

Enforcing Obligations Erga Omnes in International Law

The concept of obligations erga omnes - obligations owed to the international community as a whole - has fascinated international lawyers for decades, yet its precise implications remain unclear. This book assesses how this concept affects the enforcement of international law. It shows that all States are entitled to invoke obligations erga omnes in proceedings before the International Court of Justice, and to take countermeasures in response to serious erga omnes breaches. In addition, it suggests ways of identifying obligations that qualify as erga omnes. In order to sustain these results, the book conducts a thorough examination of international practice and jurisprudence as well as the recent work of the UN International Law Commission in the field of State responsibility. By so doing, it demonstrates that the erga omnes concept is now solidly grounded in modern international law, and clarifies one of the central aspects of the international regime of law enforcement.

Christian J. Tams is a Lecturer at the Walther Schücking Institute for International Law at the University of Kiel, Germany.



CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW

Established in 1946, this series produces high quality scholarship in the fields of public and private international law and comparative law. Although these are distinct legal subdisciplines, developments since 1946 confirm their interrelation.

Comparative law is increasingly used as a tool in the making of law at national, regional, and international levels. Private international law is now often affected by international conventions, and the issues faced by classical conflicts rules are frequently dealt with by substantive harmonisation of law under international auspices. Mixed international arbitrations, especially those involving state economic activity, raise mixed questions of public and private international law, while in many fields (such as the protection of human rights and democratic standards, investment guarantees and international criminal law) international and national systems interact. National constitutional arrangements relating to 'foreign affairs', and to the implementation of international norms, are a focus of attention.

The Board welcomes works of a theoretical or interdisciplinary character, and those focusing on the new approaches to international or comparative law or conflicts of law. Studies of particular institutions or problems are equally welcome, as are translations of the best work published in other languages.

Whewell Professor of International Law, Faculty of Law, and Director, Lauterpacht Research Centre for International Law,

University of Cambridge John S. Bell FBA

Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, University of Cambridge

Editorial Board Professor Hilary Charlesworth University of Adelaide

Professor Lori Damrosch Columbia University Law School

Professor John Dugard University of Leiden

Professor Mary-Ann Glendon Harvard Law School

Professor Christopher Greenwood London School of Economics

Professor David Johnston University of Edinburgh Professor Hein Kötz Max-Planck-Institut, Hamburg Professor Donald McRae University of Ottawa Professor Onuma Yasuaki University of Tokyo

Professor Reinhard Zimmermann Universität Regensburg

Advisory Committee Professor D. W. Bowett QC

Judge Rosalyn Higgins QC Professor J. A. Jolowicz QC

Professor Sir Elihu Lauterpacht CBE QC

Professor Kurt Lipstein Judge Stephen Schewebel

A list of books in the series can be found at the end of this volume.



Enforcing Obligations Erga Omnes in International Law

Christian J. Tams

Walther Schücking Institute University of Kiel (Germany)





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521856676

© Christian J. Tams 2005

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2005

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN-13 978-0-521-85667-6 hardback ISBN-10 0-521-85667-1 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



Contents

Foreword pag	ge xiii
Preface	XV
Notes on citation	xvii
Table of cases	xviii
List of abbreviations	xxviii
Introduction	1
Part I Background to the erga omnes concept	17
1 Clarifications	19
1.1 Countermeasures and ICJ proceedings	19
1.2 The notion of standing	25
1.2.1 Standing as a normative concept	28
1.2.2 Standing as a flexible concept	32
1.2.3 The diversity of rules governing standing	36
1.2.4 Interim conclusions	40
1.3 Standing to enforce individual legal positions	40
1.3.1 The basis of the distinction	41
1.3.2 Categories of individual legal positions	42
1.3.2.a Bilateral legal rules and similar situations	42
1.3.2.b Special injury	44
1.4 Concluding observations	46
2 Traditional approaches to standing	48
2.1 Restrictive tendencies	52
2.1.1 A structural analysis of multilateral obligations	53
2.1.1.a Three categories of obligations	54
2.1.1.b The legal regime	58

vii



V111	CONTENTS
VIII	CONTENTS

		2.1.2 A restrictive interpretation of treaty provisions:	
		the South West Africa case	63
	2.2	Expansive tendencies	69
		2.2.1 Treaty-based rules of standing	70
		2.2.1.a Unequivocal treaty clauses	71
		2.2.1.b Equivocal clauses broadly interpreted: the	
		Wimbledon case	76
		2.2.2 The position in the absence of special treaty	
		regulations	80
		2.2.2.a Interdependent obligations	80
		2.2.2.b Status treaties	80
		Background	81
		Standing to react against breaches	83
		2.2.2.c The duty to comply with judgments of the	
		International Court of Justice	87
		2.2.2.d Basic humanitarian standards	89
	2.3	Concluding observations	94
Part	TT	Legal issues raised by the erga omnes concept	97
3		tinguishing types of erga omnes effects	99
J		Terminological imprecision	101
		The traditional meaning of the term	103
		'Other' erga omnes effects in the ICJ's	100
		jurisprudence	106
		3.3.1 The traditional meaning	107
		3.3.2 The territorial restriction of obligations	110
		3.3.3 The descriptive function	112
	3.4	Concluding observations	115
4	Ide	ntifying obligations erga omnes	117
		The question of sources	120
		4.1.1 The Court's jurisprudence	121
		4.1.2 Further considerations	123
	4.2	Distinguishing obligations erga omnes from other	
		customary obligations	128
		4.2.1 The structural approach	130
		4.2.1.a The strong version	131
		4.2.1.b The moderate version	133
		4.2.1.c Interim conclusion	135
		4.2.2 The material approach	136



