

INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW REPORTS

Volume 1

EARLY DECISIONS

edited by

CAIRO A. R. ROBB

General editors

DANIEL BETHLEHEM

JAMES CRAWFORD

PHILIPPE SANDS



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, United Kingdom <http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk>
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA <http://www.cup.org>
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© Lauterpacht Research Centre for International Law 1999

This book 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 1999

Printed in the United Kingdom on acid-free paper at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in MT Dante 11/13 [CE]

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

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

ISBN 0 521 64347 3 hardback

ISBN 0 521 64397 X paperback

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page</i>	ix
<i>Editorial note</i>		xii
<i>Members of Editorial Advisory Board</i>		xiv
<i>Table of abbreviations</i>		xv
<i>Tables of cases reported</i>		xvi
<i>Digest</i>		xxi
<i>Table of treaties</i>		xli
I DECISIONS OF INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS		1
Helmand River Cases (Afghanistan/Persia)		3
San Juan River Cases (Costa Rica/Nicaragua)		
(Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)		15
Bering Sea Fur-Seals Case (Great Britain/United States of America)		43
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Case (Great Britain/United States of America)		89
Island of Palmas Case (Netherlands/United States of America)		141
Case Relating to the Territorial Jurisdiction of the International Commission of the River Oder (Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Sweden/Poland)		146
Diversion of Water from the Meuse Case (Netherlands v. Belgium)		157
Trail Smelter Case (Canada/United States of America)		231
Lake Lanoux Case (France/Spain)		332
Gut Dam Case (Canada/United States of America)		386
II DECISIONS OF NATIONAL TRIBUNALS		427
Leitha River Case		429
Donauversinkung Case (Württemberg and Prussia v. Baden)		444
Société Energie Electrique du Littoral Méditerranéen v. Compagnia Imprese Elettriche Liguri		459
Solothurn v. Aargau, Aargau v. Solothurn		467

Missouri <i>v.</i> Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago	485
Kansas <i>v.</i> Colorado	500
Georgia <i>v.</i> Tennessee Copper Company and Ducktown Sulphur, Copper and Iron Company Ltd	514
New York <i>v.</i> New Jersey	524
New Jersey <i>v.</i> City of New York	536
<i>Appendix 1 Harmon Opinion</i>	543
<i>Appendix 2 Treaties</i>	550
<i>Appendix 3 Maps</i>	579
<i>Index</i>	596

Tables of cases reported

The tables of cases are arranged alphabetically, according to tribunal (international cases) and according to country (national cases). A chronological list of decisions is also provided. Decisions reproduced only in extract are indicated in the chronological list of decisions by the insertion of the word 'extract' in parenthesis after the page number of the decision.

ALPHABETICAL

Aargau *v.* Solothurn (1915) 1 467

Argovia *v.* Soleure: *see* Aargau *v.* Solothurn

Bering Sea Fur-Seals Case (Great Britain/United States of America) (1893)
1 43

Case Relating to the Territorial Jurisdiction of the International Commission of the River Oder (Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Sweden/Poland) (1929) 1 146

Costa Rica *v.* Nicaragua: *see* San Juan River Cases

Diversion of Water from the Meuse Case (Netherlands *v.* Belgium) (1937)
1 157

Donauversinkung Case (Württemberg and Prussia *v.* Baden) (1927) 1 444

Fur-Seals: *see* Bering Sea Fur-Seals Case

Georgia *v.* Tennessee Copper Company and Ducktown Sulphur, Copper and Iron Company Ltd (1907, 1915) 1 514

Gut Dam Case (Canada/United States of America) (1968) 1 386

Helmand River Cases (Afghanistan/Persia) (1872) (1905) 1 3

Island of Palmas Case (Netherlands/United States of America) (1928) 1 141

Kansas *v.* Colorado (1902, 1907) 1 500

Lake Lanoux Case (France/Spain) (1957) 1 332

- Leitha River Case (1913) **1** 429
- Meuse: *see* Diversion of Water from the Meuse Case
- Missouri *v.* Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago (1901, 1906) **1** 485
- New Jersey *v.* City of New York (1931) **1** 536
- New York *v.* New Jersey (1921) **1** 524
- North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Case (Great Britain/United States of America) (1910) **1** 89
- Oder: *see* Case Relating to the Territorial Jurisdiction of the International Commission of the River Oder
- Oster *v.* Dominion of Canada (1956) **1** 386
- Pacific Fur-Seals Case: *see* Bering Sea Fur-Seals Case
- San Juan River Cases (Costa Rica/Nicaragua) (Costa Rica *v.* Nicaragua) (1888) (1916) **1** 15
- SEELM *v.* CIEL: *see* Société Energie Electrique du Littoral Méditerranéen *v.* Compagnia Imprese Elettriche Liguri
- Sistan: *see* Helmand River Cases
- Société Energie Electrique du Littoral Méditerranéen *v.* Compagnia Imprese Elettriche Liguri (1939) **1** 459
- Soleure *v.* Argovia: *see* Solothurn *v.* Aargau
- Solothurn *v.* Aargau (1900) **1** 467
- Trail Smelter Case (Canada/United States of America) (1938, 1941) **1** 231
- Württemberg and Prussia *v.* Baden: *see* Donauversinkung Case

ACCORDING TO INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL

Central American Court of Justice

- San Juan River Case (Costa Rica *v.* Nicaragua) (1916) **1** 15

Permanent Court of International Justice

- Case Relating to the Territorial Jurisdiction of the International Commission of the River Oder (Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Sweden/Poland) (1929) **1** 146
- Diversion of Water from the Meuse Case (Netherlands *v.* Belgium) (1937) **1** 157

Permanent Court of Arbitration

- North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration (Great Britain/United States of America) (1910) **1** 89

Island of Palmas Case (Netherlands/United States of America) (1928) **1** 141

Arbitral Tribunals (various)

(see also cases listed under Permanent Court of Arbitration above)

Helmand River Cases (Afghanistan/Persia) (1872) (1905) **1** 3

San Juan River Case (Costa Rica/Nicaragua) (1888) **1** 15

Bering Sea Fur-Seals Case (Great Britain/United States of America) (1893)
1 43

Trail Smelter Case (Canada/United States of America) (1938, 1941) **1** 231

Lake Lanoux Case (France/Spain) (1957) **1** 332

Gut Dam Case (Canada/United States of America) (1968) **1** 386

ACCORDING TO COUNTRY

Austria

Leitha River Case, Verwaltungsgerichtshof (Imperial Royal Administrative Court) (1913) **1** 429

Germany

Donauversinkung Case (Württemberg and Prussia v. Baden), Staatsgerichtshof (Constitutional Court) (1927) **1** 444

Italy

Société Energie Electrique du Littoral Méditerranéen v. Compagnia Imprese Elettiche Liguri, Corte di Cassazione (Court of Cassation) (1939) **1** 459

