Chapter IV
RESPONSIBILITY OF A STATE IN CONNECTION WITH THE ACT OF ANOTHER STATE

Commentary

(1) In accordance with the basic principles laid down in chapter I, each State is responsible for its own internationally wrongful conduct, i.e. for conduct attributable to it under chapter II which is in breach of an international obligation of that State in accordance with chapter III. The principle that State responsibility is specific to the State concerned underlies the present articles as a whole. It will be referred to as the principle of independent responsibility. It is appropriate since each State has its own range of international obligations and its own correlative responsibilities.

(2) However, internationally wrongful conduct often results from the collaboration of several States rather than of one State acting alone. This may involve independent conduct by several States, each playing its own role in carrying out an internationally wrongful act. Or it may be that a number of States act through a common organ to commit a wrongful act. Internationally wrongful conduct can also arise out of situations where a State acts on behalf of another State in carrying out the conduct in question.

(3) Various forms of collaborative conduct can coexist in the same case. For example, three States, Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, together constituted the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Nauru. In the Certain Phosphate Lands in Nauru case, proceedings were commenced against Australia alone in respect of acts performed on the “joint behalf” of the three States. The acts performed by Australia involved both “joint” conduct of several States and day-to-day administration of a territory by one State acting on behalf of other States as well as on its own behalf. By contrast, if the relevant organ of the acting State is merely “placed at the disposal” of the requesting State, in the sense provided for in article 6, only the requesting State is responsible for the act in question.

(4) In certain circumstances the wrongfulness of a State’s conduct may depend on the independent action of another State. A State may engage in conduct in a situation where another State is involved and the conduct of the other State may be relevant or even deci-
sive in assessing whether the first State has breached its own international obligations. For example, in the Soering case the European Court of Human Rights held that the proposed extradition of a person to a State not party to the European Convention on Human Rights where he was likely to suffer inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment involved a breach of article 3 of the Convention by the extraditing State. Alternatively, a State may be required by its own international obligations to prevent certain conduct by another State, or at least to prevent the harm that would flow from such conduct. Thus, the basis of responsibility in the Corfu Channel case was Albania’s failure to warn the United Kingdom of the presence of mines in Albanian waters which had been laid by a third State. Albania’s responsibility in the circumstances was original and not derived from the wrongfulness of the conduct of any other State.

(5) In most cases of collaborative conduct by States, responsibility for the wrongful act will be determined according to the principle of independent responsibility referred to in paragraph (1) above. But there may be cases where conduct of the organ of one State, not acting as an organ or agent of another State, is nonetheless chargeable to the latter State, and this may be so even though the wrongfulness of the conduct lies, or at any rate primarily lies, in a breach of the international obligations of the former. Chapter IV of Part One defines these exceptional cases where it is appropriate that one State should assume responsibility for the internationally wrongful act of another.

(6) Three situations are covered in chapter IV. Article 16 deals with cases where one State provides aid or assistance to another State with a view to assisting in the commission of a wrongful act by the latter. Article 17 deals with cases where one State is responsible for the internationally wrongful act of another State because it has exercised powers of direction and control over the commission of an internationally wrongful act by the latter. Article 18 deals with the extreme case where one State deliberately coerces another into committing an act which is, or but for the coercion would be, an internationally wrongful act on the part of the coerced State. In all three cases, the act in question is still committed, voluntarily or otherwise, by organs or agents of the acting State, and is or, but for the coercion, would be a breach of that State’s international obligations. The implication of the second State in that breach arises from the special circumstance of its willing assistance in, its direction and control over or its coercion of the acting State. But there are important differences between the three cases. Under article 16, the State primarily responsible is the acting State and the assisting State has a mere supporting role. Similarly under article 17, the acting State commits the internationally wrongful act, albeit under the direction and control of another State. By contrast, in the case of coercion under article 18, the coercing State is the prime mover in respect of the conduct and the coerced State is merely its instrument.

(7) A feature of this chapter is that it specifies certain conduct as internationally wrongful. This may seem to blur the distinction maintained in the articles between the primary or

---


[387] 267 If a State has been coerced, the wrongfulness of its act may be precluded by force majeure: see article 23 and commentary.
substantive obligations of the State and its secondary obligations of responsibility. It is justified on the basis that responsibility under chapter IV is in a sense derivative. In national legal systems, rules dealing, for example, with conspiracy, complicity and inducing breach of contract may be classified as falling within the “general part” of the law of obligations. Moreover, the idea of the implication of one State in the conduct of another is analogous to problems of attribution, dealt with in chapter II.

