

IAN BROWNLIE

SYSTEM
OF THE
LAW OF
NATIONS

STATE
RESPONSIBILITY
PART I

SYSTEM OF THE LAW OF NATIONS

State Responsibility

Part I

BY

IAN BROWNLIE

Q.C., D.C.L., F.B.A.

*Chichele Professor of Public International
Law in the University of Oxford, Fellow of
All Souls College, Oxford, Associé de
l'Institut de Droit International*

CLARENDON PRESS · OXFORD

1983

Oxford University Press, Walton Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

*London Glasgow New York Toronto
Delhi Bombay Calcutta Madras Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Singapore Hong Kong Tokyo
Nairobi Dar es Salaam Cape Town
Melbourne Auckland*

*and associated companies in
Beirut Berlin Ibadan Mexico City Nicosia*

Oxford is a trade mark of Oxford University Press

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

© Ian Brownlie 1983

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without
the prior permission of Oxford University Press*

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

*Brownlie, Ian
System of the law of nations.
I: State responsibility
1. International law
I. Title
341 JX3091
ISBN 0-19-825452-0*

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

*Brownlie, Ian.
State responsibility
(System of the law of nations / Ian Brownlie)
Includes index.
1. Government liability (International law)
I. Title. II. Series: Brownlie, Ian. System of the
law of nations.
JX5402.B76 1983 341.26 83-4212
ISBN 0-19-825452-0*

*Set by Oxford Verbatim Limited
Printed in Great Britain
at the University Press, Oxford
by Eric Buckley
Printer to the University*

PREFACE

This work is the first part of a study of the principles of state responsibility. The second part will be concerned with circumstances precluding wrongfulness, including the topic of lawful countermeasures. The study will cover the 'general principles' of state responsibility rather than particular areas of the incidence of state responsibility. At the same time the exposition necessarily involves considerable reference to matters of substance and in particular the question of 'causes of action' is taken up at some length. The writer has tried to keep a balance between the consideration of issues of 'pure' legal principle and necessary reliance upon the practice of states and the experience deriving from international judicial proceedings. The valuable work of the International Law Commission has been taken carefully into account.

The intention is to present an account of the issues which reflects the relevant experience and thus is not based upon a narrow or fashionable conception of what is important, and, moreover, to present a study which will be of practical value. Whilst the codification which may result from the work of the International Law Commission will be of benefit, it is not believed that such codification will remove the existing problems. The subject-matter of responsibility is closely bound up with the precise technical problems which have to be faced in the process of applying principles and concepts. The significance of categorical formulations is much reduced in the narrow defiles of particular claims and circumstances.

This volume forms part of a series of monographs on major aspects of the law of nations. That the first item to appear relates to state responsibility results from the casual fact that I have for long wanted an opportunity to expand on the treatment of the subject which appeared in my *Principles of Public International Law*, first published in 1966.

I would express my gratitude to Grotius Publications Ltd., publishers of the *International Law Reports* (ed. E. Lauterpacht, Q.C.), for permission to reproduce substantial passages from the Awards in the cases of *B.P.v. Libyan Arab Republic* and *Texaco v. Libyan Arab Republic*, contained in Volume 53 of the *Reports*. In addition the diplomatic material at pages 24–5 is taken from *British Practice in International Law*, of which Mr. Lauterpacht is the editor. The extracts from the *Italian*

Yearbook of International Law set out at pages 108–9 are reproduced with the permission of Editorial Scientifica s.r.l., whose kindness is gratefully acknowledged.

The text of the Award of the Arbitration Tribunal in the *Kuwait–Aminoil Arbitration* became available after the text of the present work had been completed: for the text of the Award see *International Legal Materials*, vol. 21 (1982), p. 976. Certain indications have been placed in the footnotes to Chapter XIII. In a general way (and as a matter of good fortune for the writer) the approach of the Tribunal to the problems of compensation confirms the approach to be found in the text of Chapter XIII. That is to say, the precise mode of settling problems of measure of damages (and the other issues of ‘compensation’) is intrinsically connected with the particular rules of substantive law bearing upon the particular case and the dealings of the parties.