Switzerland

Solothurn v. Aargau, Bundesgericht (Federal Tribunal) (1900) **1** 467

Aargau v. Solothurn, Bundesgericht (Federal Tribunal) (1915) **1** 467

United States of America

Missouri v. Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, Supreme Court (1901, 1906) **1** 485

Kansas v. Colorado, Supreme Court (1902, 1907) **1** 500

Georgia v. Tennessee Copper Company and Ducktown Sulphur, Copper and Iron Company Ltd, Supreme Court (1907, 1915) **1** 514

New York v. New Jersey, Supreme Court (1921) **1** 524

New Jersey v. City of New York, Supreme Court (1931) **1** 536

Oster v. Dominion of Canada, District Court, NDNY (1956) **1** 386

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF DECISIONS

- 1872** 19 August, Helmand River Case (Afghanistan/Persia), *Award of Arbitrator Goldsmid* 1 3, 7
- 1888** 22 March, San Juan River Case (Costa Rica/Nicaragua), *Award of Arbitrator Cleveland* 1 15, 24
- 1893** 15 August, Bering Sea Fur-Seals Case (Great Britain/United States of America), *Award and Declarations of Arbitral Tribunal* 1 43, 67
- 1900** 1 November, Solothurn v. Aargau, *Decision of Swiss Bundesgericht (Federal Tribunal)* 1 467, 471
- 1901** 28 January, Missouri v. Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, *Opinion of US Supreme Court (extract)* 1 485, 488
- 1902** 7 April, Kansas v. Colorado, *Opinion of US Supreme Court (extract)* 1 500, 503
- 1905** 10 April, Helmand River Case (Afghanistan/Persia), *Award of Arbitrator McMahon* 1 3, 10
- 1906** 19 February, Missouri v. Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, *Opinion of US Supreme Court* 1 485, 493
- 1907** 13 May, Kansas v. Colorado, *Opinion of US Supreme Court (extract)* 1 500, 507
- 13 May, Georgia v. Tennessee Copper Company and Ducktown Sulphur, Copper and Iron Company Ltd, *Opinion of US Supreme Court* 1 514, 517
- 1910** 7 September, North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Case (Great Britain/United States of America), *Award of North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitral Tribunal* 1 89, 96
- 1913** 11 January, Leitha River Case, *Decision of Austrian Verwaltungsgerichtshof (Imperial Royal Administrative Court)* 1 429, 433
- 1915** 4 February, Aargau v. Solothurn, *Decision of Swiss Bundesgericht (Federal Tribunal)* 1 467, 477
- 10 May, Georgia v. Tennessee Copper Company and Ducktown Sulphur, Copper and Iron Company Ltd, *Opinion of US Supreme Court* 1 514, 520
- 1 June, Georgia v. Tennessee Copper Company and Ducktown Sulphur, Copper and Iron Company Ltd, *Decree of US Supreme Court* 1 514, 522
- 1916** 30 September, San Juan River Case (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua), *Judgment of Central American Court of Justice (extract)* 1 15, 27
- 1921** 2 May, New York v. New Jersey, *Opinion of US Supreme Court* 1 524, 526

- 1927 18 June, Donauversinkung Case (Württemberg and Prussia v. Baden), *Decision of German Staatsgerichtshof (Constitutional Court) (extract)* 1 444, 449
- 1928 4 April, Island of Palmas Case (Netherlands/United States of America), *Award of Arbitrator Huber (extract)* 1 141, 143
- 1929 10 September, Case Relating to the Territorial Jurisdiction of the International Commission of the River Oder (Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Sweden/Poland), *Judgment of Permanent Court of International Justice* 1 146, 151
- 1931 18 May, New Jersey v. City of New York, *Opinion of US Supreme Court* 1 536, 538
- 1937 28 June, Diversion of Water from the Meuse Case (Netherlands v. Belgium), *Judgment of Permanent Court of International Justice* 1 157, 169
- 1938 16 April, Trail Smelter Case (Canada/United States of America), *Award of Arbitral Tribunal* 1 231, 248
- 1939 13 February, Société Energie Electrique du Littoral Méditerranéen v. Compagnia Imprese Elettriche Liguri, *Decision of Italian Corte di Cassazione (Court of Cassation) (extract)* 1 459, 463
- 1941 11 March, Trail Smelter Case (Canada/United States of America), *Award of Arbitral Tribunal* 1 231, 278
- 1956 24 May, Oster v. Dominion of Canada, *Opinion of US District Court, NDNY* 1 386, 392
- 1957 16 November, Lake Lanoux Case (France/Spain), *Award of Arbitral Tribunal* 1 332, 343
- 1968 15 January, 12 February, 27 September, Gut Dam Case (Canada/United States of America), *Decisions of Lake Ontario Claims Tribunal. Report of 22 November 1968* 1 386, 407

Table of treaties

This table lists, in chronological order according to the date of signature, the treaties and other international agreements referred to in the decisions reported in this volume. It has not been possible to draw a distinction between treaties judicially considered and treaties that are merely cited. The text of certain treaties is given in full in Appendix 2 or elsewhere in this volume. Where this is so IELR has been cited as the treaty source.

- 1686** 16 November, France–Great Britain, Treaty of Peace for a
Neutrality in America, Whitehall (18 CTS 83) **1**, 123, 137
- 1713** 11 April, France–Great Britain, Treaty of Peace and Friendship,
Utrecht (35 BFSP 815; 27 CTS 475) **1**, 104, 123, 137
- 1763** 10 February, France, Great Britain, Spain, Definitive Treaty of
Peace, Paris (42 CTS 279) **1**, 137
- 1783** 3 September, Great Britain–United States of America, Definitive
Treaty of Peace and Friendship, Versailles (1 BFSP 779; 48 CTS
487; 1 US Treaties 586) **1**, 109–10, 122, 125, 129, 131
Art. III **1**, 109
- 1794** 19 November, Great Britain–United States of America, Treaty of
Amity, Commerce and Navigation, London (Jay Treaty) (1 BFSP
784; 52 CTS 243)
Art. 3 **1**, 109
Art. 25 **1**, 124
- 1815** 9 June, Austria, France, Great Britain, Portugal, Prussia, Russia,
Spain, Sweden, Final Act of the Congress of Vienna (2 BFSP 3;
64 CTS 453) **1**, 154, 156
- 1818** 20 October, Great Britain–United States of America, Treaty of
Commerce, London (6 BFSP 3; 69 CTS 293; 2 Hertslet 392) **1**,
102–37
Art. I **1**, 96–9, 102–15, 118, 121, 129, 131, 135–7

