

# State Succession to International Responsibility

*Second Edition*

*By*

Patrick Dumberry



BRILL | NIJHOFF

LEIDEN | BOSTON

# Contents

Foreword to the First Edition (2007)	xv
Acknowledgments to the Second Edition	xviii
Abbreviations	xx

## PART I

### *General Introduction*

General Introduction of Part I	3
1 The Issue Addressed in This Study	3
2 The Objective of This Study	7
3 Relevance of This Study When I Wrote the First Edition of This Book	10
3.1 <i>The Question Had Never Been Addressed by the ILC or by Any International Law Scientific Institution</i>	11
3.2 <i>The Doctrinal Analysis Was Very Limited and Generally Unsatisfactory</i>	15
4 Scope of This Study	18
4.1 <i>Meaning of State Succession</i>	18
4.2 <i>Classification of the Different Types of Succession of States</i>	20
4.3 <i>Fundamental Principles of State Responsibility in International Law</i>	27
4.4 <i>The Term “Internationally Wrongful Act” Should Be Used instead of “Tort”</i>	30
4.5 <i>This Study Does Not Deal with the Regime of State Responsibility for Breaches of Rules of State Succession</i>	31
4.6 <i>This Study Does Not Deal with the Issues of “Odious Debts” and “War Damage” between the Predecessor State and the Successor State</i>	32
4.7 <i>This Study Does Not Deal with Internationally Wrongful Acts Committed by the Predecessor State against Its Own Nationals/Corporations</i>	34
4.8 <i>This Study Does Not Deal with Wrongs Committed by Non-State Actors</i>	35

**PART 2**  
***Succession of States to the Obligation to Repair***

**General Introduction of Part 2 41**

- 1 Analysis of Scholarship 43**
  - 1 Introduction 43
  - 2 The Doctrine of Non-succession 43
    - 2.1 *General Overview of the Doctrine* 43
    - 2.2 *The Arguments Invoked in Support of the Doctrine* 49
      - 2.2.1 A State Is Only Responsible for Its Own Internationally Wrongful Acts and Not for Those Committed by Other States 52
      - 2.2.2 *Actio personalis moritur cum persona* 55
  - 3 Challenges and Criticisms of the Doctrine of Non-succession 62
- 2 Analysis of State Practice and Case Law 72**
  - 1 Introductory Remarks on the Doctrinal Analysis of State Practice 72
  - 2 Incorporation of State 75
    - 2.1 *Older Examples of Annexation of States Support the Principle of Non-succession* 75
      - 2.1.1 The Unity of Italy (1860–1861) 79
      - 2.1.2 Burma (1886) 81
      - 2.1.3 Madagascar (1896) 83
      - 2.1.4 Boer Republic of South Africa (1902) 84
      - 2.1.5 The *Hawaiian Claims Case* (1925) in the Context of the Annexation of Hawaii by the United States (1898) 93
    - 2.2 *The Position Adopted in This Study and That of the Institute and the ILC* 98
    - 2.3 *Modern State Practice Supports the Principle of Succession* 100
      - 2.3.1 The Integration of the German Democratic Republic into the Federal Republic of Germany (1990) 101
  - 3 Unification of States 110
    - 3.1 *The Position Adopted in This Study and That of the Institute and the ILC* 110
    - 3.2 *State Practice Supports the Principle of Succession* 115
      - 3.2.1 United Arab Republic (1958) 116
  - 4 Dissolution of State 119

