

LEGAL CONSEQUENCES OF PEREMPTORY NORMS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

When is a norm peremptory? This is a question that has troubled legal scholars throughout the development of modern international law. In this work, Daniel Costelloe suggests – through an examination of State practice and international materials – that it is the legal consequences of a norm which distinguish it as peremptory. This book sheds new light on the legal consequences that peremptory norms have, for instance, in the law of treaties, international responsibility and State immunity. Unlike their substance or identification, the consequences of peremptory norms have remained under-studied. This book is the first specifically on this topic and is essential reading for all scholars and practitioners of public international law.

DANIEL COSTELLOE is a senior associate in the international arbitration group at Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP. Before this he held a W. M. Tapp Studentship in Law at Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge.

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL
AND COMPARATIVE LAW

Established in 1946, this Series produces high-quality, reflective and innovative scholarship in the field of public international law. It publishes works on international law that are of a theoretical, historical, cross-disciplinary or doctrinal nature. The series also welcomes books providing insights from private international law, comparative law and transnational studies which inform international legal thought and practice more generally.

The series seeks to publish views from diverse legal traditions and perspectives and of any geographical origin. In this respect it invites studies offering regional perspectives on core *problématiques* of international law and, in the same vein, it appreciates contrasts and debates between diverging approaches. Accordingly, books offering new or less orthodox perspectives are very much welcome. Works of a generalist character are greatly valued, and the Series is also open to studies on specific areas, institutions or problems. Translations of the most outstanding works published in other languages are also considered.

After 70 years, *Cambridge Studies in International and Comparative Law* remains the standard-setter for international legal scholarship and will continue to define the discipline as it evolves in the years to come.

General Editors

Larissa van den Herik

Professor of Public International Law, Law School Leiden University

Jean D'Aspremont

*Professor of Public International Law, Manchester International
Law Centre, University of Manchester*

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

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-14503-0 — Legal Consequences of Peremptory Norms in International Law
Daniel Costelloe
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

LEGAL CONSEQUENCES OF PEREMPTORY NORMS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

DANIEL COSTELLOE



Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-14503-0 — Legal Consequences of Peremptory Norms in International Law
Daniel Costelloe
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

4843/24, 2nd Floor, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, Delhi – 110002, India

79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107145030

DOI: 10.1017/9781316535110

© Daniel Costelloe 2017

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 2017

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Costelloe, Daniel, author.

Title: Legal consequences of peremptory norms in international law /

Daniel Costelloe, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hall and Dorr LLP.

Description: Cambridge, United Kingdom; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2017. | Series: Cambridge studies in international and comparative law | Based on author's thesis (doctoral – University of Cambridge, 2013).

Identifiers: LCCN 2016052785 | ISBN 9781107145030 (hardback)

Subjects: LCSH: Jus cogens (International law) | International law – Sources.

Classification: LCC KZ1261 .C67 2017 | DDC 341–dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016052785>

ISBN 978-1-107-14503-0 Hardback

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

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14503-0 — Legal Consequences of Peremptory Norms in International Law

Daniel Costelloe

Frontmatter

[More Information](#)

For my parents

CONTENTS

<i>Foreword by James Crawford</i>	page xiii
<i>Preface</i>	xv
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxi
<i>Notes on Citations</i>	xxiii
<i>Table of International and National Decisions and Opinions</i>	xxvii
<i>Table of Treaties and International Instruments (in Chronological Order)</i>	xxxix
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xlvi
 1 Peremptory Norms and Their Legal Consequences as a Feature of General International Law	 1
A Introduction	1
a Preliminary Considerations	1
b Doctrinal History	7
c Terminological Clarifications	11
d Legal Consequences as a Relevant Characteristic of Peremptory Norms	14
B Peremptory Norms as a Feature of General International Law and the Relevance of Persistent Objection	18
C Peremptory Norms and Their Consequences as an Aspect of Multilateral Legal Relations in International Law	23
a Typology of Obligations	24
b Standing to Invoke the Breach of a Multilateral Obligation	28
c Legal Consequences of Peremptory Norms as a Characteristic of Multilateral Obligation	34
D Peremptory Norms in the Jurisprudence of the ICJ	47
a Before Acceptance of the Concept	47
b After Acceptance of the Concept	49
E Do These Consequences Follow from a Single Concept?	51
F Conclusions	53

2	Legal Consequences for Treaties	54
A	Introduction	54
B	States' Positions during the Drafting of Articles 53 and 64	56
C	Consequences under Articles 53, 64, 65, 66 and 71 VCLT	62
a	Derogation, Conflict, Invalidity and Termination	64
b	Dispute Resolution and Consequences of Invalidity	72
D	The Relevance of Peremptory Norms for Treaty Interpretation	82
a	Interpretive Presumptions	82
b	Systemic Integration	87
E	Consequences for Treaty Registration	91
F	Conclusions	93
3	Peremptory Norms Outside the Vienna Convention: Treaties of Questionable Validity by Reason of Their Content	95
A	Introduction	95
B	The Agreement for the Cession by Czechoslovakia to Germany of Sudeten German Territory	96
C	The Secret Additional Protocol to the Treaty of Non-Aggression Between the USSR and Germany of August 1939 and the Soviet-German Friendship and Frontier Treaty and Protocols of September 1939	103
D	The Protocol of Sèvres	106
E	The Treaty of Guarantee	109
F	Exchange of Notes Concerning British Indian Ocean Territory	116
G	The Camp David Accords	118
H	The Timor Gap Treaty	119
I	The European Union-Morocco Fisheries Partnership Agreement	122
J	Conclusions	127
4	Legal Consequences for Security Council Resolutions	128
A	Introduction	128
B	Validity in the Event of a Conflict with a Peremptory Norm	129
C	Reviewability for a Conflict with a Peremptory Norm	138
D	Peremptory Norms as a Basis for the Interpretation of Security Council Resolutions	144
E	Conclusions	151