Generally the text takes into account material available at the end of April 1982, but some later references have been added.

In conclusion I would thank Angela Blackburn, Hannah Brownlie, and Susan Prior for their assistance at the proof stage, and Derrick Wyatt for his kindness in undertaking to prepare the index.

Oxford,
25 May 1983.

IAN BROWNLIE

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>A.J.</i>	<i>American Journal of International Law</i>
<i>Ann. Digest</i>	<i>Annual Digest of Public International Law Cases</i>
<i>Ann. français</i>	<i>Annuaire français de droit international</i>
<i>Annuaire de l'Institut</i>	<i>Annuaire de l'Institut de Droit International</i>
<i>Ann. suisse</i>	<i>Annuaire suisse de droit international</i>
<i>British Digest</i>	C. Parry (ed.), <i>A British Digest of International Law</i> , 1965–7
<i>B.Y.</i>	<i>British Year Book of International Law</i>
<i>Canadian Yrbk.</i>	<i>Canadian Yearbook of International Law</i>
<i>Grot. Soc.</i>	<i>Transactions of the Grotius Society</i>
<i>Hackworth, Digest</i>	Hackworth, <i>Digest of International Law</i> , 8 vols., 1940–4
<i>Hague Court Reports</i>	Scott (ed.), <i>Hague Court Reports</i>
<i>Hague Recueil</i>	<i>Recueil des cours de l'Académie de droit international</i>
<i>I.C.J. Pleadings</i>	International Court of Justice: Pleadings, Oral Arguments, Documents
<i>I.C.J. Reports</i>	Reports of Judgments, Advisory Opinions and Orders of the International Court of Justice
<i>I.C.L.Q.</i>	<i>International and Comparative Law Quarterly</i>
<i>I.L.M.</i>	<i>International Legal Materials</i> (American Soc. of Int. Law)
<i>Int. L.R.</i>	International Law Reports, (ed.) Hersch and Elihu Lauterpacht
<i>Ital. Yrbk.</i>	<i>Italian Yearbook of International Law</i>
<i>Kiss, Répertoire</i>	<i>Répertoire de la Pratique Française en Matière de Droit International Public</i> , 5 vols.
<i>McNair, Opinions</i>	McNair, <i>International Law Opinions</i> , 3 vols., 1956
<i>Moore, Arbitrations</i>	Moore, <i>History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the United States has been a Party</i> , 6 vols., 1898
<i>Moore, Digest</i>	Moore, <i>Digest of International Law</i> , 8 vols., 1906
<i>Parl. Deb.</i>	Parliamentary Debates, United Kingdom
<i>P.C.I.J.</i>	Permanent Court of International Justice
<i>Répertoire suisse</i>	<i>Répertoire suisse de droit international</i> , 5 vols., 1975
<i>Revue belge</i>	<i>Revue belge de droit international</i>
<i>R.G.D.I.P.</i>	<i>Revue générale de droit international public</i>

R.I.A.A.	United Nations, Reports of International Arbitral Awards
Whiteman, <i>Digest</i>	Whiteman, <i>Digest of International Law</i> , 15 vols., 1963–73
<i>Yrbk., I.L.C.</i>	United Nations, <i>Yearbook of the International Law Commission</i>
<i>Z.a.ö.R.u.V.</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht</i>