(8) On the other hand, the situations covered in chapter IV have a special character. They are exceptions to the principle of independent responsibility and they only cover certain cases. In formulating these exceptional cases where one State is responsible for the internationally wrongful acts of another, it is necessary to bear in mind certain features of the international system. First, there is the possibility that the same conduct may be internationally wrongful so far as one State is concerned but not for another State having regard to its own international obligations. Rules of derived responsibility cannot be allowed to undermine the principle, stated in article 34 of the 1969 Vienna Convention, that a “treaty does not create either obligations or rights for a third State without its consent”; similar issues arise with respect to unilateral obligations and even, in certain cases, rules of general international law. Hence it is only in the extreme case of coercion that a State may become responsible under this chapter for conduct which would not have been internationally wrongful if performed by that State. Secondly, States engage in a wide variety of activities through a multiplicity of organs and agencies. For example, a State providing financial or other aid to another State should not be required to assume the risk that the latter will divert the aid for purposes which may be internationally unlawful. Thus, it is necessary to establish a close connection between the action of the assisting, directing or coercing State on the one hand and that of the State committing the internationally wrongful act on the other. Thus, the articles in this part require that the former State should be aware of the circumstances of the internationally wrongful act in question, and establish a specific causal link between that act and the conduct of the assisting, directing or coercing State. This is done without prejudice to the general question of “wrongful intent” in matters of State responsibility, on which the articles are neutral.

(9) Similar considerations dictate the exclusion of certain situations of “derived responsibility” from chapter IV. One of these is incitement. The incitement of wrongful conduct is generally not regarded as sufficient to give rise to responsibility on the part of the inciting State, if it is not accompanied by concrete support or does not involve direction and control on the part of the inciting State. However, there can be specific treaty

[388] See above, in the introduction to the articles, paras. (1)–(2) and (4) for an explanation of the distinction.
[390] See above, the commentary to paragraphs (3) and (10) of article 2.
obligations prohibiting incitement under certain circumstances. Another concerns the issue which is described in some systems of internal law as being an “accessory after the fact”. It seems that there is no general obligation on the part of third States to cooperate in suppressing internationally wrongful conduct of another State which may already have occurred. Again it is a matter for specific treaty obligations to establish any such obligation of suppression after the event. There are, however, two important qualifications here. First, in some circumstances assistance given by one State to another after the latter has committed an internationally wrongful act may amount to the adoption of that act by the former State. In such cases responsibility for that act potentially arises pursuant to article 11. Secondly, special obligations of cooperation in putting an end to an unlawful situation arise in the case of serious breaches of obligations under peremptory norms of general international law. By definition, in such cases States will have agreed that no derogation from such obligations is to be permitted and, faced with a serious breach of such an obligation, certain obligations of cooperation arise. These are dealt with in article 41.

[392] 272 See, e.g., article III (c) of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; and article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.
Article 16. Aid or assistance in the commission of an internationally wrongful act

A State which aids or assists another State in the commission of an internationally wrongful act by the latter is internationally responsible for doing so if:

(a) that State does so with knowledge of the circumstances of the internationally wrongful act; and

(b) the act would be internationally wrongful if committed by that State.

Commentary

(1) Article 16 deals with the situation where one State provides aid or assistance to another with a view to facilitating the commission of an internationally wrongful act by the latter. Such situations arise where a State voluntarily assists or aids another State in carrying out conduct which violates the international obligations of the latter, for example, by knowingly providing an essential facility or financing the activity in question. Other examples include providing means for the closing of an international waterway, facilitating the abduction of persons on foreign soil, or assisting in the destruction of property belonging to nationals of a third country. The State primarily responsible in each case is the acting State, and the assisting State has only a supporting role. Hence the use of the term “by the latter” in the chapeau to article 16, which distinguishes the situation of aid or assistance from that of co-perpetrators or co-participants in an internationally wrongful act. Under article 16, aid or assistance by the assisting State is not to be confused with the responsibility of the acting State. In such a case, the assisting State will only be responsible to the extent that its own conduct has caused or contributed to the internationally wrongful act. Thus, in cases where that internationally wrongful act would clearly have occurred in any event, the responsibility of the assisting State will not extend to compensating for the act itself.

(2) Various specific substantive rules exist, prohibiting one State from providing assistance in the commission of certain wrongful acts by other States or even requiring third States to prevent or repress such acts. Such provisions do not rely on any general principle of derived responsibility, nor do they deny the existence of such a principle, and it would be wrong to infer from them the non-existence of any general rule. As to treaty provisions such as Article 2, paragraph 5, of the Charter of the United Nations, again these have a specific rationale which goes well beyond the scope and purpose of article 16.