CONTENTS

xi

5	Legal Consequences for Certain Unilateral Acts	152
A	Introduction	152
B	Consequences for Unilateral Acceptances of Jurisdiction	155
C	Consequences for Unilateral Acts of Waiver	157
D	Consequences for Reservations to Treaties	161
E	Consequences for Unilateral Declarations of Independence	167
F	Consequences for Unilateral Declarations Capable of Creating Legal Obligations	171
G	Standing to Invoke the Conflict of a Unilateral Act with a Peremptory Norm	178
H	Charter-Based Authority to Make a Declaration of Invalidity and/or Unlawfulness	180
I	Conclusions	183
6	Legal Consequences in the Law of International Responsibility	184
A	Introduction	184
a	Terminology and Basic Consequences	184
b	Seriousness Threshold	187
c	Limits to the Consequences of a Serious Breach	190
B	Collective Non-Recognition	193
a	Origins	193
b	Practice	197
c	Exceptions	204
C	Collective Non-Assistance	207
D	Obligation of Co-operation and Third-Party Countermeasures	212
a	Co-operation	212
b	Third-Party Countermeasures	215
c	Exercise of Collective Response Measures	219
E	Are These Consequences Peculiar to a Serious Breach?	222
F	Unavailability of Circumstances Precluding Wrongfulness	224
G	Issues Arising for the Responsibility of International Organizations	228
a	Basic Concepts	228
b	Legal Position of International Organizations with Respect to a Serious Breach	232
H	Conclusions	240

7	Conflict between a Peremptory Norm and General International Law: Legal Consequences for State Immunity	242
A	Introduction	242
B	Scope for Conflict between a Peremptory Norm and State Immunity	243
a	Application of Principles Governing Normative Conflict	243
b	Scope for Normative Conflict between Peremptory Norms and Other Rules of General International Law	244
c	Possibility of Normative Conflict between Peremptory Norms and Rules Governing State Immunity	245
C	Peremptory Norms and State Immunity: Possible Bases for an Exception	246
a	Three Possible Grounds in Support of an Exception	248
i	Character of the Act in Question	248
ii	Hierarchy of Norms	254
iii	Implied Waiver	256
b	Problems Associated with an Exception to State Immunity	257
D	International Practice on Peremptory Norms and State Immunity	259
a	International Instruments	260
b	National Legislation	265
c	Judicial Practice	267
i	<i>Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy: Greece Intervening)</i>	267
ii	<i>Arrest Warrant (DRC v. Belgium)</i>	273
iii	<i>Al-Adsani v. United Kingdom</i>	275
iv	<i>Jones and others v. United Kingdom</i>	277
v	National Decisions	279
E	Conclusions	284
	General Conclusions	286
	<i>Bibliography</i>	291
	<i>Index</i>	313

FOREWORD

Peremptory norms of general international law enjoyed their initial moments of notoriety during the codification of the law of treaties in the 1960s. Though not unknown to scholars, they had been largely ignored by practitioners, but they took centre stage during the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties in Vienna. They were the stated reason for France's vote against the text as a whole and for several abstentions.

Notwithstanding such opposition, peremptory norms of international law – the *jus cogens* – eventually became part of accepted positive international law. Yet this took time. It was not achieved simply by the entry into force of the Vienna Convention in 1980, any more than it had been by the famous and equivocal dictum of the Court in *Barcelona Traction* in 1970 – equivocal because at the same time the Court endorsed the basic idea while avoiding the terminology of peremptory norms, finding it apparently less than cogent. These developments were accompanied by disagreements over these norms' theoretical basis, and the question which norms enjoyed this peculiar status endured. The practice of States offered few answers.

Peremptory norms have, to this day, remained something of a curiosity of the law. Extensive is the literature on the content of peremptory norms, yet few are the instances in which a court or tribunal has applied the concept so as to determine the outcome of a case. Universal is the support for these norms' existence, yet divergent are the views on the range of their legal effects.

Dr. Costelloe devotes his book to these legal effects of peremptory norms. Indeed, the concept of peremptory norms has, since the conclusion of the 1969 Vienna Convention, penetrated well beyond the confines of the law of treaties, yet the range of these norms' effects in these fields remains a matter of some uncertainty. This book's thesis is simple: it is, ultimately, their particular legal effects that render peremptory norms different in kind from other international legal norms, but State practice indicates that these effects are, in reality, comparatively few.

The author approaches these questions with modesty and an absence of bias. His discussions dispense with preconceptions or assumptions about the legal effects that peremptory norms *should* produce because of the important moral and political values they reflect. Consistent with this somewhat sceptical approach, he focuses on the study of State practice, international instruments and the decisions of courts and tribunals. His book – the first devoted specifically to the consequential question of legal consequences – is also timely, now that the International Law Commission has decided to address directly the questions concerning peremptory norms as a free-standing subject by adding the topic to its programme of work.

Despite his recognition of the realities of international law, Dr. Costelloe remains sensitive to the historical significance of peremptory norms and the importance of the principles reflected in them. These norms include rules no less important than the prohibitions under international law of the forcible acquisition of territory or of genocide, for example. He suggests that acknowledging the limits of peremptory norms may, ultimately, render a greater service to these goals than failing to do so. The result is a frank acknowledgement of international law's imperfections, but also of its achievements.