CONTENTS

Abbreviations	x
Table of Cases	xii
I. The History of State Responsibility	1
1. Perspective	
2. The origins	
3. Systematic treatment in the literature, 1840–1930	
4. Special concerns of the literature	
II. The Question of Codification	10
1. Introductory	
2. Codification by private bodies	
3. The work of regional organizations and agencies	
4. The work of the League of Nations	
5. Codification by the International Law Commission	
6. The feasibility of a convention	
III. The Nature of State Responsibility	22
1. Introductory	
2. Examples of protest in state practice	
3. The issue of responsibility and the issue of illegality	
4. Is there a law of direct international wrongs?	
5. The problem of criminal responsibility	
6. The concept of sanctions	
IV. Conceptual Foundations	35
1. Introductory	
2. Imputability	
3. Boundaries of responsibility	
4. Objective responsibility	
5. Controversy concerning fault and strict liability	
6. The proper rôle of fault (<i>culpa</i>)	
7. Intention and motive	
8. The individuality of issues: the <i>Corfu Channel</i> Case	
9. Liability for ‘lawful acts’	
10. Abuse of rights	
V. Causes of Action in the Law of Nations	53
1. Introductory	
2. The significance of defining a cause of action	
3. A calendar of causes of action	
4. Concepts and distinctions	

5. The fundamental causes of action	
6. General observations	
VI. Protest and Claim in the Practice of States	89
1. Introductory	
2. Types of state practice	
3. Diplomatic correspondence	
4. Claims settlements	
5. Practice of the organs of the United Nations	
VII. Responsibility for Acts of State Organs and Agents	132
1. Introduction: the use of categories	
2. Liability for acts of minor officials	
3. What are state organs?	
4. Heads of State and members of governments	
5. Diplomatic agents and consular officers	
6. Executive and administration	
7. Armed forces	
8. Federal units, provinces and other internal divisions	
9. The legislature	
10. The judiciary	
11. <i>Ultra vires</i> acts of organs and officials	
12. Breaches of duty emerging from a system of administration or a general policy	
13. Provenance of harm and failure to exercise proper control	
14. Responsibility on the basis of approval and adoption of harmful acts	
VIII. Responsibility for the Acts of Private Persons	159
1. Introductory	
2. The principles stated	
3. Evaluation of the principles states	
4. The approach of the International Law Commission	
5. The burden of proof	
6. Acts of private individuals (being nationals) outside state territory	
IX. Responsibility in Case of Insurrection and Civil War	167
1. Considerations of principle	
2. The diverse positions	
3. Arbitral jurisprudence	
4. State practice	
5. Assumption of responsibility by the respondent state	
6. Routine administrative acts by organs of the insurgent or revolutionary forces	
7. Granting an amnesty to insurgents	
8. Relevance of recognition of belligerency	
9. Responsibility for acts of successful insurgents	
10. Proviso: duties in respect of diplomatic agents and certain others	

X. Physical Control as an Element of Liability for Harmful Acts or Consequences Outside State Territory	180
1. Introductory	
2. Duties to control sources of danger within the state	
3. Extra-territorial consequences of dangerous operations on state territory	
4. Control of state organs operating beyond the frontiers	
5. Responsibility arising from a duty to control the activities of private persons	
6. Treaty provisions referring to jurisdiction	
7. Acts of transferred or loaned officials or organs	
8. Direction or control of another state	
XI. Joint Responsibility	189
1. Introductory	
2. Joint participation	
3. Joint responsibility arising from certain relationships	
XII. Acts Having a Continuing Character	193
1. Introductory	
2. Acts becoming unlawful	
3. Continuing acts	
4. 'Composite' and 'complex' acts	
XIII. The Forms and Function of Reparation	199
1. Introductory	
2. Declaratory judgments	
3. Satisfaction	
4. Restitution in kind and restitution <i>in integrum</i>	
5. Compensation	
6. Compensatory interest	
7. Currency of valuation	
8. General observations	
9. Cases of 'direct injury' to the state interest	
Appendices	
I. Obligations of Result and Obligations of Means	241
II. Canadian Claim for Damage Caused by Soviet Cosmos 954, 1978	277
III. I.L.C. Draft Articles	284
Index	295