(3) Article 16 limits the scope of responsibility for aid or assistance in three ways. First, the relevant State organ or agency providing aid or assistance must be aware of the circumstances making the conduct of the assisted State internationally wrongful; secondly, the aid or assistance must be given with a view to facilitating the commission of that act, and must actually do so; and thirdly, the completed act must be such that it would have been wrongful had it been committed by the assisting State itself.

(4) The requirement that the assisting State be aware of the circumstances making the conduct of the assisted State internationally wrongful is reflected by the phrase “knowl-

[393] See, e.g., the first principle of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970, annex); and article 3 (f) of the Definition of Aggression (General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974, annex).
edge of the circumstances of the internationally wrongful act”. A State providing material or financial assistance or aid to another State does not normally assume the risk that its assistance or aid may be used to carry out an internationally wrongful act. If the assisting or aiding State is unaware of the circumstances in which its aid or assistance is intended to be used by the other State, it bears no international responsibility.

(5) The second requirement is that the aid or assistance must be given with a view to facilitating the commission of the wrongful act, and must actually do so. This limits the application of article 16 to those cases where the aid or assistance given is clearly linked to the subsequent wrongful conduct. A State is not responsible for aid or assistance under article 16 unless the relevant State organ intended, by the aid or assistance given, to facilitate the occurrence of the wrongful conduct and the internationally wrongful conduct is actually committed by the aided or assisted State. There is no requirement that the aid or assistance should have been essential to the performance of the internationally wrongful act; it is sufficient if it contributed significantly to that act.

(6) The third condition limits article 16 to aid or assistance in the breach of obligations by which the aiding or assisting State is itself bound. An aiding or assisting State may not deliberately procure the breach by another State of an obligation by which both States are bound; a State cannot do by another what it cannot do by itself. On the other hand, a State is not bound by obligations of another State vis-à-vis third States. This basic principle is also embodied in articles 34 and 35 of the 1969 Vienna Convention. Correspondingly, a State is free to act for itself in a way which is inconsistent with the obligations of another State vis-à-vis third States. Any question of responsibility in such cases will be a matter for the State to whom assistance is provided vis-à-vis the injured State. Thus, it is a necessary requirement for the responsibility of an assisting State that the conduct in question, if attributable to the assisting State, would have constituted a breach of its own international obligations.

(7) State practice supports assigning international responsibility to a State which deliberately participates in the internationally wrongful conduct of another through the provision of aid or assistance, in circumstances where the obligation breached is equally opposable to the assisting State. For example, in 1984 the Islamic Republic of Iran protested against the supply of financial and military aid to Iraq by the United Kingdom, which allegedly included chemical weapons used in attacks against Iranian troops, on the ground that the assistance was facilitating acts of aggression by Iraq.[394]274 The Government of the United Kingdom denied both the allegation that it had chemical weapons and that it had supplied them to Iraq.[395]275 In 1998, a similar allegation surfaced that the Sudan had assisted Iraq to manufacture chemical weapons by allowing Sudanese installations to be used by Iraqi technicians for steps in the production of nerve gas. The allegation was denied by Iraq’s representative to the United Nations.[396]276

(8) The obligation not to use force may also be breached by an assisting State through permitting the use of its territory by another State to carry out an armed attack against a third State. An example is provided by a statement made by the Government of the Fed-

---

eral Republic of Germany in response to an allegation that Germany had participated in an armed attack by allowing United States military aircraft to use airfields in its territory in connection with the United States intervention in Lebanon. While denying that the measures taken by the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near East constituted intervention, the Federal Republic of Germany nevertheless seems to have accepted that the act of a State in placing its own territory at the disposal of another State in order to facilitate the commission of an unlawful use of force by that other State was itself an internationally wrongful act.\[397\]\[277\] Another example arises from the Tripoli bombing incident in April 1986. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya charged the United Kingdom with responsibility for the event, based on the fact that the United Kingdom had allowed several of its air bases to be used for the launching of United States fighter planes to attack Libyan targets.\[398\]\[278\] The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya asserted that the United Kingdom “would be held partly responsible” for having “supported and contributed in a direct way” to the raid.\[399\]\[279\] The United Kingdom denied responsibility on the basis that the raid by the United States was lawful as an act of self-defence against Libyan terrorist attacks on United States targets.\[400\]\[280\] A proposed Security Council resolution concerning the attack was vetoed, but the General Assembly issued a resolution condemning the “military attack” as “a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law”, and calling upon all States “to refrain from extending any assistance or facilities for perpetrating acts of aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya”.\[401\]\[281\] (9) The obligation not to provide aid or assistance to facilitate the commission of an internationally wrongful act by another State is not limited to the prohibition on the use of force. For instance, a State may incur responsibility if it assists another State to circumvent sanctions imposed by the Security Council\[402\] or provides material aid to a State that uses the aid to commit human rights violations. In this respect, the General Assembly has called on Member States in a number of cases to refrain from supplying arms and other military assistance to countries found to be committing serious human rights violations.\[403\] Where the allegation is that the assistance of a State has facilitated human rights abuses by another State, the particular circumstances of each case must be carefully examined to determine whether the aiding State by its aid was aware of and intended to facilitate the commission of the internationally wrongful conduct. (10) In accordance with article 16, the assisting State is responsible for its own act in deliberately assisting another State to breach an international obligation by which they are both bound. It is not responsible, as such, for the act of the assisted State. In some cases this