James Crawford
Peace Palace
The Hague
23 May 2016

P R E F A C E

Article 53 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a provision that has left its mark on the history of public international law, provides as follows:

Treaties Conflicting with a Peremptory Norm of General International Law ('Jus Cogens')

'A treaty is void if, at the time of its conclusion, it conflicts with a peremptory norm of general international law. For the purposes of the present Convention, a peremptory norm of general international law is a norm accepted and recognized by the international community of States as a whole as a norm from which no derogation is permitted and which can be modified only by a subsequent norm of general international law having the same character.'

To say that this article and its sister provision, Article 64, have generated an important body of scholarly work would by now amount to an understatement. As a study of peremptory norms, this book enters a crowded field. What, then, can a further study of peremptory norms hope to achieve? The question is as important as it is justified.

The International Law Commission in August 2014 first added the topic of peremptory norms to its long-term programme of work.¹ The syllabus on the basis of which the ILC added the topic notes: 'Notwithstanding its inclusion in the Vienna Convention, the contours and legal effects of *jus cogens* remain ill-defined and contentious.'² Further, the proposal indicates that 'although the formulation [in Article 53 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties] addresses a basic issue of consequences for treaties, it leaves open several other issues relating to consequences, including consequences for other rules not contained in treaties.'³ Finally, and most

¹ Report of the International Law Commission, Sixty-sixth session (5 May–6 June and 7 July–8 August 2014), A/69/10, p. 265.

² Report of the International Law Commission, Sixty-sixth session (5 May–6 June and 7 July–8 August 2014), A/69/10, Annex (Dire D. Tladi, *Jus Cogens*), para. 3.

³ *Ibid.* para. 9.

importantly, the ILC proposal observes in this connection: ‘The consideration of the effects and consequences of *jus cogens* is likely to be the most challenging part of the study and will require careful analysis of the jurisprudence of both international and domestic courts.’⁴

As becomes clear from these passages alone, especially when read in light of State practice, the jurisprudence of courts and tribunals as well as scholarly publications, the legal consequences of peremptory norms have so far not received sufficient academic attention. As litigation in national courts and before the International Court of Justice over the years has demonstrated, much uncertainty has, for example, long surrounded the effects of peremptory norms for rules of State immunity under international law. Likewise, the extent of obligations for non-injured States in response to another State’s serious breach of an obligation under a peremptory norm, and the question whether these consequences are even peculiar to peremptory norms, remain uncertain. A further area of uncertainty concerns the legal effectiveness of an attempted act of waiver by an injured State of claims arising out of another State’s breach of an obligation under a peremptory norm. The status of a treaty reservation in conflict with a peremptory norm is yet another question in need of clarification. These and other areas have been marked by pronounced disagreement.

A study devoted to the legal consequences of peremptory norms also has the potential to clarify lingering systemic uncertainties in general international law. This book offers an analysis of how peremptory norms and their consequences are features of the multilateral character of certain legal norms and obligations in general international law. These conclusions will – hopefully – not only contribute to the study of international law as an academic discipline but likewise offer clarity for international legal practice and dispute settlement. Moreover, the ILC’s study of peremptory norms as a free-standing topic – i.e., not as part of the law of treaties, State responsibility or another field – lends this treatment of the subject contemporary significance.⁵

The present study has the following two principal features. First, it focuses centrally on the legal consequences of peremptory norms, which remain an area of some uncertainty, rather than on their substance or identification. Second, and more importantly, it advances the thesis that it is these norms’ consequences across various areas of international law that lend them a particular character.

⁴ *Ibid.*, para. 17.

⁵ See Dire Tladi, First Report on Jus Cogens, A/CN.4/693. Due to the publication date of this book, it does not yet consider the Special Rapporteur’s second report on this topic or States’ comments on that report.

The book takes the position that it is not the substance of a legal norm, such as the area it regulates, or the norm's moral or political significance, that renders it peremptory. Nor is acceptance and recognition, as specified in Article 53 VCLT,⁶ of a norm's non-derogability necessarily an appropriate test outside the setting of the VCLT. In this context, only the legal consequences of a norm can render it different in kind from other norms in any meaningful way. The book's main conclusion is that one gains little by asserting that an international legal norm is peremptory if one is not able to point to any particular consequences associated with that character, i.e., if nothing follows from what otherwise is a mere label. Each such consequence requires an independent basis in the reality of practice and cannot be freely inferred from pre-supposed characteristics. As a result, this study's method is to study these norms' consequences in State practice and to formulate general conclusions about their character on that basis, rather than taking certain characteristics for granted and suggesting inferences about what consequences these norms should accordingly give rise to.

The consequences of a peremptory norm under the VCLT include, for example, the invalidity of a treaty in conflict with it, subject to provisions on dispute settlement under Articles 65 and 66.⁷ Under general international law, peremptory norms can create interpretive presumptions for treaties and other international instruments, including Security Council resolutions. Further, the breach of an obligation under a peremptory norm generates obligations of non-recognition and non-assistance for third States under the general law of State responsibility. Peremptory norms do not, however, give rise to an across-the-board result that any rule that may merely render the enforcement of a peremptory norm more difficult must be set aside, as has been suggested in the context of customary international rules on State immunity. On the contrary, the effects of peremptory norms are particular, discrete and limited, and did not develop in any noticeably systematic way. For this same reason, it is possible that additional legal consequences associated with peremptory norms may develop in State practice in the future.