	CONTENTS	1X
	4.2.2.a The point of reference	136
	4.2.2.b The required threshold of importance	138
	Obligations erga omnes and norms of	
	jus cogens	139
	The merits of a comparative	
	approach	141
	Implications for the erga omnes concept	146
	Interim conclusion	151
	Beyond jus cogens: obligation erga omnes not	
	deriving from peremptory norms	151
	Dispositive obligations erga omnes?	152
	Relevant factors	153
	4.3 Concluding observations	156
5	Standing to institute ICJ proceedings	158
	5.1 The Barcelona Traction dictum	162
	5.2 Possible counter-arguments	165
	5.2.1 Isolated pronouncements?	165
	5.2.2 An obiter dictum lacking legal relevance?	167
	5.2.3 The international community as the exclusive	
	beneficiary?	173
	5.2.4 Contradictions within the judgment?	176
	5.2.5 Inconclusive jurisprudence since 1970?	179
	5.2.5.a The Nuclear Tests cases	180
	5.2.5.b The East Timor case	182
	Obligations erga omnes and the	
	indispensable third-party rule	183
	The issue of standing	185
	5.2.5.c The Genocide case	187
	5.2.5.d The Nicaragua case	187
	5.2.5.e The Gabčíkovo case	190
	5.2.5.f Summary	192
	5.2.6 A restrictive, contextual	
	interpretation?	193
	5.3 Concluding observations	196
6	Standing to take countermeasures	198
	6.1 The Court's jurisprudence	201
	6.1.1 The Barcelona Traction case	202
	6.1.2 The Namibia and Hostages cases	204
	6.1.3 The Nicaragua case	205
	6.1.4 Interim conclusions	207



X CONTENTS

5.2	Interi	national	practice	207
	6.2.1	Specifi	c instances of state practice	208
			Actual violations	209
			Western countries - Uganda (1971-1978)	210
			European countries – Liberia (1980)	211
			G77 and socialist countries – colonial	
			regimes (1970s-1990s)	211
			Western countries - Poland (1981)	213
			United States - Soviet Union (1981)	214
			Western countries - Argentina (1982)	215
			Western countries - Soviet Union (1983)	217
			Western countries - South Africa	
			(1985–1986)	217
			Various countries – Iraq (1990)	219
			European and Commonwealth countries –	
			Nigeria (1995)	220
			African States – Burundi (1996)	221
			European countries - Yugoslavia (1998)	223
			Various countries - Zimbabwe	
			(2002–2003)	224
		6.2.1.b	Statements implying a right to take	
			countermeasures	225
			G7 declarations on aircraft hijacking	
			(1978/1981)	225
			Western countries - Iran	
			(1979–1980)	226
		6.2.1.c	Actual non-compliance justified	
			differently	227
			Netherlands-Surinam (1982)	227
			European countries-Yugoslavia (1991)	228
		6.2.1.d	An assessment	228
			A preliminary evaluation	230
			Counter-arguments examined	231
			The relevance of the erga omnes	
			concept	232
			The selectivity of practice	234
			The dominance of western practice	235
			A lack of opinio juris	237
			The requirement of collective action	240
			Interim conclusion	241



	CONTENTS	X1		
	6.2.2 Governments' comments on the ILC's work on			
	State responsibility	241		
	6.2.2.a Comments made during the first reading	242		
	6.2.2.b Comments made during the second			
	reading	245		
	6.2.2.c Interim conclusions	248		
	6.3 Concluding observations	249		
7	Erga omnes enforcement rights and competing enforcement			
	mechanisms	252		
	7.1 Identifying areas of conflict	256		
	7.1.1 Overlapping legal rules	256		
	7.1.2 Different enforcement rights	258		
	7.1.2.a Treaty-based systems of enforcement:			
	a survey	259		
	7.1.2.b Specific types of conflict	261		
	7.2 Addressing conflicts	263		
	7.2.1 Contracting out of decentralised enforcement			
	by States	263		
	7.2.1.a Direct recourse by individuals	263		
	7.2.1.b Institutional enforcement	264		
	7.2.1.c Summary	268		
	7.2.2 Contracting out of specific forms of decentralised			
	enforcement	268		
	7.2.2.a General considerations	268		
	The exclusivity thesis	269		
	Alleged support in international			
	jurisprudence	269		
	Its rejection	271		
	Guidelines for the analysis of specific			
	conflicts	276		
	Explicit conflict rules	276		
	Effectivity	277		
	Formal indications of effectivity	278		
	The character of the breach	278		
	Summary	279		
	7.2.2.b Contracting out of ICJ proceedings	279		
	Non-exclusivity clauses	280		
	Implied non-exclusivity	282		
	Flexible exclusivity clauses	283		
	Interim conclusion	286		



xii co	NTENTS	
	7.2.2.c Contracting out of countermeasures	286
	No inter-State procedures available	288
	Inter-State procedures available	289
	Non-judicial procedures	289
	Judicial procedures	291
	Interim conclusion	299
	7.2.3 Special factors restricting treaty enforcement	300
	7.2.3.a Article 51 UNC	300
	7.2.3.b The effects of reservations	302
7.3	Concluding observations	304
Conclusio	n	306
Bibliograph	у	312
Index	•	351