\[399\]\[279\] See the statement of Ambassador Hamed Houdeiry, Libyan People’s Bureau, Paris, The Times, 16 April 1986, p. 6.


\[401\]\[281\] General Assembly resolution 41/38 of 20 November 1986, paras. 1 and 3.


may be a distinction without a difference: where the assistance is a necessary element in the wrongful act in absence of which it could not have occurred, the injury suffered can be concurrently attributed to the assisting and the acting State. \[404\] \[284\] In other cases, however, the difference may be very material: the assistance may have been only an incidental factor in the commission of the primary act, and may have contributed only to a minor degree, if at all, to the injury suffered. By assisting another State to commit an internationally wrongful act, a State should not necessarily be held to indemnify the victim for all the consequences of the act, but only for those which, in accordance with the principles stated in Part Two of the articles, flow from its own conduct.

(11) Article 16 does not address the question of the admissibility of judicial proceedings to establish the responsibility of the aiding or assisting State in the absence of or without the consent of the aided or assisted State. ICJ has repeatedly affirmed that it cannot decide on the international responsibility of a State if, in order to do so, “it would have to rule, as a pre-requisite, on the lawfulness”\[405\] \[285\] of the conduct of another State, in the latter’s absence and without its consent. This is the so-called Monetary Gold principle. \[406\] \[286\] That principle may well apply to cases under article 16, since it is of the essence of the responsibility of the aiding or assisting State that the aided or assisted State itself committed an internationally wrongful act. The wrongfulness of the aid or assistance given by the former is dependent, inter alia, on the wrongfulness of the conduct of the latter. This may present practical difficulties in some cases in establishing the responsibility of the aiding or assisting State, but it does not vitiate the purpose of article 16. The Monetary Gold principle is concerned with the admissibility of claims in international judicial proceedings, not with questions of responsibility as such. Moreover, that principle is not all-embracing, and the Monetary Gold principle may not be a barrier to judicial proceedings in every case. In any event, wrongful assistance given to another State has frequently led to diplomatic protests. States are entitled to assert complicity in the wrongful conduct of another State even though no international court may have jurisdiction to rule on the charge, at all or in the absence of the other State.

**DECISIONS OF INTERNATIONAL COURTS, TRIBUNALS AND OTHER BODIES**

**World Trade Organization panel**

**Turkey—Restrictions on Imports of Textile and Clothing Products**

In its 1999 report on Turkey—Restrictions on Imports of Textile and Clothing Products, the panel, in examining the Turkish argument according to which the measures at issue had been taken by a separate entity (i.e. the Turkey-European Communities customs union or the European Communities), concluded that the said measures were attributable to Turkey, since they had been adopted by the Turkish Government or had at least been implemented, applied and monitored by Turkey. In this regard, the panel found that, in any

---

\[404\] \[284\] For the question of concurrent responsibility of several States for the same injury, see article 47 and commentary.


event, “in public international law, in the absence of any contrary treaty provision, Turkey could reasonably be held responsible for the measures taken by the Turkey-EC customs union”, on the basis of the principle reflected in draft article 27 adopted on first reading by the International Law Commission. In the report, the panel reproduced a passage of the commentary of the Commission to that provision.

[A/62/62, para. 85]

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE


In its 2007 judgment in the Genocide case, the Court, in examining whether the Respondent was responsible for “complicity in genocide” under article III, paragraph (e), of the Genocide Convention, referred to article 16 finally adopted by the International Law Commission in 2001, which it considered as reflecting a customary rule:

In this connection, reference should be made to Article 16 of the ILC’s Articles on State Responsibility, reflecting a customary rule . . .