- Art. III 1, 109
- 1824** 17 April, Russia–United States of America, Convention Regulating Navigation, Fishing, Trading and Establishment on the Northwest Coast of America, St Petersburg (1 IELR 557) **1**, 52, 58, 69, 86
- Art. 1 1, 46
- Art. 2 1, 46n
- Art. 3 1, 46n
- Art. 4 1, 46
- Art. 5 1, 46
- 1825** 16 February, Great Britain–Russia, Convention Concerning the Limits of Their Respective Possessions on the Northwest Coast of America and the Navigation of the Pacific Ocean, St Petersburg (1 IELR 560) **1**, 47, 52, 58, 65, 68–70, 86, 563
- Art. III 1, 46n, 47n, 563
- Art. IV 1, 563
- Art. VII 1, 46n
- 1832** 18 December, Russia–United States of America, Treaty of Navigation and Commerce, St Petersburg (83 CTS 119) **1**, 47
- 1839** 2 August, France–Great Britain, Convention for Defining the Limits of Exclusive Fishing Rights, Paris (27 BFSP 983; 89 CTS 221; 5 Hertslet 89) **1**, 137–8
- Arts. IX–X 1, 135
- 1848** 2 February, Mexico–United States of America, Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Limits and Settlement, Guadalupe Hidalgo (37 BFSP 567; 102 CTS 29; 2 US Treaties 1107) **1**, 543–6
- Art. VII 1, 543–6
- Art. XII 1, 546
- 1853** 30 December, Mexico–United States of America, Treaty of Limits etc, Mexico City (42 BFSP 724; 111 CTS 235; 1 US Treaties 1121)
- Art. III 1, 546–7
- Art. IV 1, 544–5
- 1854** 5 June, Great Britain–United States of America, Treaty Regarding the North Atlantic Fisheries, Commercial Reciprocity etc, Washington (112 CTS 31) **1**, 105, 108
- 1856** 1 December, France–Spain, Treaty of Delimitation, Bayonne (47 BFSP 765; 7 Traités 196) **1**, 347, 362
- Art. 13 1, 375
- 1857** 4 March, Great Britain–Persia, Treaty of Peace, Paris (47 BFSP 42; 116 CTS 329; 10 Hertslet 947)

- Art. VI 1, 4n, 8
- 1858** 15 April, Costa Rica–Nicaragua, Treaty of Limits, San José (Cañas–Jerez Treaty) (1 IELR 551) 1, 21–4, 33–40
- Art. II 1, 23
- Art. V 1, 24
- Art. VI 1, 24–5, 33
- Art. VIII 1, 26, 34, 37
- 1861** 21 September, Belgium–Netherlands, Agreement Relative to the Diversion of Water from the Meuse, Brussels (124 CTS 357) 1, 175
- 1862** 14 April, France–Spain, Treaty of Delimitation, Bayonne (52 BFSP 155; 125 CTS 455; 8 *Traités* 397)
- Preamble 1, 375 1, 347, 362
- 1863** 12 May, Belgium–Netherlands, Treaty for the Regulation of the Diversion of Water from the Meuse, The Hague (1 IELR 572; see 127 CTS 441 for Annexes) 1, 169–226, 228–30
- Art. I 1, 179–85, 191, 193–8, 200–2, 206, 211–12, 215, 217, 222, 225
- Art. II 1, 179, 183, 196–7, 201, 203, 215
- Art. III 1, 179, 182, 196, 203, 213, 215
- Art. IV 1, 179, 184–5, 189, 191, 193–4, 196–203, 206–7, 211, 215, 221, 223, 226
- Art. V 1, 179, 182, 185, 190, 196, 198–201, 203–6, 209, 211, 219, 221–3, 225–6
- Art. VI 1, 196, 199
- Art. VII 1, 196, 199
- Art. VIII 1, 196, 199
- Art. IX 1, 179, 190, 196, 199, 202, 211–12, 215, 223–4
- Art. X 1, 196, 199
- Art. XI 1, 196, 199–200, 206–7, 211
- Art. XII 1, 196, 199
- Art. XIII 1, 199
- Art. XIV 1, 199
- Annexes 1, 215
- 1866** 26 May, France–Spain, Treaty of Delimitation, Bayonne (56 BFSP 212; 132 CTS 359; 9 *Traités* 532) 1, 344–5, 347, 357, 359–60, 362, 364–6, 368, 370–2, 374–8, 380, 382–3, 385
- Preamble 1, 347–8
- Art. 20 1, 348

- 26 May, France–Spain, Additional Act to the Delimitation Treaties Concluded on 2 December 1856, 14 April 1862 and 26 May 1866, Bayonne (56 BFSP 226; 132 CTS 359; 9 *Traités* 541) 1, 344–5, 357, 359–60, 362, 364–6, 368, 370–2, 374–8, 380, 382–3, 385
- Preamble 1, 348
- Art. 8 1, 348, 364, 366, 374–5
- Arts. 8–21 1, 375
- Art. 9 1, 348–9, 364, 366–7, 376, 383
- Art. 10 1, 349, 366–7, 383
- Art. 11 1, 349, 354, 359–60, 366–7, 371–2, 375, 377–9, 381–5
- Art. 12 1, 349, 359, 368
- Art. 13 1, 349–50
- Art. 14 1, 350
- Art. 15 1, 350, 359–60, 376–7
- Art. 16 1, 350, 359, 376–7, 382
- Art. 17 1, 350, 360
- Art. 18 1, 350–1, 366
- Art. 19 1, 350
- 1867** 30 March, Russia–United States of America, Convention Ceding Alaska, Washington (1 IELR 562) 1, 47, 58, 65, 67, 70
- Art. I 1, 47n, 566–7
- 11 November, France–Great Britain, Fisheries Convention, Washington (57 BFSP 8; 135 CTS 473; 12 *Hertslet* 1126; 9 *Traités* 773)) 1, 137–8
- Art. I 1, 135
- 1868** 4 July, Mexico–United States of America, Claims Convention, Washington (61 BFSP 95; 137 CTS 331; 1 *US Treaties* 1128) 1, 294
- 1871** 8 May, Great Britain–United States of America, Treaty for the Amicable Settlement of All Causes of Difference Between the Two Countries, Washington (61 BFSP 40; 143 CTS 145; 13 *Hertslet* 970; 1 *US Treaties* 700) 1, 105, 108
- 1882** 6 May, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain and The Netherlands, Convention for the Regulation of the North Sea Fisheries, The Hague (17 BFSP 39; 160 CTS 219; 15 *Hertslet* 794) 1, 138
- Art. II 1, 136