Foreword

The subject of obligations erga omnes - obligations to the international community as a whole - their character and possible consequences has been with us ever since the stray dictum of the International Court in the Barcelona Traction case in 1970. The shares in that Canadian company may have become worthless, but huge resources have been put into explaining and accounting for this particular product of the company's failure. And as so much has been said, so opinions have differed. The phrase was used incidentally only to mark out the terrain of diplomatic protection as an inherently bilateral sphere of interstate relations. It was a pretext for an apology for the Court's earlier decision in Second South West Africa - a disaster from a public relations point of view for the Court and a turning point in its relations with the Third World - in short it was law as politics. It showed the Court confronting a new structure of international law, where what matters are not bilateral but multilateral relations and multilateral norms - self-determination, non-discrimination, the prohibition of aggression, fundamental human rights. It showed the Court evading the challenge presented by the concept of peremptory norms of general international law, adopted over the dissent of France at the Vienna Conference in 1969. Where the States (or most of them) would boldly go with a fundamental assertion of core substantive values or at least of the possibility of such values - the Court would timorously follow, reducing those values to a procedural concept of standing to sue. And so on.

The conceptual split which the two Latin phrases – *jus cogens* and *erga omnes* – caused in the academy has still not been fully traced. Could they not be different aspects of the same underlying concept – fundamental values of juridical interest to all and therefore not waivable without general assent? The International Law Commission in its Articles on

xiii



xiv FOREWORD

Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts used both terms (in Articles 40 and 48) without implying that there is any radical distinction between them. It also used the notion of a group of States (Article 48(1)(a)), immediately contrasted with the international community as a whole – not, be it noted, the international community of States. Historically we have had a world in which there were hundreds of States and State-like entities – countless hundreds in 1648 – and a world in which there were around 60, at the numerical low point of 1945. Currently in the oscillation of numbers of States we seem to be stuck just short of 200 – but such numbers are evidently arbitrary. Perhaps all the States there are now are simply a 'group of States', the group of entities that happen to be States at this time, a contingency not a category.

There is much here that needs careful, painstaking and dispassionate analysis, avoiding dogma and the a priori. Christian Tams provides all this. Of course his is not the only work in the field but it may be judged by some distance the best, and not merely because it has the temporary advantage of being the most recent. It is well researched, historically informed, well-written and balanced in its judgements. It does not oversell the subject but deals with it lucidly and thoroughly, convincing the reader where more strident works on the subject might not. It is a significant contribution, which I believe will help mark out Christian Tams as one of the very best international lawyers of the coming generation.

James Crawford Lauterpacht Research Centre for International Law 16 July 2004



Preface

The concept of obligations *erga omnes* has fascinated international lawyers for some time. It has raised high hopes about the protection of fundamental interests shared by the international community as a whole, yet its precise implications remain, at best, uncertain. My own interest in the concept goes back to a seminar, held at the Christian-Albrechts University of Kiel (Germany) in early 1998, which clearly exposed both aspects – high hopes and lack of certainty. Internships at the United Nations International Law Commission, during the final stages of its work on State responsibility (1999–2001), made me realise that obligations *erga omnes* not only present an intellectual challenge, but are eminently relevant to States.

This book assesses to what extent the fascinating, yet elusive, concept of obligations *erga omnes* has had an impact on the rules of modern international law. It is based on research undertaken at the Universities of Cambridge and Kiel. It was submitted as a PhD thesis to the University of Cambridge in late 2003, and was subsequently awarded the Yorke Prize 2005. My research in Cambridge was supervised by Professor James Crawford, to whom I am much indebted. As the International Law Commission's Special Rapporteur on the topic of State responsibility, he was in a unique position to provide expert guidance. His comments and advice proved most helpful. At the same time, I have greatly appreciated his tolerance of criticism of the Commission's work.

In addition, a great number of people have helped me develop my thoughts on the topic. They include Judge Bruno Simma (The Hague); Professors Jost Delbrück (Kiel), Rainer Hofmann (Frankfurt), and Colin Wabrick (Durham); Chester Brown and Ben Olbourne (both at London); Martin Mennecke (Copenhague); Dr. Andreas Paulus (Munich); as well as Dr. Guigelmo Verdirame, Dr. Matthew Conaglen, and Dr. Roger O'Keefe



xvi PREFACE

(all at Cambridge). Between 2000 and 2003, while I was a member of Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge, my research was generously supported by the College's W. M. Tapp Fund. I am grateful to the Trustees of the Fund, in particular to Dr. Pippa Rogerson, as well as to the following bodies: the Whewell Fund; the Cambridge European Trust; Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes; Evangelisches Studienwerk Villigst; Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst. Thanks are also due to Cambridge University Press, in particular to Finola O'Sullivan, Annie Lovett, and Jan Miles-Kingston, for all their help in turning this manuscript into book form.