Although this provision, because it concerns a situation characterized by a relationship between two States, is not directly relevant to the present case, it nevertheless merits consideration. The Court sees no reason to make any distinction of substance between ‘complicity in genocide’, within the meaning of Article III, paragraph (e), of the Convention, and the ‘aid or assistance’ of a State in the commission of a wrongful act by another State within the meaning of the aforementioned Article 16—setting aside the hypothesis of the issue of instructions or directions or the exercise of effective control, the effects of which, in the law of international responsibility, extend beyond complicity. In other words, to ascertain whether the Respondent is responsible for ‘complicity in genocide’ within the meaning of Article III, paragraph (e), which is what the Court now has to do, it must examine whether organs of the respondent State, or persons acting on its instructions or under its direction or effective control, furnished ‘aid or assistance’ in the commission of the genocide in Srebrenica, in a sense not significantly different from that of those concepts in the general law of international responsibility.

[A/62/62/Add.1, para. 5]


[408] 135 This provision was amended and incorporated in article 16 finally adopted by the International Law Commission in 2001. The text of draft article 27 was the following:

Article 27

Aid or assistance by a State to another State for the commission of an internationally wrongful act

Aid or assistance by a State to another State, if it is established that it is rendered for the commission of an internationally wrongful act carried out by the latter, itself constitutes an internationally wrongful act, even if, taken alone, such aid or assistance would not constitute the breach of an international obligation. (Yearbook . . . 1996, vol. II (Part Two), para. 65.)


Article 17. Direction and control exercised over the commission of an internationally wrongful act

A State which directs and controls another State in the commission of an internationally wrongful act by the latter is internationally responsible for that act if:

(a) that State does so with knowledge of the circumstances of the internationally wrongful act; and

(b) the act would be internationally wrongful if committed by that State.

Commentary

(1) Article 17 deals with a second case of derived responsibility, the exercise of direction and control by one State over the commission of an internationally wrongful act by another. Under article 16 a State providing aid or assistance with a view to the commission of an internationally wrongful act incurs international responsibility only to the extent of the aid or assistance given. By contrast, a State which directs and controls another in the commission of an internationally wrongful act is responsible for the act itself, since it controlled and directed the act in its entirety.

(2) Some examples of international responsibility flowing from the exercise of direction and control over the commission of a wrongful act by another State are now largely of historical significance. International dependency relationships such as “suzerainty” or “protectorate” warranted treating the dominant State as internationally responsible for conduct formally attributable to the dependent State. For example, in Rights of Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco,[411] 287 France commenced proceedings under the Optional Clause in respect of a dispute concerning the rights of United States nationals in Morocco under French protectorate. The United States objected that any eventual judgment might not be considered as binding upon Morocco, which was not a party to the proceedings. France confirmed that it was acting both in its own name and as the protecting power over Morocco, with the result that the Court’s judgment would be binding both on France and on Morocco,[412] 288 and the case proceeded on that basis.[413] 289 The Court’s judgment concerned questions of the responsibility of France in respect of the conduct of Morocco which were raised both by the application and by the United States counter-claim.

(3) With the developments in international relations since 1945, and in particular the process of decolonization, older dependency relationships have been terminated. Such links do not involve any legal right to direction or control on the part of the representing State. In cases of representation, the represented entity remains responsible for its own international obligations, even though diplomatic communications may be channelled through another State. The representing State in such cases does not, merely because it is the channel through which communications pass, assume any responsibility for their


content. This is not in contradiction to the *British Claims in the Spanish Zone of Morocco* arbitration, which affirmed that “the responsibility of the protecting State . . . proceeds . . . from the fact that the protecting State alone represents the protected territory in its international relations”,[414] 290 and that the protecting State is answerable “in place of the protected State”.[415] 291 The principal concern in the arbitration was to ensure that, in the case of a protectorate which put an end to direct international relations by the protected State, international responsibility for wrongful acts committed by the protected State was not erased to the detriment of third States injured by the wrongful conduct. The acceptance by the protecting State of the obligation to answer in place of the protected State was viewed as an appropriate means of avoiding that danger.[416] 292 The justification for such an acceptance was not based on the relationship of “representation” as such but on the fact that the protecting State was in virtually total control over the protected State. It was not merely acting as a channel of communication.