- Arts. V–XIII 1, 120
- 1884** 12 November, Mexico–United States of America, Boundary Treaty, Washington (75 BFSP 994; 164 CTS 337; 1 US Treaties 1159)
Art. V 1, 543
- 1886** 24 December, Costa Rica–Nicaragua, Convention to Submit to the Arbitration of the Government of the United States the Question in Regard to the Validity of the Treaty of 15 April 1858, Guatemala (Esquivel–Roman Treaty) (1 IELR 21) 1, 24
- 1888** 15 February, Great Britain–United States of America, Treaty for the Settlement of the Fishery Question on the Atlantic Coast of North America (79 BFSP 272; 18 Hertslet 1182; 1 US Treaties 738) 1, 136
- 1891** 15 June, Great Britain–United States of America, Agreement for a *Modus Vivendi* in Relation to the Fur Seal Fisheries in Behring Sea, Washington (1 IELR 565) 1, 52, 84
- 1892** 29 February, Great Britain–United States of America, Treaty Submitting to Arbitration the Questions Relating to the Seal Fisheries in Behring Sea, Washington (1 IELR 62) 1, 52, 67, 566, 568
Art. I 1, 52–3
Art. II 1, 67
Art. IV 1, 67
Art. VI 1, 53, 67, 69–72
Art. VII 1, 53, 68
Art. VIII 1, 53, 60, 68, 72–6, 569
Art. IX 1, 52n
Art. X 1, 52n
Regulations 1, 70–2
Declarations 1, 76–7
- 18 April, Great Britain–United States of America, Convention Respecting a *Modus Vivendi* in Behring Sea, Washington (1 IELR 566) 1, 52n, 569
- 1894** 4 May, Russia–United States of America, Agreement for a *Modus Vivendi* in Relation to the Fur Seal Fisheries in Behring Sea, Washington (180 CTS 141) 1, 86
- 1896** 8 February, Great Britain–United States of America, Convention for the Submission to Arbitration of British Claims in Connection with the Behring Sea Seal Fishery, Washington (1 IELR 568) 1, 82–3

- 1898** 10 December, Spain–United States of America, Treaty of Peace, Paris (90 BFSP 832; 187 CTS 100; 6 RGDIP 598; USTS 343)
 Art. III 1, 141n
- 1900** 8 September, Russia–United States of America, Protocol Respecting the Claim of the *Schooner James Hamilton Lewis et al*, St Petersburg (189 CTS 66) 1, 87–8
- 1904** 8 April, France–Great Britain, Convention Respecting Newfoundland and West and Central Africa, London (195 CTS 205) 1, 105
- 1907** 18 October, Hague Convention No. I for the Pacific Settlement of Disputes (100 BFSP 298; 205 CTS 233; UKTS 6 (1971); 2 US Treaties 2220; USTS 536) 1, 293, 298–9
 Chapter IV 1, 99, 116
 Art. 49 1, 245
 Art. 53 1, 99
 Art. 54 1, 99
 Art. 59 1, 345
 Art. 60 1, 345
 Art. 62 1, 345
 Art. 63 1, 345
 Arts. 64–85 1, 345
 Art. 83 1, 295, 297–8
- 20 December, Convention for the Establishment of a Central American Court of Justice, Washington (100 BFSP 841; 206 CTS 722; 2 US Treaties 2399)
 Art. 1 1, 27–8, 41
 Art. XIII 1, 41
 Art. XXI 1, 30, 41
 Art. XXII 1, 30, 41
 Art. XXIV 1, 41
 Art. XXV 1, 41
- 20 December, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Salvador, United States of America, General Treaty of Peace and Amity, Washington (100 BFSP 840; 206 CTS 72; 2 US Treaties 2397) 1, 41
 Art. IX 1, 39–40
- 1908** 4 April, Great Britain–United States of America, Arbitration Treaty, Washington (206 CTS 359) 1, 96, 114
- 1909** 11 January, Great Britain–United States of America, Convention

- Relating to Boundary Waters and Boundary Questions between the USA and Canada, Washington (102 BFSP 37; 208 CTS 213; UKTS 23 (1910); 3 US Treaties 2607; USTS 548) **1**, 244, 397
 Art. IX **1**, 256, 286
- 27 January, Great Britain–United States of America, Special Agreement for the Submission of Questions Relating to Fisheries on the North Atlantic Coast, Washington (1 IELR 96) **1**, 96, 102, 113
 Art. II **1**, 112, 114–15
 Art. III **1**, 112, 114–16
 Art. IV **1**, 112, 114, 116–18, 126–9
 Art. V **1**, 102
 Art. IX **1**, 130
- 1911** 7 July, Great Britain, Japan, Russia and United States of America, Convention Respecting Measures for the Preservation and Protection of Fur Seals in the North Pacific Ocean, Washington (214 CTS 80) **1**, 84
 Art. IV **1**, 84n
- 1914** 5 August, Nicaragua–United States of America, Treaty for the Construction of an Interoceanic Canal, Washington (Bryan–Chamorro Treaty) (1 IELR 554) **1**, 27, 29–31, 35–6, 38–41, 554–7
 Art. I **1**, 31–2, 38
- 17 December, France–Italy, Convention for the Utilisation of the River Roya and its Tributaries, Paris (1 IELR 576) **1**, 463–6
 Art. 1 **1**, 464
 Art. 4 **1**, 465
 Art. 5 **1**, 464–6
- 1919** 28 June, Covenant of the League of Nations (112 BFSP 13; 225 CTS 195; UKTS 4 (1919))
 Art. 13 **1**, 208
- 28 June, Treaty of Peace Between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany, Versailles (112 BFSP 1; 225 CTS 189; 29 Hertslet 603; UKTS 4 (1919); 3 US Treaties 3714) **1**, 154, 156
 Part XII, Section II, Chapter III **1**, 151–2
 Art. 331 **1**, 151–6
 Arts. 332–7 **1**, 152
 Art. 332 **1**, 152

- Art. 338 1, 151–2
 Arts. 340–5 1, 152
 Art. 341 1, 151
 Art. 344 1, 152, 155
- 1920** 4 June, Treaty of Peace Between the Allied and Associated Powers and Hungary, Trianon (113 BFSP 486; UKTS 10 (1920); 3 US Treaties 3539) 1, 443
 Art. 27(1) 1, 443n
 16 December, Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice (6 LNTS 380; PCIJ Series D, No. 1, 7) 1, 227, 299
 Art. 36 1, 170
 Art. 36(2) 1, 169, 228
 Art. 38 1, 205, 227
 Art. 39 1, 192
 Art. 40 1, 169–70
 Art. 57 1, 192
 Art. 59 1, 294
 Art. 61 1, 296–8
- 1921** 20 April, Convention and Statute on Navigable Waterways of International Concern, Barcelona (116 BFSP 527; 7 LNTS 36) 1, 151, 463,
 23 July, Convention Establishing the Definitive Statute of the Danube, Paris (26 LNTS 174) 1, 463
- 1922** 22 February, Statute of Navigation of the Elbe, Dresden (26 LNTS 220) 1, 463
- 1923** 27 January, Additional Convention on the Statute of Navigation of the Elbe, Dresden (26 LNTS 253) 1, 463
- 1925** 23 January, Netherlands–United States of America, Special Agreement Relating to the Arbitration of Differences Respecting Sovereignty over the Island of Palmas (or Miangas), Washington (122 BFSP 979; 33 LNTS 446) 1, 142–3n
 Art. I 1, 142n, 143
 Art. VII 1, 142n
- 1929** 10 July, France–Spain, Treaty of Arbitration (148 LNTS 369) 1, 344, 376
 Art. 2 1, 345–6
- 1935** 15 April, Canada–United States of America, Convention for Settlement of Difficulties Arising from Operation of Smelter at Trail, BC, Ottawa (1 IELR 244) 1, 248, 258, 272–3, 276–8, 291–2, 296–7, 300, 303–5, 331

