, the state/government distinction, continuity and succession—recur throughout this work and need some brief initial explanation.

### (1) International personality<sup>122</sup>

The term 'international personality' has been defined as 'the capacity to be bearer of rights and duties under international law'.<sup>123</sup> Such definitions only tend to obscure: any person or aggregate of persons has the capacity to be given rights and duties by States,<sup>124</sup> and in an era of human rights, investment protection and international criminal law, everyone is at some level 'the bearer of rights and duties' under international law.<sup>125</sup> Yet there is evidently a distinction

<sup>119</sup> E.g., the recognition of Cyprus by the Treaty of Guarantee, Art II, 16 August 1960, 382 UNTS 3.

<sup>120</sup> For collective action in the creation of States see further Chapter 12.

<sup>121</sup> Cf Anzilotti, *Corso di Diritto Internazionale* (3rd edn), vol I, 163–6.

<sup>122</sup> See, e.g., Kelsen, *Principles of International Law* (2nd edn), 573–4; Barberis, *Festschrift für Hermann Mosler*, 25; Cassese, *International Law in a Divided World*, 74–104; Jennings and Watts, *Oppenheim* (9th edn), 119–20 (§33), 330–1 (§103); Hickey (1997) 2 *Hofstra LPS* 1; Charlesworth and Chinkin, *The Boundaries of International Law*, 124–5; Shinoda, *Re-examining Sovereignty*, 17–18; Raič, *Statehood and the Law of Self-Determination* (2002), 10–18; Brownlie, *Principles* (6th edn), 648–50 (respecting personality of international organizations); Shaw, *International Law* (5th edn), 175–201.

<sup>123</sup> Schwarzenberger, *Manual*, 53.

<sup>124</sup> Cf *Danzig Railway Officials*, PCIJ ser b No 15 (1928) 17–18.

<sup>125</sup> See Crawford, *Selected Essays*, 17, 26–9; Brownlie, *Principles* (2nd edn), 73, (6th edn), 69: 'The state is a type of legal person recognized by international law. Yet, since there are other types of legal person so recognized... the possession of legal personality is not in itself a sufficient mark of statehood.'

between being a beneficiary of rights or a bearer of duties, on the one hand, and being an active participant on the international level, on the other. Individuals and companies can bring claims in international forums established by treaty (and not only as the delegates of the States parties to these treaties<sup>125a</sup>). But it remains true that these forums are created and ultimately controlled by States or by intergovernmental organizations, and it is these entities that remain the gatekeepers and legislators of the international system.<sup>126</sup>

As an aspect of the developments in doctrine and practice in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, international legal personality came to be regarded as synonymous with statehood.<sup>127</sup> For example, it was never definitively settled whether the League of Nations had international personality.<sup>128</sup> The question arose with respect to the United Nations soon after its foundation: could the United Nations bring a claim for injury (a) to itself and (b) to its agents caused by the conduct of a non-member State? In the *Reparations* Opinion the International Court gave an affirmative answer in both respects. It reformulated that question in the following terms:

... whether the Charter has given the Organization such a position that it possesses, in regard to its Members, rights which it is entitled to ask them to respect. *In other words*, does the Organization possess international personality? This is no doubt a doctrinal expression, which has sometimes given rise to controversy. But it will be used here to mean that if the Organization is recognized as having that personality, it is an entity capable of availing itself of obligations incumbent upon its Members.<sup>129</sup>

As to whether the United Nations might claim reparations for injury to its agents committed by nationals of a non-Member state, the Court gave an affirmative answer, stating that ‘... fifty States, representing the vast majority of the members of the international community, had the power, in conformity

<sup>125a</sup> See *Occidental Exploration & Production Co v Republic of Ecuador*, ‘the investor is given direct standing to pursue the state.’ [2005] EWCA Civ 1116, *Times*, 23 Sept 2005 (Mance LJ), para 16.

<sup>126</sup> See Oppenheim (9th edn), 119–20, §33; Malanczuk, in Weiss et al (eds), *International Economic Law With a Human Face*, 64; Brownlie, in Evans (ed), *Aspects of Statehood and Institutionalism in Contemporary Europe*, 5; Virally (1985) 183 *HR* 9, 71–2.