(4) Other relationships of dependency, such as dependent territories, fall entirely outside the scope of article 17, which is concerned only with the responsibility of one State for the conduct of another State. In most relationships of dependency between one territory and another, the dependent territory, even if it may possess some international personality, is not a State. Even in cases where a component unit of a federal State enters into treaties or other international legal relations in its own right, and not by delegation from the federal State, the component unit is not itself a State in international law. So far as State responsibility is concerned, the position of federal States is no different from that of any other State: the normal principles specified in articles 4 to 9 of the draft articles apply, and the federal State is internationally responsible for the conduct of its component units even though that conduct falls within their own local control under the federal constitution.[417] 293

(5) Nonetheless, instances exist or can be envisaged where one State exercises the power to direct and control the activities of another State, whether by treaty or as a result of a military occupation or for some other reason. For example, during the belligerent occupation of Italy by Germany in the Second World War, it was generally acknowledged that the Italian police in Rome operated under the control of the occupying Power. Thus, the protest by the Holy See in respect of wrongful acts committed by Italian police who forcibly entered the Basilica of St. Paul in Rome in February 1944 asserted the responsibility of the German authorities.[418] 294 In such cases the occupying State is responsible for acts of the occupied State which it directs and controls.

(6) Article 17 is limited to cases where a dominant State actually directs and controls conduct which is a breach of an international obligation of the dependent State. International tribunals have consistently refused to infer responsibility on the part of a dominant State merely because the latter may have the power to interfere in matters of administration internal to a dependent State, if that power is not exercised in the particular case. In the *Brown* case, for example, the arbitral tribunal held that the authority of Great Britain,
as suzerain over the South African Republic prior to the Boer War, “fell far short of what would be required to make her responsible for the wrong inflicted upon Brown.”[419] 295

It went on to deny that Great Britain possessed power to interfere in matters of internal administration and continued that there was no evidence “that Great Britain ever did undertake to interfere in this way.”[420] 296 Accordingly, the relation of suzerainty “did not operate to render Great Britain liable for the acts complained of”. [421] 297 In the Heirs of the Duc de Guise case, the Franco-Italian Conciliation Commission held that Italy was responsible for a requisition carried out by Italy in Sicily at a time when it was under Allied occupation. Its decision was not based on the absence of Allied power to requisition the property, or to stop Italy from doing so. Rather, the majority pointed to the absence in fact of any “intermeddling on the part of the Commander of the Occupation forces or any Allied authority calling for the requisition decrees”. [422] 298 The mere fact that a State may have power to exercise direction and control over another State in some field is not a sufficient basis for attributing to it any wrongful acts of the latter State in that field. [423] 299

(7) In the formulation of article 17, the term “controls” refers to cases of domination over the commission of wrongful conduct and not simply the exercise of oversight, still less mere influence or concern. Similarly, the word “directs” does not encompass mere incitement or suggestion but rather connotes actual direction of an operative kind. Both direction and control must be exercised over the wrongful conduct in order for a dominant State to incur responsibility. The choice of the expression, common in English, “direction and control”, raised some problems in other languages, owing in particular to the ambiguity of the term “direction” which may imply, as is the case in French, complete power, whereas it does not have this implication in English.

(8) Two further conditions attach to responsibility under article 17. First, the dominant State is only responsible if it has knowledge of the circumstances making the conduct of the dependent State wrongful. Secondly, it has to be shown that the completed act would have been wrongful had it been committed by the directing and controlling State itself. This condition is significant in the context of bilateral obligations, which are not opposable to the directing State. In cases of multilateral obligations and especially of obligations to the international community, it is of much less significance. The essential principle is that a State should not be able to do through another what it could not do itself.

(9) As to the responsibility of the directed and controlled State, the mere fact that it was directed to carry out an internationally wrongful act does not constitute an excuse under chapter V of Part One. If the conduct in question would involve a breach of its international
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[420] 296 Ibid., p. 131.
[421] 297 Ibid.
[423] 299 It may be that the fact of the dependence of one State upon another is relevant in terms of the burden of proof, since the mere existence of a formal State apparatus does not exclude the possibility that control was exercised in fact by an occupying Power. Cf. Restitution of Household Effects Belonging to Jews Deported from Hungary (Germany), Kammergericht of Berlin, ILR, vol. 44, p. 301, at pp. 340–342 (1965).
obligations, it is incumbent upon it to decline to comply with the direction. The defence of “superior orders” does not exist for States in international law. This is not to say that the wrongfulness of the directed and controlled State’s conduct may not be precluded under chapter V, but this will only be so if it can show the existence of a circumstance precluding wrongfulness, e.g. force majeure. In such a case it is to the directing State alone that the injured State must look. But as between States, genuine cases of force majeure or coercion are exceptional. Conversely, it is no excuse for the directing State to show that the directed State was a willing or even enthusiastic participant in the internationally wrongful conduct, if in truth the conditions laid down in article 17 are met.
Article 18. Coercion of another State

A State which coerces another State to commit an act is internationally responsible for that act if:

(a) the act would, but for the coercion, be an internationally wrongful act of the coerced State; and

(b) the coercing State does so with knowledge of the circumstances of the act.