- 4.1 *The Position Adopted in This Study and That of the Institute and the ILC* 119
- 4.2 *Ancient State Practice Generally Supports the Principle of Non-succession* 128
  - 4.2.1 Kingdom of Westphalia (1813) 129
  - 4.2.2 Austria-Hungary Dual Monarchy (1918) 129
  - 4.2.3 Union of Colombia (1829–1831) 132
- 4.3 *Modern State Practice Supports the Principle of Succession* 134
  - 4.3.1 United Arab Republic (1961) 135
  - 4.3.2 *The Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Case* (1997) in the Context of the Dissolution of Czechoslovakia (1992) 138
  - 4.3.3 Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (1991–1992) 145
- 5 Cession and Transfer of Territory 163
  - 5.1 *The Position Adopted in This Study and That of the Institute and the ILC* 164
  - 5.2 *The Continuing State Remains Responsible for Internationally Wrongful Acts Committed before the Date of Succession* 167
    - 5.2.1 Romanian Court Cases in the Context of the Transfer of Bessarabia to Romania (1918) 168
    - 5.2.2 French Court Cases and French-German Mixed Arbitral Tribunal Cases in the Context of the Cession of Alsace-Lorraine to France (1919) 170
    - 5.2.3 A Hungarian Court Case in the Context of the Cession of Transylvania to Romania (1920) 171
    - 5.2.4 *The 1947 Paris Peace Treaty* in the Context of the Cession of the Dodecanesian Islands to Greece (1947) 172
    - 5.2.5 Claims Nos. 11 and 12—a Decided by the Arbitral Tribunal in the *Lighthouse Arbitration Case* (1956) in the Context of the Cession of Crete to Greece (1913) 172
    - 5.2.6 A German Court Case in the Context of the Transfer of Upper Silesia to Poland (1951) 177
    - 5.2.7 Other Less Significant Examples 178
  - 5.3 *A Special Case: Acts Committed by Autonomous Entities* 179
    - 5.3.1 Claim No. 4 Decided by the Arbitral Tribunal in the *Lighthouse Arbitration Case* (1956) in the Context of the Cession of Crete to Greece (1913) 180

- 5.3.2 The *Samos* Case in the Context of the Cession of the Aegean Islands to Greece (1913) 185
- 6 Separation 186
  - 6.1 *The Position Adopted in This Study and That of the Institute and the ILC* 187
  - 6.2 *The Continuing State Remains Responsible for Internationally Wrongful Acts Committed before the Date of Succession* 197
    - 6.2.1 The Position Taken by the Allies in the Context of the Break-up of the Austria-Hungary Dual Monarchy (1918) 198
    - 6.2.2 Polish and German Court Cases in the Context of the Secession of Poland (1918) 199
    - 6.2.3 German Democratic Republic (1949) 201
    - 6.2.4 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (199) 202
    - 6.2.5 Kingdom of the Netherlands (1815) 210
    - 6.2.6 Montenegro (2006) 213
  - 6.3 *Examples Where the Principle of Succession Was Applied* 215
    - 6.3.1 Belgium (1830) 216
    - 6.3.2 Panama (1903) 220
    - 6.3.3 War Reparation Paid by the GDR to the USSR 221
    - 6.3.4 Offer of Compensation Made by the GDR to Jewish Groups 223
- 7 Newly Independent States 224
  - 7.1 *The Position Adopted in This Study and That of the Institute and the ILC* 224
  - 7.2 *Examples Where the Continuing State Remained Responsible for Internationally Wrongful Acts Committed before the Date of Succession* 229
    - 7.2.1 The Partition of India (1947) 230
    - 7.2.2 Belgian Court Cases in the Context of the Independence of Congo (1960) 231
    - 7.2.3 State Practice of France and French Court Cases Supporting the Principle of Non-succession in the Context of the Independence of Algeria (1962) 234
    - 7.2.4 A French Court Case in the Context of the Independence of Vanuatu (1980) 239
    - 7.2.5 The 1958 Peace Treaty between Indonesia and Japan 240
    - 7.2.6 Ghana (1957) 241