<sup>127</sup> Crawford, *Selected Essays* (2002) 17, 19; Nijman, in *State, Sovereignty, and International Governance*, 109.

<sup>128</sup> Williams, *Some Aspects of the Covenant of the League of Nations*, 38, 43; Zimmern, *The League of Nations and the Rule of Law 1918–1935*, 277–85; Brierly (1946) 23 *BY* 83, 85.

<sup>129</sup> *Reparations Case*, ICJ Rep 1949, p 174, 178 (emphasis added). On the legal personality of international organizations generally, see Menon (1992) 70 *RDI* 61; Bederman (1996) 36 *Va JIL* 275; Seidl-Hohenveldern and Loibl, *Das Recht der Internationalen Organisationen*, (6th edn), 43; Lim, in Harding (ed), *Renegotiating Westphalia*, 53; Amerasinghe, *Principles of the International Law of International Organizations* (2nd edn), ch 3. Regarding the legal personality of particular organizations, Bernhardt (1982) 18 *Europarecht* 199; Khodakov (1993) 7 *Emory ILR* 13; Head (1996) 90 *AJ* 214, 221; Packer and Rukare (2002) 96 *AJ* 365.

with international law, to bring into being an entity possessing objective international personality, and not merely personality recognized by them alone, together with capacity to bring international claims'.<sup>130</sup> A distinction is thus drawn between 'objective international personality' and personality recognized by particular States only. It would appear that the former exists wherever the rights and obligations of an entity are conferred by general international law, and the latter where an entity is established by particular States for special purposes.<sup>131</sup> States clearly are included in the former category: the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, Rhodes and Malta is an example of the latter.<sup>132</sup> The Court held that, by virtue of the importance of its functions and the extent of its membership, the United Nations was also in the former category, an 'objective' legal person.<sup>133</sup>

There is thus a distinction between 'general' (or 'objective') and 'special' (or 'particular') legal personality. General legal personality arises against the world (*erga omnes*): particular legal personality binds only consenting States. But no further implications may be drawn from the existence of legal personality: the extent of the powers, rights and responsibilities of any entity is to be determined only by examination of its actual position.<sup>134</sup> And, as with other

<sup>130</sup> ICJ Rep 1949 p 174, 185.

<sup>131</sup> There does not appear to be any general practice of recognition by States of the legal personality of international organizations. The USSR sought for years (and unavailingly) to deny the existence of the European Communities; that episode does not seem to have generated imitators. Distinguish, however, headquarters agreements between international organizations and host countries, e.g., Headquarters Agreement of 15 April 1991 between UK and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, UKTS No 45 (1991), (1991) 62 *BY* 576 and the position respecting the European Union. *HC Debs*, vol 240, *WA*, col 291, 23 March 1994; *Parl Papers* 1992–3; (1992) 63 *BY* 660–1.

<sup>132</sup> The position of individuals or corporations as bearers of rights under international law is a distinct one. They may have standing under treaties, and they may certainly have rights especially under international human rights instruments. That does not make them in any meaningful sense 'international legal persons'. As holders of rights and even obligations they do not cease to be subject to the State of their nationality, residence or incorporation, as the case may be. On the position of individuals under international law see Janis (1984) 17 *Cornell ILJ* 61; Orentlicher (1991) 100 *Yale LJ* 2537; Vazquez (1992) 92 *Col LR* 1082; Meron (2000) 94 *AJ* 239; Dolzer (2002) 20 *Berkeley JIL* 296. Compare St Korowics (1956) 50 *AJ* 533.

<sup>133</sup> For criticism see Schwarzenberger, *International Law*, vol I, 128–9, 469–71, 523, 596. Brownlie describes the passage cited as 'an assertion of political and constitutional fact rather than a reasoned conclusion', but regards it as 'appropriate and necessary' in the special circumstances: *Principles* (2nd edn), 670; (6th edn), 661. Cf also Oppenheim (8th edn), vol 1, 407 (§168), 880 (§492), 928–9 (§522); *ibid*, (9th edn), vol 1, 18 (§7), 1203 (§583), 1263 (§627).