TABLE OF CASES

<i>Aegean Sea Continental Shelf Case</i>	28
<i>Aerial Incident of 19 Nov. 1951 (U.S. v. Hungary and U.S.S.R.)</i>	239
<i>Aerial Incident of 7 October 1952 (U.S. v. U.S.S.R.)</i>	239
<i>Aerial Incident of 10 March 1953 (U.S. v. Czechoslovakia)</i>	239
<i>Aerial Incident of 4 September 1954 (U.S. v. U.S.S.R.)</i>	239
<i>Aerial Incident of 7 November 1954 (U.S. v. U.S.S.R.)</i>	239
<i>Aerial Incident of 27 July 1955 (Israel v. Bulgaria) (Preliminary Objections)</i>	64, 75, 78, 105, 209
<i>Affaire Martini</i>	72, 212, 215, 216, 217
<i>Airey Case</i>	151
<i>Alabama Claims Arbitration</i>	5, 133
<i>Ambatielos Case</i>	80
<i>Ambatielos Case (Merits)</i>	80
<i>Ambatielos Claim</i>	80
<i>American Cast Iron Pipe Company Claim</i>	227, 228, 229
<i>Anglo-Chinese Shipping Company Ltd. v. U.S.</i>	189, 192
<i>Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Case (Preliminary Objections)</i>	62, 63, 64, 66, 80
<i>Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries Case</i>	27, 28, 29, 223
<i>Application No. 290/57 (against Ireland)</i>	269
<i>Application No. 867/60 (against Norway)</i>	269
<i>Arbitral Award of the King of Spain</i>	62, 63
<i>Argonaut and the Colonel Jonas H. French Claims</i>	78
<i>Aris Gloves Inc. v. U.S.</i>	187
<i>Aroa Mines Case</i>	173
<i>Artico Case</i>	235
<i>Asylum Case</i>	62
<i>Award of 30 June 1930 (Portugal v. Germany)</i>	64
<i>Baldwin</i>	46
<i>Barcelona Traction Case</i>	216, 229, 233-5
<i>Barcelona Traction Case (2nd phase)</i>	59, 64-5, 70-3, 80, 82, 138, 150, 165, 200, 214-5, 229, 233-4
<i>Beagle Channel Arbitration</i>	67
<i>Belgian Linguistics Case (Merits)</i>	81
<i>Bensley Case</i>	146
<i>Bethune Claim</i>	78, 80
<i>Bolivar Railway Co. Case</i>	178
<i>Borchgrave Case (Preliminary Objections)</i>	208
<i>Borchgrave Case</i>	74, 94, 179, 231, 235, 238
<i>B.P. Exploration Co. (Libya) Ltd. v. Government of the Libyan Arab Republic</i>	212-3, 221, 224
<i>Brown Claim</i>	188
<i>Cadenhead Claim</i>	75
<i>Caire Claim (1929)</i>	39, 74-5, 140, 145, 147
<i>Caminer v. Northern and London Investment Trust</i>	153
<i>Canadienne Claim</i>	79
<i>Carthage (The)</i>	69, 79, 209, 237