- | | | |
|-------------|--|--|
| | Preamble | 1, 271, 279, 304 |
| | Art. I | 1, 304, 330 |
| | Art. II | 1, 248, 278 |
| | Art. III | 1, 249, 258, 271–4, 286, 292, 296–7, 304, 306, 310, 326, 330 |
| | Art. IV | 1, 249–50, 278–9, 292, 296–7 |
| | Art. V | 1, 303 |
| | Art. VIII | 1, 249–50, 278, 280 |
| | Art. X | 1, 304 |
| | Art. XI | 1, 249, 276, 280, 286, 290–1, 304, 310, 326–7 |
| | Art. XII | 1, 272, 286, 290, 324 |
| | Art. XIII | 1, 303 |
| | Art. XIV | 1, 302 |
| 1949 | 31 January/3 February, France–Spain, Agreement | 1, 374, 378–81 |
| | 17 November/24 January, Canada–United States of America, Exchange of Notes Supplementing the Convention of 15 April 1935 Relating to Claims on Account of Damages Caused by Fumes Emitted from the Smelter at Trail, British Columbia (1 IELR 330) | 1, 329 |
| 1956 | 19 November, France–Spain, Arbitral Compromis on the Interpretation of the Treaty of Bayonne of 26 May 1866 and Additional Act of the Same Date Concerning the Utilisation of the Waters of Lake Lanoux, Madrid (1 IELR 344) | 1, 343–4, 365, 367, 370–1 |
| | Preamble | 1, 366 |
| | Art. 2 | 1, 346 |
| | Art. 3 | 1, 346 |
| 1965 | 25 March, Canada–United States of America, Agreement Concerning the Establishment of an International Arbitral Tribunal to Dispose of United States Claims Relating to Gut Dam, Ottawa (1 IELR 400) | 1, 407, 409, 411, 424 |
| | Art. I | 1, 410–11 |
| | Art. VI | 1, 412 |
| | Art. VII | 1, 415–16 |
| | Art. X | 1, 412 |
| | Art. XV | 1, 417 |
| 1968 | 1 October, Canada–United States of America, Exchange of Notes Concerning the Lake Ontario Claims Tribunal and Lump Sum Settlement of Disputes Concerning Gut Dam, Ottawa (1 IELR 424) | 1, 423 |

1970 14 July, Nicaragua–United States of America, Convention for Termination of Convention of 5 August 1914, Managua (UNTS No. 11243) **1**, 42n

Helmand River Cases (Afghanistan/Persia)

Arbitral Tribunal, Tehran

19 August 1872 (Goldsmid, *Arbitrator*)

Arbitral Tribunal, Camp Kohak

10 April 1905 (McMahon, *Arbitrator*)

Waters – international river – Helmand River – boundary delimitation – apportionment of waters – prohibition of works interfering with requisite supply of water for irrigation – determination of requisite supply of water for irrigation

Sources of international law – general principles – international river – subject to natural changes in course – precautionary approach to be taken regarding envisaged works

Powers and procedures of tribunals – apportionment of waters of international river – arbitral award providing for establishment of monitoring and dispute settlement mechanism

SUMMARY *The facts*¹ The Helmand River and its principal tributaries originated in the mountains of central Afghanistan. The river flowed south-west through Afghanistan to Band-i-Kamal Khan at which point it turned northwards and flowed through a lakeside region known as Sistan. Approximately forty miles downstream

¹ The facts are based on information given in C. U. Aitchinson, *A Collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sanads Relating to India and Neighbouring Countries* (Government of India Central Publication Branch, Calcutta, 1933) vol. XIII, pp. 32–5, 209–10, J. G. Lammers, *Pollution of International Watercourses* (Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, The Hague, 1984) pp. 302–4, and in the Awards themselves. According to F. J. Goldsmid (ed.), *Eastern Persia: an Account of the Journeys of the Persian Boundary Commission 1870–71–72* (MacMillan & Co., London, 1876) pp. 281ff, 'bands' were dam-like structures usually constructed from the branches of tamarisk shrubs.

from Band-i-Kamal Khan lay Kohak, where the Kohak Dam, or Band-i-Kohak, was to be found.²

The rival claims of Persia and Afghanistan to sovereignty over Sistan caused disputes for many years. Pursuant to the Treaty of Peace of 4 March 1857 between Britain and Persia, the British Government offered to arbitrate on the question of the sovereignty and boundaries of the whole of Sistan on both sides of the Helmand River on the basis of ancient right and present possession.³ As a result British, Afghan and Persian Commissioners met in Sistan. The Afghan and Persian Commissioners stated and substantiated their claims and local enquiry was made. The Commissioners then proceeded to Tehran to discuss the matter fully. The British Commissioner was required to state his opinion as arbitrator, and it was agreed that should either the Persian or Afghan Government not agree to the opinion of the British arbitrator, reference should be made to the British Government whose decision would be final and binding on both Governments. The Award of Major General Goldsmid, the British Commissioner, was delivered on 19 August 1872.

Held by Arbitrator Goldsmid (1) The part of Sistan enclosed on three sides by lakes and on the fourth by the Helmand River, should be included by a special boundary line within the limits of Persia (p. 9).

(2) Persia should not possess the land on the right of the Helmand (p. 9).

(3) The banks of the Helmand to the north of Kohak should be given up to Afghanistan (p. 10).

(4) The main bed of the Helmand below Kohak should be the eastern boundary of Persian Sistan (p. 10).

(5) No works were to be carried out calculated to interfere with the requisite supply of water for irrigation on both banks of the Helmand (p. 10).

Subsequent facts Arbitrator Goldsmid's Award was confirmed by the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and was accepted by

² See map in Appendix 3, p. 580.

³ GB–Persia, Treaty of Peace, Paris, 4 March 1857. Article VI provided: 'In case of differences arising between the Government of Persia and the countries of Herat and Afghanistan, the Persian Government engages to refer them for adjustment to the friendly offices of the British Government, and not to take up arms unless those friendly offices fail of effect.'

the Persian and Afghan Governments in 1873. As final confirming authority of the Award, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs further laid down in 1873, after consulting Arbitrator Goldsmid, that the clause in the Award providing that '[i]t is to be clearly understood that no works are to be carried out on either side calculated to interfere with the requisite supply of irrigation on both sides of the Helmand' was not to be understood to apply either to existing canals or to old or disused canals that it may be desired to put in proper repair, nor to interfere with the excavation of new canals, provided that the requisite supply on both banks was not diminished.