<sup>134</sup> See further O'Connell (1963) 67 *RGDIP* 5; Lauterpacht (1947) 63 *LQR* 433, (1948) 64 *LQR* 97; Siotto Pintor (1932) 41 *HR* 245; Aufrecht (1943) 37 *Am Pol Sci R* 217; Scelle, in Lipsky (ed), *Law and Politics in the World Community*, 49.

questions, it is not in the bulk of cases but, rather, in the marginal ones that the more difficult questions are likely to arise.<sup>135</sup>

## (2) The State

In a sense, the whole of this work is an attempt to define and elucidate the concept of statehood as it operates in present-day international law. In particular, the criteria for statehood, ancient and modern, are examined in detail in Chapters 2 and 3. Despite its importance, statehood ‘in the sense of international law’ has not always been a clearly defined concept. Although the United Kingdom and Indian Governments thought a definition of the term ‘State’ a prerequisite for the proposed Draft Declaration on the Rights and Duties of States,<sup>136</sup> the International Law Commission (ILC) concluded:

that no useful purpose would be served by an effort to define the term ‘State’ . . . In the Commission’s draft, the term . . . is used in the sense commonly accepted in international practice. Nor did the Commission think that it was called upon to set forth . . . the qualifications to be possessed by a community in order that it may become a State.<sup>137</sup>

This rather bland rejoinder concealed considerable disagreement as to the definition of both ‘State’ and ‘Nation’ and their relationship.<sup>138</sup> As we shall see, to refer merely to statehood ‘for the purposes of international law’ assumes that a State for one purpose is necessarily also a State for another. This may be true in most cases but not necessarily all. The ‘A’ Mandated territories were treated as States for the purposes of nationality, but were much less certainly States for other purposes. The Free City of Danzig was a State for the purposes of Article 71(2) of the Rules of the Permanent Court; whether it was a State for all purposes has been doubted. Many legal issues subsumed under the rubric of ‘statehood’ may be able to be resolved in their own terms—often this will take the form of interpretation of a treaty or other document. But at a basic level and for many purposes it still makes a great difference whether an entity is or is not a State. The matter is pursued in the next chapter.

<sup>135</sup> See, e.g., Tabory in Shapira (ed), *New Political Entities*, 139 (Palestine); Morin (1984) 1 *Rev Québécoise DI* 163 (Quebec); Mushkat (1994) 24 *HKLJ* 328 (Macau); Crawford, *Rights in One Country* (Hong Kong).

<sup>136</sup> ILC, *Preparatory Study*, A/CN.4/2, 1948, 50.

<sup>137</sup> ILC, *Report* 1949: A/925, 9.

<sup>138</sup> See *ILC Ybk*, 1949, 61–8, 70–1, 84–6, 138, 173.

### (3) Sovereignty

The term ‘sovereignty’ has a long and troubled history, and a variety of meanings.<sup>139</sup> In its most common modern usage, sovereignty is the term for the ‘totality of international rights and duties recognized by international law’ as residing in an independent territorial unit—the State.<sup>140</sup> It is not itself a right, nor is it a criterion for statehood (sovereignty is an attribute of States, not a precondition). It is a somewhat unhelpful, but firmly established, description of statehood; a brief term for the State’s attribute of more-or-less plenary competence.

Unsurprisingly, the term has drawn criticism. According to Charney: ‘The word “sovereignty” should be stricken from our vocabulary. It evokes the anachronistic idea of the total independence and autonomy of the state, and has no real meaning today. Use of the word calls to mind a fundamentalist view that is difficult to debate in light of its emotive baggage.’<sup>141</sup> But the term seems to be ineradicable, and anyway its eradication might only make matters worse. Better, one might think, 192 sovereigns than one or a few. Associated with the concept of sovereign equality, the term is a normative one and may be unobjectionable. What is objectionable is the abuse of language involved in statements of the form ‘State A is sovereign therefore its conduct is unquestionable’ (a statement normally used to defend the conduct of one’s own State, not that of others). As a United States court observed:

We cannot accept... [a] definition of sovereignty as the ‘supreme, absolute, and uncontrollable power by which an independent state is governed.’ [Appellant] would have us believe that sovereignty is an ‘all or nothing’ concept... we disagree... [T]his