TABLE OF CASES

xiii

<i>Central Rhodope Forests Case</i>	212
<i>Chapman Claim</i>	80, 132
<i>Chattin Claim</i>	42, 73
<i>Chazen Claim</i>	77
<i>Chemins de Fer de Palestine</i>	216
<i>Chevreau Case</i>	76, 140, 187
<i>Chorzów Factory (Indemnity) Case</i>	200, 207, 212, 214
<i>Clipperton Island Arbitration</i>	67
<i>Cook Claim</i>	80
<i>Cook v. Lewis</i>	153
<i>Coquiltam Claim</i>	78
<i>Corfu Channel Case (Merits)</i>	29, 32, 43, 44, 45, 47, 50, 52, 57, 60, 61, 64, 66, 854, 132, 133, 151, 152, 153, 154, 181–2, 189, 192, 207, 209, 225, 227, 231, 237
<i>Corfu Channel Case (Assessment of Compensation)</i>	231, 233, 237
<i>Crossman Case</i>	146
<i>Cyprus v. Turkey</i>	183–5, 195
<i>Daniels v. Whetstone Entertainments Ltd.</i>	150
<i>David Claim</i>	79
<i>Davies Claim</i>	78
<i>Daylight Claim</i>	79
<i>De Becker Case</i>	193, 210, 269
<i>De Wilde, Ooms and Versyp</i>	144, 235
<i>Delagoa Bay Case</i>	216
<i>Deweer Case</i>	235
<i>Diversion of Water from the Meuse Case. See Meuse, Diversion of Water Case.</i>	
<i>Diverted Cargoes Arbitration</i>	231, 234
<i>Dix Case</i>	46, 224
<i>Duc de Guise Claim</i>	222
<i>Eastern Greenland Case</i>	30, 201
<i>Eis Claim</i>	140
<i>Electricity Co. of Sofia Case</i>	51
<i>El Palmar Rubber Estate Claim</i>	78
<i>El Triunfo</i>	80
<i>Engel and Ors</i>	235
<i>Fatovich Claim</i>	228
<i>Faulkner Claim</i>	74, 76
<i>Favourite (The)</i>	38, 227
<i>Fisheries Case (U.K. v. Norway)</i>	28, 47, 55, 65, 66, 69, 205, 227
<i>Fisheries Jurisdiction Case (Federal Republic of Germany v. Iceland)</i>	58, 65, 82, 83, 101, 103
<i>Fisheries Jurisdiction Case (U.K. v. Iceland)</i>	58
<i>Franco-Ethiopian Railway Co. Claim</i>	222
<i>Free Zones Case</i>	51
<i>Friede Claim</i>	228
<i>Frontier Land Case</i>	67
<i>Fubini Case</i>	173
<i>García and Garza Claim</i>	74, 75, 140
<i>Gelbtrunk Claim</i>	173
<i>German Interests in Polish Upper Silesia</i>	269
<i>Ghana v. Portugal (Breach of Convention by Portugal)</i>	252
<i>Golder Case</i>	151, 235
<i>Goldman v. Hargrave</i>	153
<i>Gordon Claim</i>	74, 147

<i>Great N.W. Telegraph Co. of Canada (G.B. v. U.S.)</i>	78
<i>Greenstreet Claim</i>	80
<i>Guardianship of Infants Case</i>	61
<i>Hardman Claim</i>	78
<i>Haya de la Torre Case</i>	56
<i>Henriquez Case</i>	147
<i>Hoff Claim</i>	78
<i>Home Missionary Society Case</i>	42, 173
<i>Hopkins Case (The)</i>	176
<i>Horace B. Parker (The)</i>	227
<i>Howard Claim</i>	78
<i>Illinois Central Railroad Co. Claim</i>	82, 227
<i>Iloilo Claims</i>	78
<i>I'm Alone Case</i>	208-9
<i>Interhandel Case (Preliminary Objections)</i>	55, 56, 61, 62, 82, 84, 89, 211
<i>International Military Tribunal of the Far East, Judgment</i>	146
<i>Ireland v. U.K.</i>	147, 151, 152, 198, 210
<i>Island of Palmas Arbitration</i>	67
<i>Italian Republic v. Federal Republic of Germany</i>	222
<i>James Case</i>	46, 74, 161, 223-4
<i>Jessie (The)</i>	38, 69, 79
<i>Jessie Lewis Claim</i>	78
<i>John Hedio Proach, Claim</i>	229
<i>Kate (The)</i>	38, 69, 78, 227
<i>Kelley Claim</i>	80
<i>Kennedy Claim</i>	78
<i>Keppel Bus Co. Ltd. v. Sa'ad bin Ahmad</i>	50
<i>Klass and Others (Case of)</i>	143
<i>Kling Claim</i>	40
<i>König Case</i>	144
Judgment of 10 March 1980	235
<i>Lauritzen et al. v. Government of Chile</i>	231
<i>Lena Goldfields</i>	216
<i>Levi Case</i>	173
<i>Libyan American Oil Co. v. Government of Libyan Arab Republic</i>	221-2
<i>Lighthouses Arbitration</i>	45, 227, 230, 234
<i>Lloyd v. Grace-Smith & Co</i>	135
<i>Losinger et Cie</i>	216
<i>Lottie May Incident (The)</i>	76, 78, 79
<i>Lotus (The)</i>	47, 71
<i>Lucas Claim</i>	227
<i>Luedicke, Belkacem and Koc (Case of)</i>	144, 210
Judgment of 10 March 1980	212, 223, 225
<i>Lusitania Claims</i>	212, 223, 225
<i>McLean Claim</i>	69, 78
<i>McMahon Claim</i>	77
<i>Mallard Claim</i>	75
<i>Mallén Claim</i>	80, 140, 147, 148, 149
<i>Manouba (The)</i>	69, 79, 209, 237
<i>Marckx Case</i>	143
<i>Mariposa Claim</i>	142, 270