Finally, my deepest thanks are owed to my parents, Christa and Dr Gerhard Tams, and to Ina Wiesner, for all their support and encouragement. This work is dedicated to them.



Notes on citation

Citations in the book follow a modified social sciences (Harvard) style, with abbreviated references in the footnotes and full references in the bibliography.

A full bibliographical reference such as

Delbrück, Jost, 'Laws in the Public Interest – Some Observations on the Foundations and Identification of erga omnes Norms in International Law', in: Liber Amicorum Günther Jaenicke – Zum 85. Geburtstag (Götz et al. eds., 1998), 17

therefore is given in the footnotes as

Delbrück (1998), 17

Where necessary, different entries published in the same year are distinguished by 'a' or 'b', i.e. Delbrück (1999a), Delbrück (1999b).

Documents issued by the International Law Commission are not included in the general bibliography, but listed separately.

Cases cited in the footnotes are listed in the Table of cases, which also gives shorthand titles used in the text.

Websites were checked on 20 December 2004.

xvii



Table of cases

1. International Court of Justice

```
Aegan Shelf case (Greece/Turkey) (interim protection), ICJ Reports 1976, 3 171
```

Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Guinea/Congo), Application of 28 December 1998, available at: http://www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idecisions.htm 282

Ambatielos case (Greece/United Kingdom) (preliminary objections), ICJ Reports 1952, 28 24

Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. case (United Kingdom/Iran) (preliminary objections), ICJ Reports 1952, 93 265

Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case (United Kingdom/Norway), ICJ Reports 1951, 116 237, 238

Arbitral Award case (Nicaragua/Honduras), ICJ Reports 1960, 192 43

Armed Activities case (DRC/Rwanda) (new application) (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 2002, 299 97, 117, 160, 282

Armed Activities case (DRC/Uganda) case (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 2000, 111 23, 282, 303

Arrest Warrant case (DRC/Belgium), Judgment of 14 February 2002, ICJ Reports 2002, 3 143

Asylum case (Columbia/Peru), ICJ Reports 1951, 266 239

Barcelona Traction case (Belgium/Spain) (preliminary objections), ICJ Reports 1964, 6 1, 23, 39

Barcelona Traction case (Belgium/Spain) (merits) ICJ Reports 1970, 3 1–3, 4, 11, 14, 15, 29, 31, 33, 34, 39, 41, 45, 46, 52, 97–98, 102–103, 105–108, 112, 113, 117, 118, 120, 122, 123, 128, 135, 140, 162–165, 169, 171, 176–179, 194, 197, 202–204, 238, 269, 270–272, 307, 308, 309–310

Breard case (Paraguay/United States) (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 1998, 248 45

xviii



TABLE OF CASES XIX

Certain Expenses case (advisory opinion), ICJ Reports 1962, 151 171, 265

Certain Properties case, (Liechtenstein/Germany), Application of 1 June 2001 and Judgment of 10 February 2005, available at: http://www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idecisions.htm 283, 286

Continental Shelf (Libya/Malta) case, ICJ Reports 1984, 3 88

Corfu Channel case (United Kingdom/Albania), ICJ Reports 1949, 4 10, 44, 87, 93, 118, 293

East Timor case (Portugal/Australia), ICJ Reports 1995, 90 12, 29, 31, 33, 97, 118, 123, 153, 159, 160, 166, 166–167, 168, 174, 176, 179, 180, 182–186, 192, 202, 230, 266, 281, 301, 311

ELSI case (United States/Italy), ICJ Reports 1989, 15 1, 171

Gabcikovo case (Hungary/Slovakia), ICJ Reports 1997, 7 12, 19, 20, 24, 27, 97, 118, 137, 167, 187, 190–192, 301

Genocide case (Bosnia/FRY) (preliminary objections), ICJ Reports 1996, 595 12, 75, 110–112, 135, 167, 174, 187, 192, 266

Genocide case (Bosnia/FRY) (provisional measures, second request), ICJ Reports 1993, 325 11, 135, 266

Genocide Convention (advisory opinion), ICJ Reports 1951, 15 2, 50, 53, 97, 303

Gulf of Maine case (Canada/United States), ICJ Reports 1984, 246 238

Hostages case (United States/Iran) (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 1979, 15 21, 45, 204–205, 265, 277, 297

Hostages case (United States/Iran) (merits), ICJ Reports 1980, 3 21, 45, 153, 265

ICAO case (India/Pakistan), ICJ Reports 1972, 46 21

Interhandel case (Switzerland/United States) (preliminary objections), ICJ Reports 1959, 6 24

International Status of South West Africa (advisory opinion), ICJ Reports 1950, 128 66, 82

Israeli Wall case (advisory opinion), 43 ILM (2004), 1009; available at: http://www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idecisions.htm 11, 12, 97, 118, 123, 145, 166, 184

Kosovo case (Yugloslavia/Belgium) (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 1999, 124 295