<sup>139</sup> See 10 *Enc PIL* 397, 399; Wildhaber, in Macdonald and Johnston (eds), *The Structure and Process of International Law*, 425; Hinsley, *Sovereignty* (2nd edn 1986), 224–35; Kranz (1992) 30 *Archiv des Völkerrechts* 411; Bartelson, *A Genealogy of Sovereignty*; E Lauterpacht (1997) 73 *Int Affairs* 137; Dupuy, *Dialectiques du droit international*; Merriam, *History of the Theory of Sovereignty since Rousseau*; Rawls, *Law of Peoples*, 27, 79; Jackson (2003) 97 *AJ* 782; Sarooshi (2004) 25 *Michigan JIL* 1107; Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*, 3–25.

<sup>140</sup> Cf *Reparations Case*, ICJ Rep 1949 p 174, 180. See generally Whiteman, 1 *Digest* 233–82; Korowicz, *Organisations internationales et souveraineté États membres*; Sukiennicki, *La Souveraineté des États en droit internationale moderne*; Crawford, *Selected Essays*, 95. Kamal Hossain, ‘State Sovereignty and the UN Charter’ (MS DPhil d 3227, Oxford, 1964) distinguishes three meanings of sovereignty: (1) State sovereignty as a distinctive characteristic of States as constituent units of the international legal system; (2) Sovereignty as freedom of action in respect of all matters with regard to which a State is not under any legal obligation; and (3) Sovereignty as the minimum amount of autonomy which a State must possess before it can be accorded the status of a ‘sovereign state’. There is a fourth meaning: sovereignty as plenary authority to administer territory. The first meaning seems to be reflected in the following UK Government statement: ‘Sovereignty is an attribute which under international law resides inherently in any independent state recognised as such. By virtue and in exercise of their sovereignty, states conduct dealings with one another internationally.’ *HL Debs*, vol 566, *WA* 85, 16 October 1995.

<sup>141</sup> Charney (1997) 91 *AJ* 394, 395 (citing Henkin).

argument ignores the distinction between sovereignty, or the legal personhood of the nation, and jurisdiction, or the rights and powers of the nation over its inhabitants. It is uncontroversial that nations, even though they are recognized as full members of the international community, must modify their internal affairs as a result of their participation in the international community.<sup>142</sup>

In any event, as a matter of international law no further legal consequences attach to sovereignty than attach to statehood itself. The question of sovereignty in international law is not to be confused with the constitutional lawyer's question of supreme competence within a particular State: the 'sovereignty of Parliament' could coexist with the effective abandonment of the sovereignty of the United Kingdom.<sup>143</sup> Nor is it to be confused with the exercise of 'sovereign rights': a State may continue to be sovereign even though important governmental functions are carried out on its behalf by another State or by an international organization. And, finally, 'sovereignty' does not mean actual equality of rights or competences. The actual competence of a State, for example, to wage war, may be restricted by its constitution,<sup>144</sup> or by treaty<sup>145</sup> or even by a particular international rule.<sup>146</sup> As a legal term 'sovereignty' refers not to omnipotent authority—the authority to slaughter all blue-eyed babies, for example—but to the totality of powers that States may have under international law.<sup>147</sup> By contrast, as a political term its connotations are those of untrammelled authority and power and it is in such discourse that the term can be problematic.<sup>148</sup>

#### (4) State and government<sup>149</sup>

One of the prerequisites for statehood is the existence of an effective government; and the main—for most purposes the only—organ by which the State

<sup>142</sup> *Heller v US*, 776 F 2d 92, 96–7 (3rd Cir 1985).

<sup>143</sup> Cf *Harris v The Minister of the Interior* [1952] 2 SA (AD) 428. The confusion was reflected in the plaintiff's argument in *Blackburn v AG* [1971] 1 WLR 1037, 52 ILR 414. On the 'sovereignty of parliament' in relation to the incorporation of European law into UK law, see Akehurst (1989) 60 BY 351.

<sup>144</sup> E.g., The Philippines by the Constitution of 1935 as amended, Art II(3).

<sup>145</sup> E.g., Austria by the State Treaty of 1955, 217 UNTS 223, Art 13.

<sup>146</sup> E.g., Switzerland, by the 'public law of Europe': McNair, *Law of Treaties*, 50.