⁶ Article 53 VCLT ('Treaties conflicting with a peremptory norm of general international law (*'jus cogens'*)).

⁷ Article 65 ('Procedure to be followed with respect to invalidity, termination, withdrawal from or suspension of the operation of a treaty'); Article 66 ('Procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation'). These provisions must be read in conjunction with Article 42 ('Validity and continuance in force of treaties'), Article 69 ('Consequences of the invalidity of a treaty') and Article 71 ('Consequences of the invalidity of a treaty which conflicts with a peremptory norm of general international law').

While the book's various chapters address different fields, the themes mentioned above are fully developed, and appreciated by the reader, across the work read as a whole. The general conclusions follow precisely from a study of peremptory norms and their consequences across a range of areas in international law. The book concludes that there is nothing mysterious about peremptory norms and that their legal consequences are limited and often modest. For example, the legal effects of peremptory norms under the law of treaties and with respect to Security Council resolutions are more limited than is often assumed. Indeed, it is often not even necessary to appeal to the concept of a peremptory norm. For example, a treaty reservation's incompatibility with the object and purpose of a treaty typically can provide a sufficient answer to its lack of legal effect. Likewise, impermissible derogations from certain fundamental international legal norms may, if the norm is already codified in a multilateral treaty, typically already be excluded by virtue of Articles 41 and 58 VCLT⁸ as between parties to both the multilateral treaty and the VCLT. All these questions will receive fuller elaboration across the remainder of this study.

The study arrives at these conclusions not by starting from an *idée fixe*, but through an examination of State practice and international materials – including judicial and arbitral decisions, governmental statements and the work of the International Law Commission, among others – with a focus on recent developments where possible and appropriate. The study emphasizes formal analysis, but avoids, for example, unnecessary personifications of 'international law' and of the 'State'. One of its goals is to re-introduce analytical and terminological clarity into the scholarly debates on peremptory norms. It is important to remain sensitive to, and engage with, the realities of international legal practice. These methodological postures are among the book's important features. Indeed, the concept of peremptory norms has developed to a significant extent in the literature and has taken on a life of its own in that realm which, while at times instructive, does not always enjoy a convincing basis in the reality of international legal practice. On the whole, the work draws conclusions that speak in favour of a reserved stance towards peremptory norms. A frank statement of the legal position, and of its limits, can yield greater fruits than placing too much hope in this legal concept.

⁸ Article 41 ('Agreements to modify multilateral treaties between certain of the parties only'); Article 58 ('Suspension of the operation of a multilateral treaty by agreement between certain of the parties only').

As always, though in particular with respect to peremptory norms, there are numerous and divergent views and approaches. A degree of methodological and substantive disagreement between scholars is inevitable and indeed to be welcomed. The purpose of this book is not to assert that any of those approaches lacks merit. Instead, it argues in favour of one particular approach that focuses on international practice and draws balanced conclusions from the observable effects of peremptory norms, one which it considers most defensible and particularly helpful to scholars and international practitioners. The purpose of this study is to shed a realistic light on peremptory norms and their legal consequences in international law. By no means, however, should this approach convey the impression that the fundamental principles that peremptory norms seek to protect are undeserving of stringent safeguards.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Over the course of this project I had the great fortune to receive thoughts, comments, criticism and encouragement from very talented people in the field of public international law and beyond.

I would like, first of all, to thank Judge James Crawford – who, when still Professor Crawford, was my Ph.D. supervisor – for all his help and encouragement along the way. Professor Crawford’s thoughtful guidance is the reason why my doctoral dissertation became what it was and why the dissertation has now turned into a book. I count myself lucky to have been his student, and I am indebted to him. I would also like to thank Professor Guglielmo Verdirame, who acted as my temporary Ph.D. supervisor during the first year of the project, for his thoughtful advice.

Further, I am indebted to my Ph.D. examiners, Professor Christian Tams and Professor Christine Gray. Their comments and encouragement greatly assisted me in taking the project from the level of a dissertation to that of a monograph.

This project would not have been possible had I not benefited from the expertise and encouragement of various people over the past several years. I would like, in particular, to extend my gratitude to Professor Malgosia Fitzmaurice for our many enjoyable conversations on this topic and on international law in general, and for reading one of the chapters. I also would like to extend special thanks to Sir Michael Wood for his generous comments on the text and suggestions for the chapter he read.

Likewise, I extend my sincerest gratitude to Dr. Fernando Lusa Bordin, Professor Chimène Keitner, Dr. Sarah Nouwen, Dr. Federica Paddeu, Dr. Daniel Peat and Dr. Cecily Rose for reading various chapters and parts of the work. Their expertise proved invaluable, and I learned much from them. I also would like to thank Professor Douglas Guilfoyle for generously offering his thoughts on certain passages and arguments. I also received helpful advice from Dr. Valentin Jeutner, Dr. Olga Ladrowska and Dr. Santiago Villalpando.

Pursuing a Ph.D. in law at the University of Cambridge would have been unthinkable without the support of the W.M. Tapp Studentship at Gonville & Caius College, which funded my studies there. I extend my thanks to the trustees of the fund and to Dr. Pippa Rogerson in particular.

Similarly, turning the doctoral dissertation into a book would not have been possible without the unwavering support and efforts of Cambridge University Press. I am particularly indebted to Elizabeth Spicer, Rebecca Jackaman and Finola O'Sullivan for all their generous help and patience over the course of my preparing the manuscript for publication and for helping me see this project to fruition.