Commentary

(1) The third case of derived responsibility dealt with by chapter IV is that of coercion of one State by another. Article 18 is concerned with the specific problem of coercion deliberately exercised in order to procure the breach of one State’s obligation to a third State. In such cases the responsibility of the coercing State with respect to the third State derives not from its act of coercion, but rather from the wrongful conduct resulting from the action of the coerced State. Responsibility for the coercion itself is that of the coercing State vis-à-vis the coerced State, whereas responsibility under article 18 is the responsibility of the coercing State vis-à-vis a victim of the coerced act, in particular a third State which is injured as a result.

(2) Coercion for the purpose of article 18 has the same essential character as force majeure under article 23. Nothing less than conduct which forces the will of the coerced State will suffice, giving it no effective choice but to comply with the wishes of the coercing State. It is not sufficient that compliance with the obligation is made more difficult or onerous, or that the acting State is assisted or directed in its conduct: such questions are covered by the preceding articles. Moreover, the coercing State must coerce the very act which is internationally wrongful. It is not enough that the consequences of the coerced act merely make it more difficult for the coerced State to comply with the obligation.

(3) Though coercion for the purpose of article 18 is narrowly defined, it is not limited to unlawful coercion. As a practical matter, most cases of coercion meeting the requirements of the article will be unlawful, e.g. because they involve a threat or use of force contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, or because they involve intervention, i.e. coercive interference, in the affairs of another State. Such is also the case with countermeasures. They may have a coercive character, but as is made clear in article 49, their function is to induce a wrongdoing State to comply with obligations of cessation and reparation towards the State taking the countermeasures, not to coerce that State to violate obligations to third States. However, coercion could possibly take other forms, e.g. serious economic pressure, provided that it is such as to deprive the coerced State of any possibility of conforming with the obligation breached.

(4) The equation of coercion with force majeure means that in most cases where article 18 is applicable, the responsibility of the coerced State will be precluded vis-à-vis the injured third State. This is reflected in the phrase “but for the coercion” in subparagraph (a) of article 18. Coercion amounting to force majeure may be the reason why the wrongfulness of an act is


[425] 301 See article 49, para. 2, and commentary.
precluded vis-à-vis the coerced State. Therefore, the act is not described as an internationally wrongful act in the opening clause of the article, as is done in articles 16 and 17, where no comparable circumstance would preclude the wrongfulness of the act of the assisted or controlled State. But there is no reason why the wrongfulness of that act should be precluded vis-à-vis the coercing State. On the contrary, if the coercing State cannot be held responsible for the act, the injured State may have no redress at all.

(5) It is a further requirement for responsibility under article 18 that the coercing State must be aware of the circumstances which would, but for the coercion, have entailed the wrongfulness of the coerced State’s conduct. The reference to “circumstances” in subparagraph (b) is understood as reference to the factual situation rather than to the coercing State’s judgement of the legality of the act. This point is clarified by the phrase “circumstances of the act”. Hence, while ignorance of the law is no excuse, ignorance of the facts is material in determining the responsibility of the coercing State.

(6) A State which sets out to procure by coercion a breach of another State’s obligations to a third State will be held responsible to the third State for the consequences, regardless of whether the coercing State is also bound by the obligation in question. Otherwise, the injured State would potentially be deprived of any redress, because the acting State may be able to rely on force majeure as a circumstance precluding wrongfulness. Article 18 thus differs from articles 16 and 17 in that it does not allow for an exemption from responsibility for the act of the coerced State in circumstances where the coercing State is not itself bound by the obligation in question.

(7) State practice lends support to the principle that a State bears responsibility for the internationally wrongful conduct of another State which it coerces. In the Romano-Americana case, the claim of the United States Government in respect of the destruction of certain oil storage and other facilities owned by a United States company on the orders of the Government of Romania during the First World War was originally addressed to the British Government. At the time the facilities were destroyed, Romania was at war with Germany, which was preparing to invade the country, and the United States claimed that the Romanian authorities had been “compelled” by Great Britain to take the measures in question. In support of its claim, the United States Government argued that the circumstances of the case revealed “a situation where a strong belligerent for a purpose primarily its own arising from its defensive requirements at sea, compelled a weaker Ally to acquiesce in an operation which it carried out on the territory of that Ally”.[426] 302 The British Government denied responsibility, asserting that its influence over the conduct of the Romanian authorities “did not in any way go beyond the limits of persuasion and good counsel as between governments associated in a common cause”.[427] 303 The point of disagreement between the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain was not as to the responsibility of a State for the conduct of another State which it has coerced, but rather the existence of “compulsion” in the particular circumstances of the case.[428] 304