XX TABLE OF CASES

Kosovo case (Yugloslavia/Netherlands) (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 1999, 542 23, 295

Kosovo case (Yugloslavia/Spain) (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 1999, 761 295, 303

Kosovo case (Yugloslavia/United States) (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 1999, 916 295, 303

LaGrand case, ICJ Reports 2001, 514 292

Land and Maritime Boundary (Cameroon/Nigeria) (preliminary objections), ICJ Reports 1998, 275 24

Lockerbie cases (Libya/United Kingdom, Libya/United States) (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 1992, 3 and 114 266

Lockerbie cases (Libya/United Kingdom, Libya/United States) (preliminary objections), ICJ Reports 1998, 9 and 115 266

Monetary Gold case (Italy/United Kingdom, France, United States), ICJ Reports 1954, 19 23, 87-88, 183, 184, 186

Namibia case (advisory opinion), ICJ Reports 1971, 16 97, 107–109, 204

Nauru case (Nauru/Australia), ICJ Reports 1992, 240 23, 183

Nicaragua case (Nicaragua/United States) (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 1984, 185 15, 23, 118, 196, 222, 293

Nicaragua case (Nicaragua/United States) (jurisdiction and admissibility), ICJ Reports 1984, 392 112, 114–115, 167, 222, 265, 266, 293

Nicaragua case (merits), ICJ Reports 1986, 14 93, 97, 171, 179, 187, 187–190, 192, 205–207, 209, 212, 222, 257, 269–270, 293, 300, 301, 303

North Sea Continental Shelf cases (Germany/ Denmark, Germany/Netherlands), ICJ Reports 1969, 3 36, 143, 154, 207, 235, 238

Northern Cameroons case (Cameroon/United Kingdom), ICJ Reports 1963, 15 23

Nottebohm case (Liechtenstein/Guatemala), ICJ Reports 1955, 4 24, 169 Nuclear Tests cases (Australia/France, New Zealand/France) (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 1973, 99 and 135 46, 49, 51, 97, 155, 168, 176

Nuclear Tests cases (Australia/France, New Zealand/France) (merits), ICJ Reports 1974, 253 and 474 23, 31, 43, 46, 49, 51, 97, 109, 112–114, 155, 159, 161, 168, 176, 177, 178, 180–182, 192, 202

Nuclear Tests case (New Zealand's Request for an Examination of the Situation), ICJ Reports 1995, 288 46, 49, 97, 155, 167, 168, 176



TABLE OF CASES

xxi

Nuclear Weapons (advisory opinion requested by the UN General Assembly), ICJ Reports 1996, 226 107, 109–110, 202

Oil Platforms case (Iran/United States) (preliminary objections), ICJ Reports 1996, 803 36, 222, 257

Oil Platforms case (Iran/United States) (merits), ICJ Reports 2003, 161 170, 205, 222

Pakistani Prisoners of War case (Pakistan/India) (provisional measures), ICJ Reports 1973, 328 294

Reparations for Injuries case (advisory opinion), ICJ Reports 1949, 174 82, 83, 105, 175

Rights of Passage case (Portugal/India), ICJ Reports 1960, 39 42, 43

South West Africa case (Ethiopia/South Africa, Liberia/South Africa) (preliminary objections), ICJ Reports 1962, 319 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 39, 51, 63–69, 66, 73, 76, 164, 264

South West Africa case (Ethiopia/South Africa, Liberia/South Africa) (merits), ICJ Reports 1966, 6 15, 24, 29, 30–31, 37, 39, 53, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 94–95, 105, 124, 161, 163, 164, 175, 193–194, 196, 203, 307, 308

Territorial Dispute (Libya/Chad), ICJ Reports 1996, 6 24

2. Permanent Court of International Justice

Chorzów Factory case (interpretation of Judgments No. 7 and 8), PCIJ Reports, Ser. A, No. 13 (1928) 170

Chorzów Factory case (jurisdiction), PCIJ Reports, Ser. A, No. 9 (1927) 23, 278

Chorzów Factory case (merits), PCIJ Reports, Ser. A, No. 17 (1928) 23, 172

Eastern Greenland case, PCIJ Reports, Ser. A/B, No. 53 (1933) 43, 114

Free Zones of Upper Savoy and the District of Gex, PCIJ Reports, Ser. A/B, No. 46 (1932) 44, 104, 172–173

German Interests in Polish Upper Silesia, PCIJ Reports, Ser. A, No. 6 (1925) 23

Lotus case, PCIJ Reports, Ser. A, No. 10 (1927) 173



XXII TABLE OF CASES

Mavrommatis Jerusalem Concessions (jurisdiction) case, PCIJ Reports, Ser. A, No. 5 (1925) 66

Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions, PCIJ Reports, Ser. A, No. 2 (1924) 21, 24

Memel Statute Interpretation case (merits), PCIJ Reports, Ser. A/B, No. 49 (1932) 75–76, 195

Memel Statute Interpretation case (preliminary objections), PCIJ Reports, Ser. A/B, No. 47 (1932) 75–76, 308