TABLE OF CASES

xv

<i>Massey Claim</i>	74, 139, 150, 161
<i>Macrommatis Jerusalem Concession</i>	215, 216, 220
<i>Metzger Case</i>	146
<i>Meuse, Diversion of Water Case</i>	203-4
<i>Minquiers and Ecrehos Case</i>	67, 205
<i>Monnot Case</i>	46
<i>Morton Claim</i>	75, 147
<i>Mossé Claim</i>	145, 173
<i>Namibia Opinion</i>	165, 180-1, 183
<i>Naulilaa Case</i>	140
<i>National Carriers Ltd. v. Panalpina (Northern) Ltd.</i>	35
<i>Neer Claim (1926)</i>	39, 74
<i>Neumeister Case</i>	144, 235
<i>Newchwang Claim</i>	79
<i>Nicaragua v. El Salvador</i>	215
<i>Northern Cameroons Case</i>	56, 61, 193
<i>Norwegian Loans Case</i>	54, 56, 82
<i>Norwegian Shipowners Claim</i>	79, 81, 225, 227-8
<i>Nottebohm Case (Preliminary Objections)</i>	61, 76, 77
<i>Nottebohm Case (Second phase)</i>	61, 76-7, 89, 205
<i>Nuclear Tests Case (Australia v. France)</i>	57, 69, 83, 201-9, 224
<i>Nuclear Tests Case (N.Z. v. France)</i>	57-8, 110, 151, 182-3
<i>Oakland Truck Sales Inc. v. U.S.</i>	188
<i>Ousset Claim</i>	46, 146
<i>Palmarejo and the Mexican Goldfields Claim</i>	78
<i>Pellat Claim</i>	141
<i>Perry Claim (The)</i>	76
<i>Pettersson v. Royal Oak Hotel Ltd.</i>	150
<i>Philadelphia-Guard National Bank Case</i>	46
<i>Phosphates in Morocco Case (Preliminary Objections)</i>	258
<i>Pinson Case</i>	173, 178
<i>Portendick Claim</i>	50
<i>Prats Case</i>	42
<i>Prince Sliman Bay v. Minister of Foreign Affairs</i>	187
<i>Queirolo Claim</i>	78
<i>R. T. Roy Claim</i>	78
<i>Rau</i>	46
<i>Rights of Passage on Indian Territory</i>	62
(Merits)	55, 193, 203-4
<i>Rights of U.S. Nationals in Morocco</i>	62
<i>Ringelsen Case</i>	209, 231, 235
<i>Re Rizzio</i>	46
<i>Roberts Case</i>	146
<i>Roberts Claim</i>	39, 74, 76
<i>Roe v. Minister of Health</i>	153
<i>Roggero Claim</i>	000
<i>Roper Claim</i>	139
<i>Russian Indemnity Case</i>	42, 228
<i>Rylands v. Fletcher</i>	21, 44
<i>Salem Case</i>	64
<i>Sambiaggio Case</i>	173