After 1873 changes occurred in the course of the Helmand River and its tributaries causing further disputes, and over time relations between Persia and Afghanistan in this regard once again became strained. An abnormal deficiency of water in the Helmand in 1902 brought matters to a crisis and led to a request for arbitration again by the British Government, on condition that the award rendered would be in accordance with the terms of Arbitrator Goldsmid's Award. The Award of Colonel McMahon, as Arbitrator, was delivered on 10 April 1905.

Held by Arbitrator McMahon

Preliminary remarks (1) The present Award was restricted by the condition that it had to be in accordance with Arbitrator Goldsmid's Award (p. 11).

(2) That Award was so definite that it was unnecessary to make any attempt to define it further except on one particular point. It provided that Persia had a right to a requisite supply of water for irrigation. In order to prevent future misunderstandings, it only remained to define what amount of water fairly represented a requisite supply (p. 11).

(3) Since the question of the sufficiency of water was serious only during spring crop cultivation when the river was at its lowest, any settlement based on the requirements of that season would also meet the case of the remainder of the year (p. 12).

(4) Calculation of the normal volume of the Helmand River during the spring cultivation season showed that one third of the water of the Helmand River entering Sistan at Band-i-Kamal Khan would amply suffice for the irrigation of all existing cultivation in the Persian part of Sistan, would allow for a large future extension

of that cultivation and would leave a requisite supply for all Afghan requirements (p. 12).

Award (1) No irrigation works were to be carried out on either side that were calculated to interfere with the requisite supply of water for irrigation on both banks of the river. Both sides, however, had the right within their own territories to maintain existing canals, to open out old or disused canals, and to make new canals from the Helmand River, provided that the supply of water requisite for irrigation on both sides was not diminished (p. 12).

(2) The amount of water required for irrigation of Persian lands, irrigable from and below Kohak, was one third of the whole volume of the Helmand River which entered Sistan (p. 12).

(3) Persia was therefore entitled to one third of the whole Helmand River calculated at the point where water was first taken off to irrigate lands on either bank situated in Sistan (p. 12).

(4) Any irrigation works constructed by Afghanistan to divert water had to allow for at least one third of the volume of the whole river being available for Persian use at Kohak (p. 12).

(5) To monitor compliance with the Award, and to avoid the necessity of fresh references to the British Government, a British officer with irrigation experience was to be attached permanently to the British Consulate in Sistan. The officer was to be empowered to give an opinion, when required by either party, on any case of doubt or dispute over water questions that might arise. The officer was also to be able to call the attention of either party to any significant indications of danger to their water supply arising from natural causes or their own irrigation works. To enable the officer to fulfil these functions, the officer was to be given free access, by either side, to the Helmand River, its branches and the heads of canals leading therefrom (pp. 12–13).

(6) The maintenance of the dam at Kohak was of great importance to the welfare of Persian Sistan. Should the deepening of the river bed necessitate moving the dam a short distance further up the river, Afghanistan should permit such a move and grant Persia the right to excavate the short canal through Afghan territory required for such an adjustment. Similarly should it become necessary for Afghanistan to move the Shahgul Dam lower down the Pariun River Persia should, as it had done before, allow Afghanistan the requisite right of way through Persian territory (p. 13).

(7) The rights to the Helmand River which Afghanistan's geographical position naturally gave it as owner of the Upper Helmand had been restricted to the extent stated above in favour of Persia in accordance with Arbitrator Goldsmid's Award. It followed that Persia had no right to alienate to any other power the water rights thus acquired without the consent of Afghanistan (p. 13).

(8) The Helmand River in Sistan had always been subject to sudden, significant changes in its course. Great care should be exercised by both countries in the opening out of new canals or the enlargement of old canals leading from the Helmand. Unless that was done with proper precaution it could cause the river to divert itself entirely at such points and cause great loss to both countries (p. 13).

There follows

Award of Arbitrator Goldsmid, 19 August 1872	7
Award of Arbitrator McMahan, 10 April 1905	10
<i>Note concerning non-acceptance of Arbitrator McMahan's Award</i>	14

Award of Arbitrator Goldsmid, 19 August 1872

[410] PREAMBLE

The Arbitral opinion which I am required to deliver has been formed after perusal of the several histories of Sistán of more general note; after examination of much oral and written evidence; and after a stay of forty-one days within the localities under dispute. Naturally the more immediate argument with which I have to deal is contained in the statement authoritatively given in by the Persian Government (through the Foreign Office, or Mirza Melkam Khán), and Afghán Commissioners. These have been carefully considered together with the documentary evidence with which they are supported.

I now proceed to summarise my views on the whole Sistán question, and to carry out the instructions with which I have been honoured.

SUMMARY

I. Sistán was undoubtedly in ancient times part of Persia, and it appears to have been so especially under the Safavian Kings; but under Ahmad Shah it formed part of the Duráni Empire. Further it had not been recovered to Persia until at a very recent date; and *that* only partially, and under circumstances the nature of which materially affect the present enquiry.

II. Ancient associations, together with the religion, language, and perhaps habits of the people of Sistán Proper, render the annexation of that tract to Persia by no means a strange or unnatural measure. But Persia has no valid claim to possess it on abstract right, [411] whether the country be taken from Afghánistán, or whether it be simply deprived of independence. The period referred to for former connection is too remote. A century of disconnection cannot fail to be a bar to validity.

III. The possession of the Afgháns for the second half-century may have been more nominal than real, and more spasmodic than sustained. It may have been asserted by raids and invasions, or mere temporary tenure: but it has nevertheless a certain number of facts in support; and these are most material in an enquiry of this nature. General principles and theories are always important, but they cannot produce facts: whereas facts have a more practical tendency – for they support and establish general principles and theories. Neither ancient associations nor national sympathy are strong enough to nullify the force of circumstances, and circumstances show that Persia has exercised no interference in the internal administration of Sistán from the days of Nadir Shah until a very recent date.

IV. Geographically, Sistán is clearly part of Afghánistán, and the intrusion of Káin into that province is prejudicial to the delineation of a good natural frontier.

It has been commonly considered part of Herát and Lásh Juwain; though its dependence on the Helmand for irrigation may cause it to be included by some in the general valley of that river. The Neh Bandan Hills manifestly separate Sistán from Persia. I cannot but believe such would have been found to be the *status* had an illustrative map accompanied the sixth article of the Paris treaty.