Minority Schools in Upper Silesia, PCIJ Reports, Ser. A, No. 15 (1928) 76

Socobel case, PCIJ Reports, Ser. A/B, No. 78 (1939) 44

Wimbledon case, PCIJ Reports, Ser. A, No.1 (1923) 38, 76-79, 82, 195, 308

3. Arbitral Awards

Air Services case (United States/France), 54 ILR 204 19, 20, 271-276, 277, 278, 287

Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. v. Jaffrate (The Rose Mary), 20 ILR 316 89

Cysne case, RIAA, Vol. II, 1035 20, 21

Fur Seal Arbitration, in: Moore, History and Digest of International Arbitration, Vol. I (1898), 755 9

Guinea-Bissau v. Senegal, 83 ILR 1 143

Island of Palmas case, RIAA, Vol. II, 840 104

Kuwait v. Aminoil, 66 ILR 587 142

Lac Lanoux case, RIAA, Vol. XII, 314 31 Lena Goldfield case, 36 Cornell Law Quarterly (1950–1951), 42 44

Monetary Gold (arbitiration), RIAA, Vol. XII, 13 44, 87

Mox Plant case (Ireland/United Kingdom) (arbitration), Suspension Order of
24 June 2003, available at: http.pca-cpa.org/ENLISH/RPC 277

Naulilaa case, RIAA, Vol. II, 1013 20



TABLE OF CASES XXIII

Socobel v. Greek State, 18 ILR 3 44 Southern Bluefin Tuna case (arbitral award), 39 ILM (2000), 1359 253, 256, 277, 279

4. Judgments of the ICTY and ICTR

The relevant decisions are available at: http://www.un.org/icty/cases/indictindex-e.htm and http://www.ictr.org respectively

Blaskic: ICTY, Appeals Chamber, *Prosecutor v. Blaskic*, Case IT-95-14-AR 108bis (Judgment on the Request of the Republic of Croatia for Review of the Decision of the Trial Chamber, 29 October 1997), reproduced in: 110 ILR 607 119, 120, 126, 127

Delalic: ICTY, Trial Chamber, Prosecutor v. Delalic, Case IT-96-21-T (Judgment of 16 November 1998) 145

Furundzija: ICTY, Trial Chamber, Prosecutor v. Furunzija, Case IT-95-17/1-T (Judgment of 10 December 1998) 119, 143, 145, 278, 289, 291

Kambanda: ICTR, Trial Chamber, *Prosecutor v. Kambanda*, Case ICTR-97-23 (Judgment and Sentence, 4 September 1998) 294

Kunarac: ICTY, Trial Chamber, Prosecutor v. Kunarac, IT-96-23-T (Judgment of 22 February 2001) 145

Kupreskic (evidence): ICTY, Trial Chamber, Prosecutor v. Kuprescic et al., Case IT-95-16-T (Decision on evidence of the good character of the accused and the defence of tu quoque, 17 February 1999) 191

Kupreskic (judgment): ICTY, Trial Chamber, Prosecutor v. Kupresckic et al., Case IT-95-16 (judgment of 14 January 2000) 145

5. European Court/ Commission of Human Rights

European Commission of Human Rights

Cyprus v. Turkey case (admissibility), 39 YbECHR (1996),54-55, 283, 285

The Greek case (Denmark, Norway, Sweden and the Netherlands v. Greece) (admissibility), 11 YbECHR (1968), 690 and 730 72, 87
The Greek case (Denmark, Norway, Sweden and the Netherlands v. Greece) (report) 12 YbECHR (1969) (special issue) 72, 91



XXIV TABLE OF CASES

Pfunders case (admissibility), 4 YbECHR (1961), 116 50, 55, 72, 91

Pfunders case (report), 6 YbECHR (1963), 740 50, 53

European Court of Human Rights

Al-Adsani v. United Kingdom, (Application No. 35763/97), 34 European Human Rights Reports (2002), 273; also available at: http://www.echr.coe.int/Eng/judgments.htm 143, 145

Bankovic and Others v. Belgium and 16 Other Contracting States (Application No. 52207/99); available at: http://www.echr.coe.int/Eng/ Judgments.htm 111

Cruz Varas v. Sweden, ECHR, Ser. A, No. 201 (1991) 292, 298

Ireland v. United Kingdom case, Ser. A, No. 25 (1978) 55, 63

Mamatkulov and Abdurasulovic v. Turkey (Applications Nos. 46827/99 and 46951/99); available at: http://www.echr.coe.int/Eng/ Judgments.htm 292

Neumeister case, ECHR, Ser. A, No. 17 (1974) 256

Papamichalopolous and Others v. Greece (just satisfaction), ECHR, Ser. A, No. 330B (1995) 292

Pfeifer and Plankl v. Austria, ECHR, Ser. A, No. 227 (1992) 298

Stran Greek Refineries and Stratis Andreadis case (merits and just satisfaction), ECHR, Ser. A, No. 301B (1994) 292

6. GATT/WTO Reports

Bananas (Panel Report): EC – Regime for the Importation, Sale and Distribution of Bananas, WT/DS27/R, 126

Bananas (Appellate Body Report): EC – Regime for the Importation, Sale and Distribution of Bananas, WT/DS27/AB/R, 126