<sup>147</sup> The utility of the term is not increased by a good deal of writing loosely suggesting the eclipse of States, the lapse of sovereign equality and the value of 'relative' sovereignty. See, e.g., Simonovic (2000) 28 *Georgia JILC* 381; Wriston (1993) 17 *Fletcher Forum World Aff* 117, 117; Schreuer (1993) 4 *EJIL* 447–71; Cullet (1999) 10 *EJIL* 549, 551; Williams (2000) 26 *Rev Int Stud* 557, 557–73. See also Kingsbury (1998) 9 *EJIL* 599.

<sup>148</sup> Cf Westlake, *International Law*, vol I, 237 (cited in translation in the French *Counter-Mémoire, The Lotus*, PCIJ ser C, no 13-II, 275); Hart, *The Concept of Law* (1961), 217–18. See also Reisman (1990) 84 *AJ* 866; Henkin (1999) 68 *Fordham LR* 1; Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*.

<sup>149</sup> See Whiteman, 1 *Digest* 911–16; Jennings (1967) 121 *HR* 350–2; Arangio Ruiz (1975) *OZFOR* 265, 260; Verhoeven, *Reconnaissance*, 66–71.

acts in international relations is its central government.<sup>150</sup> There would thus seem to be a close relation between the concepts of government and statehood. According to O'Connell: 'Until the middle of the nineteenth century, both types of change [change of State and change of government] were assimilated, and the problems they raised were uniformly solved. With the abstraction of the concept of sovereignty, however, a conceptual chasm was opened between change of sovereignty and change of government.'<sup>151</sup> This 'post-Hegelian'<sup>152</sup> development O'Connell criticizes as 'dogmatic' and 'arbitrary'.<sup>153</sup> In the context of succession to obligations—that is, in the context of the legal effects of changes in State or government—it is more useful and more cogent in his view to pay regard not to any such distinction but to the real changes or continuities in political, social and administrative structure.<sup>154</sup> He thus advocates a return to the eighteenth-century position of practical assimilation of changes of State and government.<sup>155</sup>

It is true that some changes of government have greater and more traumatic effects than most changes of statehood (as with Russia in the period after the Revolution of 1917). Nonetheless it is a reasonable assumption that changes in statehood are more likely to have greater social and structural importance than changes in government. In any event, international law does distinguish between change of State personality and change of the government of the State.<sup>156</sup> There is a strong presumption that the State continues to exist, with its rights and obligations, despite revolutionary changes in government, or despite a period in which there is no, or no effective, government. Belligerent occupation does not affect the continuity of the State, even where there exists no government claiming to represent the occupied State.<sup>157</sup> The legal position of governments-in-exile is dependent on the distinction between government and State.<sup>158</sup> So also is the characterization of a lengthy conflict such as the Spanish Civil War as a 'civil' rather than as 'international' war.<sup>159</sup> The concept

<sup>150</sup> Cf *Genocide case (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Yugoslavia) (Preliminary Objections)*, ICJ Rep 1996 p 595, 621–2 (citing Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, Art 7(2)(a)).

<sup>151</sup> *State Succession* (1967), vol I, 5–6. <sup>152</sup> *Ibid*, vol I, vi. <sup>153</sup> *Ibid*, vol I, 7; II, vi.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid*, vol II, vi. <sup>155</sup> *Ibid*, vol I 1, 7.

<sup>156</sup> Wright (1952) 46 *AJ* 299, 307; Jessup, *Modern Law of Nations*, 43.

<sup>157</sup> The occupation of Iraq in 2003 illustrated the difference between 'government' and 'State'; when Members of the Security Council, after adopting SC res 1511, 16 October 2003, called for the rapid 'restoration of Iraq's sovereignty', they did not imply that Iraq had ceased to exist as a State but that normal governmental arrangements should be restored. See Grant (2003) 97 *AJ* 823, 836–7.

<sup>158</sup> Whiteman, 1 *Digest* 921–30; Oppenheimer (1942) 26 *AJ* 568–95; Verhoeven, *Reconnaissance*, 76–83. On governments-in-exile, see Talmon, *Recognition of Governments in International Law*. For the special case of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, see Grant (2001) 1 *Baltic YBIL* 23, 41–9.