Finally, I would like, most of all, to thank my family, without whom none of this would have been possible.

NOTES ON CITATIONS

The footnotes in this book use a modified version of the Harvard (social sciences) guide to citation for books and journal articles.

Unless otherwise indicated, in [square] brackets in the bibliography, all references in the footnotes are to the author's surname and the year of publication in parentheses. Where applicable, the year is followed by a pin-cite to the relevant page number.

Examples: Abass (2004).
 Alland (2002), 1233.
 Jørgensen (2010b), 697.

Articles in the *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law* are cited by giving the name of the author, followed by the Encyclopedia's year of publication *and* the year in which the article was last updated.

Example: Watts (2012/2007).

Decisions of the International Court of Justice are cited in a slightly modified format of the Court's official mode of citation. The citation gives the case and decision title/title of the advisory opinion. The citation also gives the year of the decision, followed first by the first page of the decision in the Court's official reports and, where applicable a pin-cite to the relevant page number. Where the decision's paragraphs are numbered, the pin-cite also refers to the relevant paragraph number.

Examples: *South West Africa (Liberia v. South Africa; Ethiopia v. South Africa)*, ICJ Reports 1966, 6.
Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Preliminary Objections, ICJ Reports 1996, 595, 616 (para. 31).

Accordance with International Law of the Unilateral Declaration of Independence in Respect of Kosovo, ICJ Reports 2012, 403, 442 (para. 94).

North Sea Continental Shelf (Federal Republic of Germany/Netherlands; Federal Republic of Germany/Denmark), ICJ Reports 1969, 3, 229 (Judge Lachs, diss.).

Subsequent references to ICJ decisions are given in short form.

Examples: *Jurisdictional Immunities*.
Reservations to the Genocide Convention, 23.

Decisions of other courts or tribunals are cited in an appropriate international or national format and subsequently in short form.

Examples: *Cyprus v. Turkey*, Application no. 25781/94 (Judgment of May 10, 2001), (2001-IV) E.C.H.R. 1, para. 94.
Argentine Republic v. Amerada Hess Shipping Corporation, 109 S.Ct. 683 (1989).
Pinochet (No. 3).

In order to avoid confusion, this short form may consist of all parties' names:

Examples: *Al-Adsani v. Government of Kuwait*.
Al-Adsani v. United Kingdom.

International Law Commission materials are cited by title, document number and, where applicable, reference to the *Yearbook of the International Law Commission*. Three documents are cited in abbreviated form in the footnotes, followed by the relevant article number and, where applicable, a reference to the commentary:

ARSIWA	Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts 2001
DALT	Draft Articles on the Law of Treaties 1966
DARIO	Draft Articles on the Responsibility of International Organizations 2011

The document 'Fragmentation of International Law: Difficulties Arising from the Diversification and Expansion of International Law, Report of

NOTES ON CITATIONS

XXV

the Study Group of the International Law Commission, finalized by Martti Koskenniemi' is cited in the following short form: ILC, *Fragmentation*, [para. xx].

Footnotes in all cited material are omitted.

All websites were last checked on February 4, 2017.

TABLE OF INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL DECISIONS AND OPINIONS

International Court of Justice

- Accordance with International Law of the Unilateral Declaration of Independence in Respect of Kosovo*, ICJ Reports 2012, p. 403
- Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Republic of Guinea v. Democratic Republic of the Congo)*, ICJ Reports 2010, p. 1
- Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. Case (United Kingdom v. Iran)*, ICJ Reports 1952, p. 93
- Application of the Convention of 1902 Governing the Guardianship of Infants (Netherlands v. Sweden)*, ICJ Reports 1958, p. 55
- Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro)*, ICJ Reports 2007, p. 1
- Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro)*, Preliminary Objections, ICJ Reports 1996, p. 595
- Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, Provisional Measures, Order of 8 April 1993, ICJ Reports 1993, p. 3
- Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro)*, Further Requests for the Indication of Provisional Measures, Order of 13 September 1993, ICJ Reports 1993, p. 407
- Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo (New Application: 2002) (Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Rwanda)*, Jurisdiction and Admissibility, ICJ Reports 2006, p. 6
- Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo (Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda)*, ICJ Reports 2005, p. 168
- Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Belgium)*, ICJ Reports 2002, p. 3
- Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited (Belgium v. Spain)*, ICJ Reports 1970, p. 3

xxviii TABLE OF INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL DECISIONS

- Certain expenses of the United Nations (Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter)*, ICJ Reports 1962, p. 151
- Certain Phosphate Lands in Nauru (Nauru v. Australia)*, ICJ Reports 1992, p. 240
- Certain Questions of Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters (Djibouti v. France)*, ICJ Reports 2008, p. 177
- Corfu Channel (United Kingdom v. Albania)*, Merits, ICJ Reports 1949, p. 4
- Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary in the Gulf of Maine Area (Canada/United States of America)*, ICJ Reports 1984, p. 246
- Difference Relating to Immunity from Legal Process of a Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights*, ICJ Reports 1999, p. 62
- Dispute regarding Navigational and Related Rights (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, ICJ Reports 2009, p. 213
- East Timor (Portugal v. Australia)*, ICJ Reports 1995, p. 90
- Fisheries Jurisdiction (United Kingdom v. Iceland)*, ICJ Reports 1973, p. 3
- Frontier Dispute (Burkina Faso/Mali)*, ICJ Reports 1986, p. 554
- Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project (Hungary/Slovakia)*, ICJ Reports 1997, p. 7
- Interpretation of the Agreement of 25 March 1951 between the WHO and Egypt*, ICJ Reports 1980, p. 73
- Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy: Greece intervening)*, ICJ Reports 2012, p. 99
- Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy)*, Counter-Claim, Order of July 6, 2010, ICJ Reports 2010, p. 310
- LaGrand (Germany v. United States of America)*, ICJ Reports 2001, p. 466
- Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria)*, Preliminary Objections, ICJ Reports 1998, p. 275
- Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria: Equatorial Guinea intervening)*, Jurisdiction and Admissibility, ICJ Reports 2002, p. 303
- Land, Island and Maritime Frontier Dispute (El Salvador/Honduras)*, Application to Intervene, ICJ Reports 1990, p. 92
- Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970)*, ICJ Reports 1971, p. 16
- Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory*, ICJ Reports 2004, p. 136
- Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*, ICJ Reports 1996, p. 226
- Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain (Qatar v. Bahrain)*, Jurisdiction and Admissibility, ICJ Reports 1994, p. 112