Japan – Leather: Japanese Measures on Imports of Leather, Panel Report, BISD 31S/94, 126



TABLE OF CASES XXV

- Korea Dairy: Korea Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Certain Dairy Products, WT/DS98/R (Panel), 126
- Oilseeds: EEC Payments and Subsidies Paid to Processors and Producers of Oilseeds and Related Animal-Feed Proteins, GATT Panel Report, BISD 37S/86, 126
- Shrimp/Turtle: United States Import Prohibition of Certain Shrimp and Shrimp Products (Appellate Body), WT/DS58/AB/R, 9
- Tuna II: United States Restrictions on Import of Tuna, DS29/R (unadopted Panel Report), reproduced in: 33 ILM (1994), 839, 9, 126
- US Anti-Dumping Act of 1916: United States Anti-Dumping Act of 1916, WT/DS136/AB/R (Appellate Body), 254
- US Hot-Rolled Steel: United States Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Products from Japan, WT/DS184/AB/R (Appellate Body), 254
 US Shirts and Blouses: United States Measures Affecting Imports of Woven
 Wool Shirts and Blouses, WT/DS33/AB/R (Appellate Body), 254

7. Other International Decisions/ Proceedings

- *Aaland Island dispute*, Report of the Committee of Jurists, LNOJ, Special Supplement No. 3, Oct. 1920, 82, 84–86, 106, 308
- Commission v. Luxembourg and Belgium (ECJ), Cases 90/63 and 91/63, [1964] ECR 631, 277
- Communication 227/99 (DRC v. Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda) (African Commission of Human Rights and Peoples' Rights), 283
- Ghana Portugal complaint (ILO inter-State complaint), 45 ILO Bulletin (1962), No. 2, Supplement II, 73
- Loayaza Tamayo (Inter-American Court of Human Rights), 19 HRLJ (1998), 203, 260
- M. V. Saiga (No.2) case (merits) (International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea), 38 ILM (1999), 1323, 38, 78
- Opinion No. 10 (Arbitration Commission on Yugoslavia), 96 RGDIP (1992), 594, 144



XXVI TABLE OF CASES

Portugal Liberia complaint (ILO inter-State complaint), 46 ILO Bulletin (1963), No. 2, Supplement II, 803, 73

Racke GmbH and Cov. Hauptzollamt Mainz (ECJ), Case C-162/96 [1998] ECR I-3655. 228

Roach and Pinkerton v. United States (American Commission on Human Rights), 8 HRLJ (1997), 351, 139

Southern Bluefin Tuna case (provisional measures) (International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea), 38 ILM (1999), 1624, 277

8. National decisions

a. Germany

Bundesverfassungsgericht (Federal Constitutional Court)

BVerfGE 96, 68 (Decisions of the Federal Constitutional Court,

Vol. 96, 68) - GDR Ambassador case 100, 104

BVerfGE 75, 20 (Decisions of the Federal Constitutional Court, Vol. 75, 20)

Order of 12 December 2000, 54 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift (2001), 1848 119, 149

Bundesverwaltungsgericht (Federal Administrative Court)

BVerwGE 30, 191 (Decisions, Vol. 30, 191) 35

BVerwGE 61, 256 (Decisions, Vol. 61, 256) 35

BVerwGE 65, 167 (Decisions, Vol. 65, 167) 35

b. United Kingdom

Abbasi and another v. Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs and another (Court of Appeal) [2002] EWCA Civ. 159 143

Al-Adsani case (High Court) 103 ILR 420 143, 145

Al-Adsani case (Court of Appeal) 107 ILR 536 143, 145

Bearmans Ltd v. Metropolitan Police District Receiver (High Court) [1961] 1 All ER 391 28

The 'Le Louis' 2 Dodson 210 (1817) 52

R v. Bow Street Metropolitan Stipiendary Magistrate, ex parte Pinochet Ugarte (No. 3) (House of Lords) [2000] 1 A.C. 198 143, 145



TABLE OF CASES XXVII

```
c. United States
The 'Antelope', 23 US (10 Wheaton) 64 (1825) 52
Cabiri v. Assasie-Gyimah, 921F. Supp. 1189 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) 145
Filartiga v. Peña-Irala (Court of Appeals, 2nd Cir.), 77 ILR, 169 145
Marcos Manto v. Thajane, 508 US 972 (1993) 145
Princz v. Germany (Court of Appeals, District of Columbia), 103 ILR
  604 143
Siderman de Blake v. Argentina (Court of Appeals, 9th Cir.), 193 ILR
       143, 145
  455
Trajanos v. Marcos, 978 F. 2d 500 (9th Circ. 1992) 145
United States v. 'La Jeune Eugénie', 26 Federal Cases 832 (1822) 52
d. Decisions of other national courts
Brussels Court of First Instance: In re Pinochet (Order of 6 November 1998,
  119 ILR 346) 119, 143, 145, 149
Hungarian Supreme Court: Decision No. 53 of 13 December 1993,
  reproduced in: Az Alkotmànybirosg Hatà rosatai, 1994, 2836
Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Bouzari and Others v. Iran, 124 ILR
  427 145
Spanish National Criminal Court (Audencia Nacional): Pinochet case (Order
  of 5 November 1998), 119 ILR 331 144
Swiss Supreme Court (Tribunal Fédéral): Bufano et al., Arrêts du Tribunal
```