	7.2.7	The <i>Mutua</i> Case in the Context of the Independence of Kenya (1963)	241
7.3		<i>Examples Where the Successor State Took Over the Obligations Arising from the Commission of Internationally Wrongful Acts</i>	246
	7.3.1	Dutch Court Cases in the Context of the Independence of Indonesia (1949)	249
	7.3.2	The Constitution of Malaya (1957)	251
	7.3.3	State Practice of France and French Court Cases Supporting the Principle of Succession in the Context of the Independence of Algeria (1962)	253
	7.3.4	Namibia (1991)	256
8		Conclusion to Chapter 2	268
<b>3</b>		<b>Analysis of Specific Issues</b>	274
1		Introduction	274
2		The Predecessor State Recognises Its Liability for an Internationally Wrongful Act	277
3		A Judicial Body Finds the Predecessor State Responsible for an Internationally Wrongful Act	278
4		The Successor State Accepts to Take Over the Responsibility for an Internationally Wrongful Act	282
5		The Successor State Continues an Internationally Wrongful Act Committed by the Predecessor State	287
	5.1	<i>Acts Committed by the Successor State after the Date of Succession</i>	289
	5.2	<i>Acts Committed by the Predecessor State before the Date of Succession</i>	290
	5.2.1	The Predecessor State Ceases to Exist	293
	5.2.2	The Predecessor State Continues Its Existence	296
6		An Insurrectional Movement Commits an Internationally Wrongful Act during Its Struggle to Establish a New State	298
7		An Autonomous Government Commits an Internationally Wrongful Act	300
	7.1	<i>The Position Adopted by the Institute and the ILC</i>	303
	7.2	<i>The Application of This Principle to Different Types of Succession</i>	306
8		The Use of the Principle of Unjust Enrichment to Resolve Issues of Succession to Responsibility	313
	8.1	<i>The Principle of Unjust Enrichment</i>	313

- 8.2 *The Principle Has Been Mentioned by Courts Dealing with Issues of State Succession* 314
- 8.3 *Analysis of Scholarship and the Position Adopted in This Study* 316
- 8.4 *Application of the Principle to Different Types of Succession of States* 322
- 9 The Use of the Principle of Equity to Resolve Issues of Succession to Responsibility 324
- 10 The Relevance of the Territorial Factor to Resolve Issues of Succession to Responsibility 330
  - 10.1 *The Existence of a "Direct Link" between the Consequences of a Wrongful Act and a Territory* 330
  - 10.2 *Violation of Territorial Regime Obligations* 336
- 11 The Relevance of Treaty Succession to Resolve Issues of Succession to Responsibility 338
- 12 Internationally Wrongful Acts Having a Special Character 344
  - 12.1 *Commission of "Odious" Acts* 344
  - 12.2 *Breach of jus cogens Norms* 348
- 4 General Conclusion to Part 2 349

### PART 3

## *Succession of States to the Right to Reparation*

- General Introduction of Part 3 353
- 5 The Commission of an Internationally Wrongful Act Directly Affecting the Predecessor State 354
  - 1 Introduction 354
  - 2 Analysis of Scholarship 354
    - 2.1 *The Doctrine of Non-succession* 354
    - 2.2 *Challenges and Criticisms of the Doctrine of Non-succession* 357
  - 3 Analysis of State Practice and Case Law 361
    - 3.1 *Unification and Incorporation of States* 361
      - 3.1.1 The Position Adopted in This Study and That of the Institute and the ILC 361

3.1.2	Agreements between the United Arab Republic and Other States in the Context of the Suez Crisis (1956)	363
3.2	<i>Dissolution of State</i>	365
3.2.1	The Position Adopted in This Study and That of the Institute and the ILC	365
3.2.2	The <i>Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros</i> Case (1997) in the Context of the Dissolution of Czechoslovakia (1992)	369
3.2.3	Claim Submitted by the Czech Republic before the UNCC for Damage to the Czechoslovak Embassy Caused by Iraq	371
3.2.4	The Agreement on Succession Issues in the Context of the Dissolution of Yugoslavia (1991–1992)	372
3.3	<i>Separation</i>	373
3.3.1	The Position Adopted in This Study and That of the Institute and the ILC	373
3.3.2	The 1997 Agreement Entered into by Russia and France on Reparation for Expropriation of Bonds after the 1917 Russian Revolution	376
3.3.3	The 1946 Agreement on Reparation from Germany in the Context of the Separation of Pakistan (1947)	377
3.3.4	The 1958 Protocol Entered into by the USSR and the GDR for the Restitution of Cultural Properties	378
3.4	<i>Newly Independent States</i>	380
3.4.1	The Position Adopted in This Study and That of the Institute and the ILC	380
3.4.2	The Peace Treaties Entered into by Japan with Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore after the Second World War	381
3.4.3	The <i>Certain Phosphate Lands in Nauru</i> Case (1992) in the Context of the Independence of Nauru (1968)	383
3.4.4	The 1984 Exchange of Notes between Vanuatu and the United Kingdom	384
3.4.5	Namibia (1990)	384
4	Conclusion to Chapter 5	390
6	<b>The Commission of an Internationally Wrongful Act Affecting a National of the Predecessor State</b>	393
1	Introduction	393