TABLE OF INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL DECISIONS xxix

- Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America)*, Merits, ICJ Reports 1986, p. 14
- Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua*, Jurisdiction and Admissibility, ICJ Reports 1984, p. 392
- Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua*, Provisional Measures, Order of 10 May 1984, ICJ Reports 1984, p. 169
- Monetary Gold Removed from Rome in 1943 (Italy v. France, United Kingdom and United States)*, Preliminary Question, ICJ Reports 1954, p. 19
- North Sea Continental Shelf (Federal Republic of Germany/Netherlands; Federal Republic of Germany/Denmark)*, ICJ Reports 1969, p. 3
- Case Concerning Norwegian Loans (France v. Norway)*, ICJ Reports 1957, p. 9
- Nottebohm case (Liechtenstein v. Guatemala)*, Preliminary Objection, ICJ Reports 1953, p. 111
- Nuclear Tests (Australia v. France; New Zealand v. France)*, ICJ Reports 1974, 253 and ICJ Reports 1974, p. 457
- Oil Platforms (Islamic Republic of Iran v. United States of America)*, ICJ Reports 2003, p. 161
- Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 1971 Montreal Convention (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya v. United Kingdom)*, Preliminary Objections, ICJ Reports 1998, p. 9
- Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 1971 Montreal Convention arising from the Aerial Incident at Lockerbie (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya v. United Kingdom)*, Provisional Measures, Order of 14 April 1992, ICJ Reports 1992, p. 3
- Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 1971 Montreal Convention arising from the Aerial Incident at Lockerbie (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya v. United States of America)*, Provisional Measures, Order of 14 April 1992, ICJ Reports 1992, p. 113
- Questions relating to the Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belgium v. Senegal)*, ICJ Reports 2012, p. 422
- Reparation for Injuries Suffered in the Service of the United Nations*, ICJ Reports 1949, p. 174
- Reservations to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, ICJ Reports 1951, p. 15
- Right of Passage over Indian Territory (Portugal v. India)*, ICJ Reports 1960, p. 6
- Right of Passage over Indian Territory (Portugal v. India)*, Preliminary Objections, ICJ Reports 1957, p. 125
- South West Africa (Ethiopia v. South Africa; Liberia v. South Africa)*, Preliminary Objections, ICJ Reports 1962, p. 319

XXX TABLE OF INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL DECISIONS

- South West Africa, Second Phase, (Ethiopia v. South Africa; Liberia v. South Africa)*, ICJ Reports 1966, p. 6
Sovereignty over Pulau Ligitan and Pulau Sipadan (Indonesia v. Malaysia), ICJ Reports 2002, p. 625
Case concerning the Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia v. Thailand), Preliminary Objections, ICJ Reports 1961, p. 17
Territorial and Maritime Dispute (Nicaragua v. Colombia), ICJ Reports 2012, p. 624
Territorial and Maritime Dispute between Nicaragua and Honduras in the Caribbean Sea (Nicaragua v. Honduras), ICJ Reports 2007, p. 659
United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran (United States of America v. Iran), ICJ Reports 1980, p. 3
United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran, Order of 15 December 1979 (Request for the Indication of Provisional Measures), ICJ Reports 1979, p. 6
Western Sahara, ICJ Reports 1975, p. 12

Permanent Court of International Justice

- Factory at Chorzow (Judgment)*, PCIJ Ser. A., No. 9 (1927)
Free Zones (Order), PCIJ Ser. A., No. 24 (1930)
Jurisdiction of the Courts of Danzig, PCIJ Ser. B., No. 15 (1928)
Legal Status of Eastern Greenland, PCIJ Ser. A./B. No. 53 (1933)
Minority Schools in Albania, PCIJ Ser. A./B. No. 64 (1935)
The Oscar Chinn Case, PCIJ Ser. A./B. No. 63 (1934)
Payment in Gold of Brazilian Loans Contracted in France, PCIJ, Ser. A., No. 21 (1929)
Payment of Various Serbian Loans Issued in France, PCIJ, Ser. A., No. 20 (1929)
S.S. 'Lotus', PCIJ Ser. A., No. 10 (1927)
S.S. 'Wimbledon', PCIJ Ser. A., No. 1 (1923)
Status of Eastern Carelia, PCIJ, Ser. B., No. 5 (1923)

Arbitral Awards and Commission of Inquiry Reports

- Dispute Concerning Access to Information under Article 9 of the OSPAR Convention (Ireland v. United Kingdom)*, 23 RIAA 59 (Decision of July 2, 2003)