[427] 303 Note from the British Foreign Office dated 5 July 1928, ibid., p. 704.
[428] 304 For a different example involving the coercion of a breach of contract in circumstances amounting to a denial of justice, see C. L. Bouvé, “Russia’s liability in tort for Persia’s breach of contract”, AJIL, vol. 6, No. 2 (April 1912), p. 389.
Article 19. Effect of this chapter

This chapter is without prejudice to the international responsibility, under other provisions of these articles, of the State which commits the act in question, or of any other State.

Commentary

(1) Article 19 serves three purposes. First, it preserves the responsibility of the State which has committed the internationally wrongful act, albeit with the aid or assistance, under the direction and control or subject to the coercion of another State. It recognizes that the attribution of international responsibility to an assisting, directing or coercing State does not preclude the responsibility of the assisted, directed or coerced State.

(2) Secondly, the article makes clear that the provisions of chapter IV are without prejudice to any other basis for establishing the responsibility of the assisting, directing or coercing State under any rule of international law defining particular conduct as wrongful. The phrase “under other provisions of these articles” is a reference, inter alia, to article 23 (Force majeure), which might affect the question of responsibility. The phrase also draws attention to the fact that other provisions of the draft articles may be relevant to the State committing the act in question, and that chapter IV in no way precludes the issue of its responsibility in that regard.

(3) Thirdly, article 19 preserves the responsibility “of any other State” to whom the internationally wrongful conduct might also be attributable under other provisions of the articles.

(4) Thus, article 19 is intended to avoid any contrary inference in respect of responsibility which may arise from primary rules, precluding certain forms of assistance, or from acts otherwise attributable to any State under chapter II. The article covers both the implicated and the acting State. It makes it clear that chapter IV is concerned only with situations in which the act which lies at the origin of the wrong is an act committed by one State and not by the other. If both States commit the act, then that situation would fall within the realm of co-perpetrators, dealt with in chapter II.
Chapter V

CIRCUMSTANCES PRECLUDING WRONGFULNESS

Commentary

(1) Chapter V sets out six circumstances precluding the wrongfulness of conduct that would otherwise not be in conformity with the international obligations of the State concerned. The existence in a given case of a circumstance precluding wrongfulness in accordance with this chapter provides a shield against an otherwise well-founded claim for the breach of an international obligation. The six circumstances are: consent (art. 20), self-defence (art. 21), countermeasures (art. 22), force majeure (art. 23), distress (art. 24) and necessity (art. 25). Article 26 makes it clear that none of these circumstances can be relied on if to do so would conflict with a peremptory norm of general international law. Article 27 deals with certain consequences of the invocation of one of these circumstances.

(2) Consistent with the approach of the present articles, the circumstances precluding wrongfulness set out in chapter V are of general application. Unless otherwise provided,[429] 305 they apply to any internationally wrongful act whether it involves the breach by a State of an obligation arising under a rule of general international law, a treaty, a unilateral act or from any other source. They do not annul or terminate the obligation; rather they provide a justification or excuse for non-performance while the circumstance in question subsists. This was emphasized by ICJ in the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project case. Hungary sought to argue that the wrongfulness of its conduct in discontinuing work on the Project in breach of its obligations under the Treaty on the Construction and Operation of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Barrage System was precluded by necessity. In dealing with the Hungarian plea, the Court said:

The state of necessity claimed by Hungary—supposing it to have been established—thus could not permit of the conclusion that . . . it had acted in accordance with its obligations under the 1977 Treaty or that those obligations had ceased to be binding upon it. It would only permit the affirmation that, under the circumstances, Hungary would not incur international responsibility by acting as it did.[430] 306

Thus a distinction must be drawn between the effect of circumstances precluding wrongfulness and the termination of the obligation itself. The circumstances in chapter V operate as a shield rather than a sword. As Fitzmaurice noted, where one of the circumstances precluding wrongfulness applies, “the non-performance is not only justified, but ‘looks towards’ a resumption of performance so soon as the factors causing and justifying the non-performance are no longer present”.[431] 307

(3) This distinction emerges clearly from the decisions of international tribunals. In the “Rainbow Warrior” arbitration, the tribunal held that both the law of treaties and the law of

[429] 305 For example, by a treaty to the contrary, which would constitute a lex specialis under article 55.