<i>Sanguinetti Claim</i>	78
<i>Santa Clara Estates Co. Case</i>	173
<i>Santa Rosa Mining Co. Claim</i>	77
<i>Sapphire (The)</i>	216
<i>Sarah B. Putnam</i>	227
<i>Saudi-Arabia v. Arabian-American Oil Co.</i>	201
<i>Schuesser Case</i>	144
<i>Scribner Claim</i>	78
<i>Sedleigh-Denfield v. O'Callaghan</i>	43, 153
<i>Sessarego Claim</i>	78
<i>Shufeldt Claim</i>	227-8
<i>Sidra Claim</i>	79
<i>Sivewright Beacon & Co. (G.B.) v. U.S.</i>	78
<i>Socony Vacuum Oil Co. Claim</i>	173
<i>S.W. Africa Cases (Preliminary Objections)</i>	62-3, 201
<i>Spanish Zone of Morocco Claims</i>	42, 140
<i>Standard Vacuum Oil Co. Claim</i>	173
<i>Stephens Case</i>	160
<i>Studer (U.S.) v. G.B.</i>	188
<i>Sunday Times Case</i>	235
<i>Sweet v. Parsley</i>	35
 <i>Tattler Claim (The)</i>	58, 227
<i>Tellini Incident (The)</i>	209
<i>Temple Case (Preliminary Objections)</i>	62
(Merits)	27, 28, 63, 65, 67, 82, 210-11, 215, 220
<i>Texaco Overseas Petroleum Co. v. Government of Libyan Arab Republic</i>	214-5, 221
<i>Thomas F. Bayard and the Pescauha</i>	79, 227
<i>Tinoco Concessions Case</i>	64
<i>Trail Smelter Arbitration</i>	50, 52, 165, 182
<i>Treatment of Polish Nationals in Danzig</i>	269
<i>Treves Case</i>	173
<i>Trochel v. State of Tunisia</i>	188
 <i>Union Bridge Co. Claim</i>	79
<i>U.S. Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran</i>	80, 156-7, 161, 195, 237
 <i>Vásquez Díaz Claim</i>	78
<i>Venables Claim</i>	78
<i>Vercelli Claim</i>	78
<i>Volkmar Case</i>	173
 <i>Wagon Mound (The)</i>	35, 87, 224
<i>Wal-Wal Incident (Award)</i>	42
<i>Walter Fletcher Smith Claim</i>	212
<i>Wanderer (The)</i>	38, 69, 78-9, 227
<i>Warren v. Henlys Ltd.</i>	150
<i>Way Claim</i>	139, 144
<i>Western Sahara Case</i>	59
<i>Wimbledon (The)</i>	227, 229, 230, 233
<i>Winterwerp Case</i>	143, 144, 210
 <i>Youmans Claim</i>	74, 141, 146, 161-2, 164-5
<i>Young, James and Webster</i>	143, 162
 <i>Zadeh v. U.S.</i>	188
<i>Zafiro (The)</i>	78, 146-7, 160, 189
<i>Zohrer Claim</i>	228

CHAPTER I

The History of State Responsibility

1. Perspective

In international relations, as in other social relations, the invasion of the legal interest of one subject of the law by another legal person creates responsibility in various forms. These forms will be determined by the given legal system and the customary forms of redress and self-help will vary from one historical period to another. The essential idea of responsibility is simple and has its basis both in religious thought and in the secular morality of which law is the outwork. It is the idea of being liable, answerable, accountable, for wrongdoing: hence the terminology: responsibility, *verantwortlichkeit*, *la responsabilité*, *la responsabilità*. Consequently, responsibility is an inherent element in any community based upon some system – perceived as such, however diffuse – of morality, religion, or law, or several of these.