Fédéral Suisse, Recueil Officiel, Vol. 108, I, 408

Suisse, Recueil Officiel, Vol. 101, 541

Suisse, Recueil Officiel, Vol. 109, I, 72 144

Swiss Supreme Court (Tribunal Fédéral): Lynas, Arrêts du Tribunal Fédéral

Swiss Supreme Court (Tribunal Fédéral): Sener, Arrêts du Tribunal Fédéral

144



Abbreviations

A.C. Appeal Cases (England and Wales)

ACHR (Inter-)American Convention on Human Rights

AFDI Annuaire français de droit international
AJIL American Journal of International Law
AJPIL Austrian Journal of Public International Law

All ER All England Law Reports

AnnIDI Annuaire de l'Institut de Droit International

ASR Articles on State Responsibility (International Law

Commission)

AVR Archiv des Völkerrechts

Bd(e). Band/Bände

BDGVR Berichte der deutschen Gesellschaft für Völkerrecht

BGBl. Bundesgesetzblatt

BISD Basic Instruments and Selected Documents (GATT)

BYIL British Yearbook of International Law

CAT Convention Against Torture

CCPR (International) Covenant on Civil and Political

Rights

CEDAW Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of

Discrimination Against Women

CERD (International) Convention on the Elimination of

Racial Discrimination

CSECR (International) Covenant on Social, Economic and

Cultural Right

CTS Consolidated Treaty Series (Parry ed.)

Diss.Op Dissenting Opinion

Doc. Document

xxviii



ABBREVIATIONS XXIX

DRC Democratic Republic of Congo

EC European Community

EC Bull. Bulletin of the European Communities
ECHR European Convention of Human Rights and

Fundamental Freedoms

ECJ European Court of Justice

ECOSOC (United Nations) Economic and Social Council

ECR European Court Reports (ECJ)

ed(s). edition/editor(s)

EJIL European Journal of International Law

ELR European Law Review

EPIL Encyclopaedia of Public International Law

et al. et aliter

ETS European Treaty Series

EURATOM European Atomic Energy Community
Eur. Comm'n HR European Commission on Human Rights

Eur. Ct. HR European Court of Human Rights

EWCA (Civ.) England and Wales Court of Appeal (Civil Division) FCN Friendship, Commerce and Navigation (treaties)

FRY Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
GA (United Nations) General Assembly
GATT General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GYIL German Yearbook of International Law
HJIL Harvard Journal of International Law

HRLJ Human Rights Law Journal HRQ Human Rights Quarterly

ibid. ibidem

ICAO International Civil Aviation Organization

ICJ International Court of Justice

ICLQ International and Comparative Law Quarterly
ICTR International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
ICTY International Criminal Tribunal for the Former

Yugoslavia

id. idem

IDI Institut de droit interational

i.e. id est

ILA International Law AssociationILC International Law CommissionILM International Legal Materials



XXX ABBREVIATIONS

ILO International Labour Organisation

ILR International Law Reports

Indian JIL Indian Journal of International Law
JIR Jahrbuch für Internationales Recht
LJIL Leiden Journal of International Law
LNTS League of Nations Treaty Series
LOSC Law of the Sea Convention

MichjIL Michigan Journal of International Law

MN Marginal note

NILR Netherlands International Law Review
NQHR Netherlands Quarterly for Human Rights
Nordic JIL Nordic Journal of International Law
NRG Nouveau Receuil Général (Martens)

NYIL Netherlands Yearbook of International Law

OAS Organization of American States

OJ Official Journal of the European Communities ÖZÖR Österreichische Zeitschrift für Öffentliches Recht

para(s). paragraph(s)

PCIJ Permanent Court of International Justice

Proc. ASIL Proceedings, American Society of International Law

RBDI Revue belge de droit international

RdC Recueil des Cours

Res. Resolution

RGDIP Revue générale de droit international public
RIAA Reports of International Arbitral Awards
RIW Recht der Internationalen Wirtschaft
SADC Southern African Development Community
SAYIL South African Yearbook of International Law

SC (United Nations) Security Council

SchwIIR Schweizerisches Jahrbuch für Internationales Recht

Sep.Op. Separate Opinion

Ser. Series

Strasbourg Court European Court of Human Rights

TEC Treaty Establishing the European Community
TEU Treaty Establishing the European Union

UKTS United Kingdom Treaty Series

UN United Nations

UNC United Nations Charter
UNTS United Nations Treaty Series



ABBREVIATIONS XXXI

UNYB United Nations Yearbook

US United States

VCLT Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties Virginia JIL Virginia Journal of International Law

Vol. Volume

VwGO Verwaltungsgerichtsordnung (Germany)

WTO World Trade Organization

Yb. Yearbook

YbILC Yearbook of the International Law Commission
YbECHR Yearbook of the European Convention of Human

Rights

ZaöRV Zeitschrift für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und

Völkerrecht

ZÖR Zeitschrift für Öffentliches Recht