TABLE OF INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL DECISIONS xxxi

- Achmea B.V. (formerly Eureko B.V.) v. The Slovak Republic*, PCA Case No. 2008–13 (Award on Jurisdiction, Arbitrability and Suspension of October 26, 2010)
- Air Services Agreement of 27 March 1946 between the United States of America and France*, 18 RIAA 417 (Award of December 9, 1978)
- Campbell case (United Kingdom v. Portugal)*, 2 RIAA 1145 (Award of June 10, 1931)
- Chagos Marine Protected Area Arbitration (Mauritius v. United Kingdom)* (Award of March 18, 2015)
- Deserters of Casablanca (France v. Germany)*, 16 RGDIP, Documents 36 (1909) (Award of May 22, 1909)
- Arbitral award establishing the Czechoslovak-Hungarian boundary*, 28 RIAA 401 (Award of November 2, 1938)
- Dogger-Bank incident (North Sea incident)*, Report of the International Commission of Inquiry February 25, 1905, 2 AJIL 929 (1908)
- Eastern Sugar B.V. v. The Czech Republic*, SCC Case No. 088/2004 (Partial Award of March 27, 2007)
- European American Investment Bank AG v. The Slovak Republic*, PCA Case No. 2010–17 (Award on Jurisdiction of October 22, 2012)
- Responsibility of Germany arising out of damage caused in the Portuguese colonies of southern Africa (Naulilaa incident)*, 2 RIAA 1025 (Award of July 31, 1928)
- Responsibility of Germany arising out of acts committed after 31 July 1914 and before Portugal took part in the war (Cysne case)*, 2 RIAA 1035 (Award of June 30, 1930)
- Government of Kuwait v. American Independent Oil Company (Aminoil)*, 66 ILR 519 (Award of March 24, 1982)
- Guinea-Bissau v. Senegal*, 83 ILR 1 (Award of July 31, 1989)
- Island of Las Palmas (Netherlands/U.S.A.)*, 2 RIAA 829 (Award of April 4, 1928)
- The Kronprins Gustav Adolf (Sweden v. United States of America)*, 2 RIAA 1239 (Award of July 18, 1932)
- Lusitania (United States of America/Germany)*, 7 RIAA 32 (Award of November 1, 1923)
- Pablo Nájera (France) v. United Mexican States*, (1928) 5 RIAA 466 (Award of October 19, 1928)
- Phoenix v. Czech Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/5 (Award of April 19, 2009)
- Russian Claim for Interest on Indemnities (Damages Claimed by Russia for Delay in Payment of Compensation Owed to Russians Injured During*

xxxii TABLE OF INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL DECISIONS

the War of 1877–1888) (Russia v. Turkey), 11 RIAA 421 (Award of November 11, 1912)
Arbitral Award relating to the Territory ceded by Romania to Hungary, 18 RIAA 407 (Award of August 30, 1940)

International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea

Dispute Concerning Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary Between Bangladesh and Myanmar in the Bay of Bengal (Bangladesh/Myanmar), ITLOS Reports 2012, p. 4 (Judgment of March 14, 2012)
Responsibilities and Obligations of States Sponsoring Persons and Entities with Respect to Activities in the Area, ITLOS Reports 2011, p. 10 (Advisory Opinion of February 1, 2011)

World Trade Organization

Korea – Measures Affecting Government Procurement, WT/DS163/R (May 1, 2000)

Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal

Amoco International Finance Corporation v. Iran, 15 Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal Reports 189 (1987-II)

United Nations Human Rights Committee

Sayadi and Vinck v. Belgium, CCPR/C/94/D/1472/2006 (December 29, 2008)

European Court/Commission of Human Rights

Al-Adsani v. United Kingdom, Application no. 35763/97 (Judgment of November 21, 2001), (2001-XI) E.C.H.R. 79
Al-Jedda v. United Kingdom, Application no. 27021/08 (Judgment of July 7, 2011), (2011) 53 E.H.R.R. 23, 789
Austria v. Italy, Application no. 788/60 (Decision of January 11, 1961), YbECHR 1961, 116
Behrami and Saramati v. France, Germany and Norway, Application nos. 71412/01 and 78166/01 (Judgment of May 2, 2007), (2007) 45 E.H.R.R. SE10, 85

TABLE OF INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL DECISIONS xxxiii

- Belilos v. Switzerland*, Application no. 10328/83 (Judgment of April 29, 1988), (1988) 132 E.C.H.R.-Ser.A
- Bosphorus Hava Yolları Turizm ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. Ireland*, Application no. 45036/98 (Judgment of June 30, 2005), (2005) 42 E.H.R.R. 1.
- Chagos Islanders v. United Kingdom*, Application no. 35622/04 (Judgment of December 11, 2012), (2013) 56 E.H.R.R. SE15, 173
- Cyprus v. Turkey*, Application no. 25781/94 (Judgment of May 10, 2001), (2001-IV) E.C.H.R. 1
- Demopoulos v. Turkey* (Decision of March 1, 2010), (2010) 50 E.H.R.R. SE14
- Fogarty v. United Kingdom*, Application no. 37112/97 (Judgment of November 21, 2001), (2001-XI) E.C.H.R. 157
- Grosz v. France*, Application no. 14717/06 (Decision of June 16, 2009)
- Hassan v. United Kingdom*, Application no. 29750/09 (Judgment of September 16, 2014)
- Jones and others v. United Kingdom* Applications nos. 34356/06 and 40528/06 (Judgment of June 2, 2014)
- Jorgic v. Germany*, Application no. 74613/01 (Judgment of July 12, 2007), (2007-III) E.C.H.R. 263
- Kalogeropoulou and others v. Greece and Germany*, Application no. 59021/00 (Decision of December 12, 2002), (2002-X) E.C.H.R. 415
- Loizidou v. Turkey*, Application no. 15318/89 (Judgment on Merits of December 18, 1996), (1996-VI) E.C.H.R. 2216
- Marguš v. Croatia*, Application no. 4450/10 (Judgment of May 27, 2014)
- McElhinney v. Ireland*, Application no. 31253/96 (Judgment of November 21, 2001), (2001-XI) E.C.H.R. 37
- Nada v. Switzerland*, Application no. 10593/08 (Judgment of September 12, 2012), (2013) 56 E.H.R.R. 18, 593