V. But while, in my opinion, Afghánistán has the advantage in claims on the score of an intermediate tenure, superseding that of Nadir Shah or the Safavian Kings, it cannot be denied that from year to year she has been relaxing her hold over Sistán; and this has been evinced in a marked manner since the death of the Wazír Yar Muhammad. It would be absurd to contend that the second half-century of Afghán connection with the province has been a period of continuous possession. That Sistán has now fallen into the hands of the Amir of Káin can only be attributed to the helplessness of its independence and the personal action of its ruler. It was for a time at least out of the hands of Afghánistán. I do not admit that the manner in which Sistán was occupied by Persian troops corresponds with an appeal to arms such as contemplated by Lord Russell's letter quoted – There was no fair fighting at all. Nor can it be admitted [412] that allegiance was obtained by the single means of military movements or open procedure of any kind. On the other hand, I cannot see that the Afgháns took any measures to counteract the proceedings of Persia when treating with Ali Khán, Taj Muhammad, or other Sistán chiefs.

VI. As the Sistán of the present day is not the separate principality of the past, and it is essential to a due appreciation of claims, that the parts in possession of either side should be intelligibly defined, I revert to a territorial division which has

appeared to me convenient and approximate. By this arrangement the rich tract of country, which, the Hámún on three of its sides and the Helmand on the fourth, cause to resemble an island, is designated, 'Sistán Proper,' whereas the district of Chakhansúr and lands of the Helmand above the Bank, and Sistán desert, are known as 'Outer Sistán.'

The first may be considered in absolute possession of Persia, and has a comparatively large and mixed population.

The second is either without population or inhabited chiefly by Balúchis, some of whom acknowledge Persian, some Afghán sovereignty. The professions of Kamal Khán and Imam Khán do not to my mind prove a possession to Persia, similar to that of Sistán Proper. Chakhansúr on the right bank of the Helmand is under the Afgháns. But the fort of Nad Ali on the same bank has been lately taken by the Persians.

VII. I have to consider ancient right and present possession, and report briefly my opinion on both these heads: 1st. That Sistán was incorporated in the Persia of ancient days: but the Afghánistán of Ahmad Shah, which also comprised Sistán, had not then come into existence; and it is impossible to set aside the fact that this kingdom *did* exist, any more than that Ahmad Shah was an independent monarch. 2nd. That the possession of Sistán obtained in recent days by Persia cannot affect the question of right as regards Afghánistán. If admitted at all under the circumstances, it can only be so subject to certain restrictions, and with reference to the particular people brought under control.

ARBITRAL OPINION

Weighing therefore the merits of the case on either side as gathered from evidence of many kinds, and with especial regard to [413] the great advantages of a clearly defined frontier, I submit an opinion that the tract which I have called 'Sistán Proper' should be hereafter included by a special boundary line within the limits of Persia, to be restored to independence under Persian protection, or governed by duly appointed governors. This opinion is accompanied by an expression of the sincere and earnest hope that the Persian rule will prove beneficial to a people whose nominal state has been from time immemorial one of terror, suspense, and suffering.

But I am thoroughly convinced that, by all rules of justice and equity, if Persia be allowed to hold possession of a country which has fallen to her control under such circumstances as these detailed, her possession should be circumscribed to the limits of her actual possession in Sistán Proper, as far as consistent with geographical and political requirements. She should not possess land on the right bank of the Helmand.

If in a question of ancient right and present possession, a military occupation of six or seven years and the previous action of a local chief be suffered to outweigh rights and associations extending more or less over a whole country, and

Arbitration award the most coveted, populous, and richer part of the Sistán province, it is manifestly fair that some compensating benefit should accrue to the losing side.

It appears therefore beyond doubt indispensable that Nád Ali should be evacuated by Persian garrisons, and both banks of the Helmand above the Kohak Band be given up to Afghánistán. And this arrangement becomes doubly just and proper when the character of the inhabitants along the banks of the river is compared with that of the Sistánis of Sekuha, Deshtak, and Sistán Proper.

The main bed of the Helmand therefore below Kohak should be the eastern boundary of Persian Sistán, and the line of frontier from Kohak to the hills south of the Sistán desert should be so drawn as to include within the Afghán limits all cultivation on the banks of the river from the Band upwards.

The Malik Siáh Koh on the chain of hills separating the Sistán from the Karmán desert, appears a fitting point.

North of Sistán the southern limit of the Naizár should be the frontier towards Lásh Juwain. Persia should not cross the Hámún in that direction. A line drawn from the Naizár to the 'Kuh Siáh' (black hill) near Bandan, would clearly define her possessions.

It is moreover to be well understood that no works are to be [414] carried out on either side calculated to interfere with the requisite supply of water for irrigation on the banks of the Helmand.

F. J. GOLDSMID, *Major General, On Special Mission*

[Report: F. J. Goldsmid (ed.), *Eastern Persia: An Account of the Journeys of the Persian Boundary Commission 1870–71–72* (London, MacMillan & Co., 1876), p. 410]

Award of Arbitrator McMahon, 10 April 1905

[283] PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Paragraph 1. – General Sir Frederick Goldsmid, as Arbitrator between Persia and Afghanistan, was called upon to settle the question of rights to land and water of Persia and Afghanistan in Seistan. He delivered an arbitral award on both points in 1872,⁴ which was confirmed by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and accepted by the Persian and Afghan Governments in 1873.

2. At the time of the above award, the Helmand river had one main distributary channel in Seistan, *i.e.*, the Rud-i-Seistan, at the mouth of which, in order to divert sufficient water into this Rud, was a tamarisk band known as the Band-i-Kohak or Band-i-Seistan. The Helmand river from thence onwards flowed in one channel past Nad Ali and along what is now known as the Sikhsar into the Naizar and

⁴ See above, p. 7.

Hamun. In 1896 a large flood caused the river to burst out for itself a new main channel, which left the old one near Shahgul and is now known as the Rud-i-Pariun.

3. Various disputes regarding water between Persian and Afghan Seistan, which were caused by changes in the course of canals and in the course of the main [284] river, have arisen since 1872. My enquiries show that these have, until recently, always been mutually and amicably settled by the responsible officials concerned on both sides, *i.e.*, the Governors of Seistan and Chakhansur. These officials, who thoroughly understood each other's water requirements, have always shown great tact and skill in settling water disputes to the mutual satisfaction of both countries.

4. Unfortunately of recent years, whatever may have been the cause, and whether this was due to the changes in the course of the main stream, or to more strained relations, the amicable settlement of water difficulties has been found to be no longer possible. A series of small, and in themselves unimportant, water questions arose between 1900 and 1902, which, by reason of estranged relations, caused mutual misunderstanding and increased ill-feeling, until matters were brought to a crisis by further disputes arising from abnormal deficiency of water in the Helmand in 1902. This led to the present reference to the arbitration of the British Government.

5. The condition under which the present arbitration has been agreed to by the Governments of Persia and Afghanistan is that the award should be in accordance with the terms of Sir Frederick Goldsmid's award.