Morality and law are concerned with damage not as such, but only when inflicted without justification: *damnum iniuria datum* was the condition for the action on the *Lex Aquilia* to lie.¹ The fundamental conception would remain the same whether the action or form of responsibility was ‘penal’ in nature, or was based upon fault, or involved ‘strict liability’, in which case the defendant would have the burden of exculpation. Similarly, in the development of the common law the legal terminology was that of contemporary morality: the terms used were *transgressio*, trespass, and misdemeanour.²

‘Tracing the origins’ of legal concepts and institutions can be an artificial and practically fruitless endeavour. Moreover, the more obsessive and persistent the enquiry, the more probable it is that the conclusions will be too ambitious and will involve solecism. In the case of state responsibility the task is complicated by two peculiarities of the genre. The first lies in the fact that the concept of responsibility is both very simple and yet sophisticated. It is both a fundamental moral idea

¹ Schulz, *Classical Roman Law*, Oxford, 1951, pp. 572, 587–91; Watson, *The Law of Obligations in the Later Roman Republic*, Oxford, 1965, pp. 236–41; De Zulueta, *The Institutes of Gaius, Part II, Commentary*, Oxford, 1953, pp. 212–16; Buckland, *Textbook of Roman Law*, 3rd ed. by Stein, 1963, pp. 585–7.

² Putnam, *Proceedings before the Justices of the Peace in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, 1938, introduction; Milsom, *Historical Foundations of the Common Law*, London, 1969, chapter 11.

common to laymen and lawyers, and a concept which in legal experience calls for considerable study and refinement, involving nice problems of measure of damages, liability for 'moral damage' and so forth. Secondly, in the earlier doctrine of the law of nations and even to some extent in the more recent past, the concept of state responsibility has been accorded a more or less latent role, and the existence of the concept has been a matter of assumption.

The successive editions of the well-regarded work of Hall, *International Law*, first published in 1880,³ contain no general examination of the principles of state responsibility *as such* and no chapter or section devoted to the topic. The subject is treated in the context of sovereignty in relation to the territory of a state (Chapter IV) and the responsibility of a state for acts or omissions taking place in its territory (paragraph 65). However, Hall's discussion is far from negligible and he bears witness to the state of the doctrine thus: 'The subject of the responsibility of the state is not usually discussed adequately in works upon international law.'⁴ There are more modern examples. The successful short treatment of Brierly,⁵ *The Law of Nations*, contains no discussion of state responsibility as a category although there is some consideration of the duties owed in respect of aliens received on state territory.⁶

In spite of the difficulties, the origins of the developed concept of state responsibility are reasonably clear in the sources and they will be identified in the next section.

2. The Origins

The origins are multiple and the various strands will be examined separately. The order of treatment represents a certain historical sequence, but in a very general way.

(a) *The law of nations as a concept.*

By the sixteenth century the law of nations had, at least in respect of Europe (and states having regular relations with the principalities of Europe), evolved as a set of principles recognized in the practice of states and, eventually, in doctrine. Indeed, the 'set of principles' had been prefigured by political facts in that treaties were concluded outside

³ For an earlier example: G. F. de Martens, *Précis du droit des gens moderne de l'Europe*, 2 vols., 1831.

⁴ Hall, 2nd ed., 1884, p. 198 n. 1; 5th ed., 1904, p. 222 n. 1.

⁵ 1st ed., 1928; 5th ed., 1955 (the last edition by the author). The treatment remains in the sixth edition by Sir Humphrey Waldock, published in 1963.

⁶ pp. 136-45 (1928); 217-31 (1955). Reference should also be made to the treatment of reprisals: pp. 193-5 (1928); 321-6 (1955).