- 2 Analysis of Scholarship 393
  - 2.1 *The Rule of Continuous Nationality in Diplomatic Protection* 393
  - 2.2 *The Application of the Rule of Continuous Nationality in the Context of State Succession* 396
  - 2.3 *The Parties Are Free to Exclude the Application of the Rule of Continuous Nationality* 398
  - 2.4 *The Rule of Continuous Nationality Is Not Appropriate in the Context of State Succession* 400
    - 2.4.1 Case Law 400
    - 2.4.2 Scholarship 402
    - 2.4.3 The Work of the ILC 404
    - 2.4.4 The Work of the Institute 407
  - 2.5 *The Successor State Has a Right to Claim Reparation on Behalf of Its New Nationals for Internationally Wrongful Acts Committed before the Date of Succession* 412
- 3 Analysis of State Practice and Case Law 418
  - 3.1 *Cases Where Successor States Have Submitted Claims on Behalf of Their New Nationals* 418
    - 3.1.1 *The Pablo Nájera Case (1928)* 419
    - 3.1.2 *The Claim of Finnish Shipowners against Great Britain in Respect of the Use of Certain Finnish Vessels during the War (1934)* 422
    - 3.1.3 *The Practice of Mixed Arbitral Tribunals Established after the First World War* 422
    - 3.1.4 *The Practice of the UNCC* 431
  - 3.2 *State Practice Where Reparation Was Provided to the Successor State for Its New Nationals* 434
    - 3.2.1 *The 1952 Agreement on Reparation between the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel* 434
    - 3.2.2 *The 1982 Agreement on Reparation between the United Kingdom and Mauritius for the Ilois* 437
    - 3.2.3 *Bilateral Agreements Entered into by Austria with Other States in the Context of the Austrian "Reconciliation Fund Law" (2000)* 439
    - 3.2.4 *The Joint Statement by Germany and other States in the Context of the German Foundation "Remembrance, Responsibility and Future" (2000)* 440

3.3	<i>Cases Where the Rule of Continuous Nationality Was Applied</i>	442
3.3.1	The <i>Panevezys-Saldutiskis Railway Case</i> (1939)	443
3.3.2	The <i>Sandoval and Others Case</i> (1849) and the <i>Champion Case</i> (1850)	456
3.3.3	The <i>Henriette Levy Case</i> (1881)	458
3.4	<i>The Specific Problem of Reparation Claims against the Former State of Nationality</i>	460
4	Conclusion to Chapter 6	462

#### PART 4

### *General Conclusion*

	<b>General Conclusion</b>	469
1	The Foundations of the Doctrine of Non-succession Are Not as Solid as They Appear to Be	470
2	The Doctrine of Non-succession Remains Supported by Many States	471
3	Succession to the Obligation to Repair Essentially Depends on the Type of Succession Involved and on Whether the Predecessor State Continues to Exist	479
4	State Succession to the Obligation to Repair Depends on the Different Factors and Circumstances Involved in Each Case	480
5	The Issue of State Succession to the Obligation to Repair Should Ultimately Be Resolved Based on the Application of Three Fundamental Equitable Principles	484
6	Solutions to Problems of Succession to the Obligation to Repair Remain Largely Based on the Consent of the Successor State	489
7	The Successor State Has the Right to Claim Reparation for Internationally Wrongful Acts Committed by a Third State before the Date of Succession	491
8	The Tendency in Favour of Continuity of Rights and Obligations Is in Accordance with Modern State Practice in Other Fields of State Succession	491

Annexes 1 to 3	493
----------------	-----

Index	496
-------	-----