6. In framing my award I am, therefore, restricted by the above condition.

7. Sir Frederick Goldsmid's award on the water question was as follows: – 'It is to be clearly understood that no works are to be carried out on either side calculated to interfere with the requisite supply of irrigation on both banks of the Helmand.' Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in his capacity as the final confirming authority of that award further laid down in 1873, after consulting General Goldsmid, that the above clause should not be understood to apply either to existing canals or to old or disused canals that it may be desired to put in proper repair, nor would it interfere with the excavation of new canals, provided that the requisite supply on both banks is not diminished.

8. The above award is so definite that it is unnecessary to make any attempt to define it further, except on one particular point. This award provides that Persia has a right to a requisite supply of water for irrigation. In order to prevent future misunderstandings, it only remains to define what amount of water fairly represents a requisite supply for Persian requirements.

9. From the careful and exhaustive measurements, observations, and enquiries made by this Mission in Seistan, the following facts have been clearly established: –

(a) Seistan suffers more from excess than deficiency of water. Far more loss is caused by damage done to land and crops year after year by floods, than is caused by want of water for irrigation.

(b) In only very few exceptional abnormal years of low river has any question of sufficiency of water arisen in Seistan, and then Afghan Seistan has suffered equally with Persian Seistan. Moreover, questions as to the sufficiency of water only prove serious when the spring crop cultivation is concerned, when the river is at its lowest, *i.e.*, between the autumn and spring equinoxes, yet it has been [285] ascertained that in only 3 out of the past 35 years has there been any serious deficiency of water in Seistan during that season. It is necessary, therefore, first to consider water requirements during the season of spring crops. Any settlement based on the requirements of that season will meet the case of the remainder of the year also.

(c) After carefully calculating the normal volume of the Helmand river during the period between the autumn equinox and the spring equinox it has been clearly ascertained that one-third of the water which now reaches Seistan at Bandar-i-Kamal Khan would amply suffice for the proper irrigation of all existing cultivation in Persian Seistan, and also allow of a large future extension of that cultivation. This would leave a requisite supply for all Afghan requirements.

10. I therefore give the following award:—

AWARD

Clause I. – No irrigation works are to be carried out on either side calculated to interfere with the requisite supply of water for irrigation on both banks of the river but both sides have the right, within their own territories, to maintain existing canals, to open out old or disused canals, and to make new canals, from the Helmand river, provided that the supply of water requisite for irrigation on both sides is not diminished.

Clause II. – The amount of water requisite for irrigation of Persian lands irrigable from and below the Band-i-Kohak is one-third of the whole volume of the Helmand river which enters Seistan.

Seistan, to which Sir Frederick Goldsmid's award applies, comprises all lands on both banks of the Helmand from Bandar-i-Kamal Khan downwards.

Clause III. – Persia is, therefore, entitled to one-third of the whole Helmand River calculated at the point where water is first taken off from it to irrigate lands on either bank situated at or below Bandar-i-Kamal Khan.

Clause IV. – Any irrigation works constructed by Afghanistan to divert water into Seistan lands, as above defined, must allow of at least one-third of the volume of the whole river being available for Persian use at Band-i-Kohak.

Clause V. – To enable both sides to satisfy themselves that this award is being complied with, and at the same time to avoid the necessity of fresh references to the British Government and the expense of special Missions, a British officer of irrigation experience shall be permanently attached to the British Consulate in Seistan. He will be empowered to give an opinion, when required by either party, on any case of doubt or dispute over water questions that may arise. He will,

when necessary, take steps to bring the real facts of any case to the notice of the Government concerned. He will be able to call the attention of either party to any important indications of threatening danger to their water-supply arising from natural causes or their own irrigation works. To enable this officer properly to fulfill the functions of his office, free access shall be given to him by either side to the Helmand river and its branches and the heads of canals leading therefrom.

[286] *Clause VI.* – The maintenance of the Band-i-Kohak is of great importance to the welfare of Persian Seistan. It is possible that the deepening of the river bed at and below the site of the present band may necessitate moving the band a short distance further up the river. Afghanistan should allow Persia to move this band, if necessary, and grant Persia the right to excavate the short canal required for such new band through Afghan territory to the Rud-i-Seistan.

Similarly, should it become necessary for Afghanistan to move the present Shahgul Band across the Rud-i-Pariun somewhat lower down that stream, Persia should (as has been done before) allow Afghanistan right of way for a canal through Persian territory from that band to the Nad Ali Channel.

Clause VII. – It will be noted that the rights to the Helmand river which her geographical position naturally gives to Afghanistan as owner of the Upper Helmand, have been restricted to the extent stated above in favour of Persia in accordance with Sir Frederick Goldsmid's award. It follows, therefore, that Persia has no right to alienate to any other Power the water rights thus acquired without the consent of Afghanistan.

Clause VIII. – I cannot close this award without a word of warning to both countries concerned. The past history of the Helmand river in Seistan shows that it has always been subject to sudden and important changes in its course, which have from time to time diverted the whole river into a new channel and rendered useless all the then existing canal systems. Such changes are liable to occur in the future, and great care should, therefore, be exercised in the opening out of new canals, or the enlargement of old canals leading from the Helmand. Unless this is done with proper precaution, it may cause the river to divert itself entirely at such points and cause great loss to both countries. This danger applies equally to Afghanistan and Persia.

A. H. MCMAHON, *Colonel British Commissioner, CAMP KOHAK, The 10th April 1905*
Seistan Arbitration Commission

[Report: C. U. Aitchinson, *A Collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sanads Relating to India and Neighbouring Countries* (Government of India Central Publication Branch, Calcutta, 1933) vol. XIII, pp. 283–6]

Note concerning non-acceptance of Arbitrator McMahon's Award

Arbitrator McMahon's Award on the water question was not accepted in its entirety by the Afghan Government, and was altogether rejected by Persia on the ground that it was more favourably treated under Arbitrator Goldsmid's Award. In 1950 Afghanistan and Iran agreed to establish a neutral advisory commission to make technical investigations and recommendations that might serve as a basis for a settlement of the Helmand waters question.⁵ The Commission produced a report which was rejected.⁶ Subsequently negotiations were resumed, but as at 1996 no agreement had been reached.⁷

⁵ See terms of reference of the Helmand River Delta Commission and an interpretative statement relative thereto agreed by conferees of Afghanistan and Iran, 7 September 1950, in UN Doc. ST/LEG/SER.B/12 pp. 270–3 (as cited in J. G. Lammers below, footnote 7).

⁶ *Report of the Helmand River Delta Commission, Afghanistan and Iran* (Washington DC, 1951).

⁷ J. G. Lammers *Pollution of International Watercourses* (Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, The Hague, 1984) p. 303, and D. A. Caponera, 'Conflicts over International River Basins in Africa, the Middle East and Asia', 5:2 (1996) *RECIEL* 97, 104–5.