European Union

- Case C-386/08 *Brita GmbH v. Hauptzollamt Hamburg-Hafen*, [2010] E.C.R. I-01289
- Case T-512/12 *Front populaire pour la libération de la sagaia-el-hamra et du rio de oro (Front Polisario) v. Council of the European Union*
- Case C-104/16 P *Council of the European Union v. Front populaire pour la libération de la sagaia-el-hamra et du rio de oro (Front Polisario)*
- Case C-162/96 *A. Racke GmbH & Co. v. Hauptzollamt Mainz*, [1998] 3 C.M.L.R. 219

xxxiv TABLE OF INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL DECISIONS

Case C-432/92 *R. v. Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, ex parte S.P. Anastasiou (Pissouri) Ltd.*, [1994] E.C.R. I-3087

Case T-315/01 *Yassin Abdullah Kadi v. Council of the European Union and Commission of the European Communities*, [2005] All E.R. (D) 119 (Sep)

Cases C-402/05 P and C-415/05 P *Yassin Abdullah Kadi & Al Barakaat International Foundation v. Council of the European Union*, [2010] All E.R. (EC) 1105

Case T-85/09 *Yassin Abdullah Kadi v. European Commission*, [2010] E.C.R. II-05177

Inter-American Commission on Human Rights

Resolution No. 3/87, Case 9647 ('Roach and Pinkerton')

Inter-American Court of Human Rights

Case of Aloeboetoe et al. v. Suriname, Judgment of September 10, 1993 (Reparations and Costs), Series C, No. 15/I/A

Restrictions to the Death Penalty (Arts 4(2) and 4(4) American Convention on Human Rights), Advisory Opinion OC-3/83 (September 8, 1983)

International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia

Prosecutor v. Furundžija, IT-95-17/1-T, (December 10, 1998)

Prosecutor v. Duso Tadić a/k/a 'Dule', Decision on the Defence Motion for Interlocutory Appeal on Jurisdiction, Case IT-94-1 (October 2, 1995)

International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda

Prosecutor v. Nyiramasuhuko and others, Judgment on Appeal, ICTR-98-42-A

Special Tribunal for Lebanon

Interlocutory Decision on the Applicable Law: Terrorism, Conspiracy, Homicide, Perpetration, Cumulative Charging, February 16, 2011, STL-11-01/1 (Appeals Chamber)

United States Military Tribunal at Nuremberg

In re Krupp and others, (1949) 10 Law Reports of Trials of War Criminals 69 (case no. 58)

TABLE OF INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL DECISIONS XXXV

Australia

Nulyarimma and others v. Thompson; Buzzacott v. Hill and others, (2000) 8 B.H.R.C. 135 (Australian Federal Court)
Zhang v. Zemin, [2010] NSWCA 255 (Court of Appeal of New South Wales)

Belgium

Re Sharon and Yaron, 127 ILR 110 (Court of Cassation)

Canada

Bouzari and Others v. Islamic Republic of Iran, 124 ILR 428 (Ontario Superior Court of Justice)
Bouzari and Others v. Islamic Republic of Iran, 128 ILR 586 (Ontario Court of Appeal)
Estate of the Late Zahra (Ziba) Kazemi and Stephan (Salman) Hashemi v. Islamic Republic of Iran, Ayatollah Sayyid Ali Khamenei, Saeed Mortazavi, Mohammad Bakhshi and Attorney General of Canada, [2014] 3 SCR 176 (Supreme Court of Canada)
Re Secession of Quebec, [1998] 2 SCR 217
Suresh v. Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration), 2002 S.C.C. 1 (Supreme Court of Canada)

France

Cour de cassation, arrêt no. 02-45961 du 16 décembre 2003 (*Bucheron*)
 Cour de cassation, arrêt no. 04-475040 du 3 janvier 2006 (*Grosz*)
 Cour de cassation, arrêt n° 1414 du 13 mars 2001, Chambre criminelle, 1ère et 2e Sections réunies, n° 00-87-215 (*Kadhafi*), (2001) 105 RGDIP 473

Germany

Austrian Citizen's Entitlement to Compensation (Germany) Case, 32 ILR 153 (June 22, 1960) (Federal Supreme Court)
 'Enteignungen' case, BVerfG, 2 BvR 955/00 (October 26, 2004) (Federal Constitutional Court)
Greek Citizens v. Federal Republic of Germany, Case No. III ZR 245/98, 129 ILR 556 (June 26, 2003) (Federal Supreme Court)
Restitution of Household Effects Belonging to Jews Deported from Hungary (Germany) Case, 44 ILR 301 (July 2, 1965) (Court of Appeal of Berlin)