<sup>159</sup> For the distinction between government and State in the Spanish Civil War, see *Government of Spain v Chancery Lane Safe Deposit Ltd; State of Spain v Chancery Lane Safe Deposit Ltd*, *The Times*,



of representation of States in international organizations also depends upon the distinction.<sup>160</sup>

Moreover, in arguing for a closer identification of 'State' and 'government', O'Connell sought to maximize the extent to which treaty and other obligations are transmitted from one State to its successor.<sup>161</sup> In other words he was trying to draw from the relative stability secured by the principle of State continuity a similar stability for the law of State succession. But the law of State succession has developed otherwise:<sup>162</sup> it has come to be accepted that successor States, in particular newly independent States, have substantial freedom as to the succession of treaty rights and obligations, although with certain exceptions.<sup>163</sup> To obliterate the distinction between 'change of State' and 'change of government' would now only decrease the stability of legal relations.

### (5) State continuity and State succession

There is then a clear distinction in principle between the legal personality of the State and its government for the time being.<sup>164</sup> This serves to distinguish in turn the field of State personality (which includes the topics of identity and continuity of States) and that of State succession.<sup>165</sup> State succession depends upon the conclusion reached as to State personality.<sup>166</sup> This is not to say,

26 May 1939; noted (1944) 21 *BY* 195. See also *Spanish Civil War Pension Case* (1978, Federal Social Court, FRG) 80 *ILR* 666, 668–70.

<sup>160</sup> The transition of the FRY (Serbia & Montenegro) from predecessor to successor State is discussed in Chapter 17.

<sup>161</sup> Cf *State Succession*, vol I, 30–5. The argument, for opposite reasons, was advanced by La Forest (1966) 60 *PAS* 103; cf the reactions of Briggs, *ibid*, 125, Aufricht, *ibid*, 126.

<sup>162</sup> See Crawford, *Selected Essays*, 243 for a detailed study in the context of O'Connell's own work and that of the ILC.

<sup>163</sup> In recent practice the recognition of newly emergent States has often been conditional on their acceptance of obligations arising under certain treaties to which the 'parent' State had been party. The 1991 EC Guidelines on the Recognition of New States in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union provided that States accept 'all relevant commitments with regard to disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation as well as to security and regional stability' '31 *ILM* 1486'. European States required, under the rubric of disarmament, that States established on the territory of the former Soviet Union accept the obligations contained in the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, which the Soviet Union had signed on 19 November 1990 (30 *ILM* 1 (1991)). See, e.g., 63 *BY* 637 (EC Presidency statement regarding Kyrgyzstan and Tadjikistan, specifying requirement to observe, *inter alia*, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe). This practice has tended to be specific and of variable quality; its impact on general issues of treaty succession is doubtful.

<sup>164</sup> Cf O'Connell, *State Succession*, vol I, 3; O'Connell, 1972 *Grotius SP* 23, 26–8; Charpentier, *Reconnaissance*, 15–16.

<sup>165</sup> Marek, *Identity and Continuity*, 9–14, describes the two as 'mutually exclusive'; cf Pereira, *Succession d'États en Matière de Traité*, 7–11. The ILC resisted attempts at eroding the distinction in its work on State succession: see, e.g., *ILC Ybk*, 1974/II(1), 14–16, 30–1.

<sup>166</sup> Hall, *International Law* (8th edn), 114, cited O'Connell, *State Succession*, vol I, 3.

however, that the topic of State succession is irrelevant to this study. Views taken of particular State succession situations may illuminate related problems of personality. In some areas, at least, the principles and policy considerations involved are similar. The problem of 'State succession' in the case of devolving territories such as the British Dominions, 1919 to 1945, was in part a matter of succession and in part a matter of personality or agency. Nonetheless the concepts of continuity and succession remain distinct, and blurring them serves no useful goal.<sup>167</sup>

<sup>167</sup> For the outcome of the ILC's work on State succession see Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties (1978) (entered into force 6 November 1996), 1946 UNTS 3, (1978) 17 ILM 1488; Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of State Property, Archives and Debts (1983), (1983) 22 ILM 298, A/CONF/117/15, 7 April 1983.