

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

REPORTS OF JUDGMENTS,
ADVISORY OPINIONS AND ORDERS

LEGAL CONSEQUENCES FOR STATES OF THE
CONTINUED PRESENCE OF SOUTH AFRICA IN
NAMIBIA (SOUTH WEST AFRICA)
NOTWITHSTANDING SECURITY COUNCIL
RESOLUTION 276 (1970)

ADVISORY OPINION OF 21 JUNE 1971

1971

COUR INTERNATIONALE DE JUSTICE

RECUEIL DES ARRÊTS,
AVIS CONSULTATIFS ET ORDONNANCES

CONSÉQUENCES JURIDIQUES POUR LES ÉTATS DE
LA PRÉSENCE CONTINUE DE L'AFRIQUE DU SUD
EN NAMIBIE (SUD-OUEST AFRICAIN)
NONOBTANT LA RÉOLUTION 276 (1970)
DU CONSEIL DE SÉCURITÉ

AVIS CONSULTATIF DU 21 JUIN 1971

Official citation:

Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.

Mode officiel de citation:

Conséquences juridiques pour les Etats de la présence continue de l'Afrique du Sud en Namibie (Sud-Ouest africain) nonobstant la résolution 276 (1970) du Conseil de sécurité, avis consultatif, C.I.J. Recueil 1971, p. 16.

Sales number
N° de vente: **352**

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

YEAR 1971

1971
21 June
General List
No. 53

21 June 1971

LEGAL CONSEQUENCES FOR STATES OF THE
CONTINUED PRESENCE OF SOUTH AFRICA IN
NAMIBIA (SOUTH WEST AFRICA) NOTWITHSTANDING
SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 276 (1970)

Composition and competence of the Court—Propriety of the Court's giving the Opinion—Concept of mandates—Characteristics of the League of Nations Mandate for South West Africa—Situation on the dissolution of the League of Nations and the setting-up of the United Nations: survival of the Mandate and transference of supervision and accountability to the United Nations—Developments in the United Nations prior to the termination of the Mandate—Revocability of the Mandate—Termination of the Mandate by the General Assembly—Action in the Security Council and effect of Security Council resolutions leading to the request for Opinion—Requests by South Africa to supply further factual information and for the holding of a plebiscite—Legal consequences for States

ADVISORY OPINION

Present: President Sir Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN; Vice-President AMMOUN; Judges Sir Gerald FITZMAURICE, PADILLA NERVO, FORSTER, GROS, BENGZON, PETRÉN, LACHS, ONYEAMA, DILLARD, IGNACIO-PINTO, DE CASTRO, MOROZOV, JIMÉNEZ DE ARÉCHAGA; Registrar AQUARONE.

Concerning the legal consequences for States of the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa), notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970),

THE COURT,

composed as above,

gives the following Advisory Opinion:

1. The question upon which the advisory opinion of the Court has been asked was laid before the Court by a letter dated 29 July 1970, filed in the Registry on 10 August, and addressed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the President of the Court. In his letter the Secretary-General informed the Court that, by resolution 284 (1970) adopted on 29 July 1970, certified true copies of the English and French texts of which were transmitted with his letter, the Security Council of the United Nations had decided to submit to the Court, with the request for an advisory opinion to be transmitted to the Security Council at an early date, the question set out in the resolution, which was in the following terms:

“*The Security Council,*

Reaffirming the special responsibility of the United Nations with regard to the territory and the people of Namibia,

Recalling Security Council resolution 276 (1970) on the question of Namibia,

Taking note of the report and recommendations submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Sub-Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 276 (1970),

Taking further note of the recommendation of the *Ad Hoc* Sub-Committee on the possibility of requesting an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice,

Considering that an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice would be useful for the Security Council in its further consideration of the question of Namibia and in furtherance of the objectives the Council is seeking

1. *Decides* to submit in accordance with Article 96 (1) of the Charter, the following question to the International Court of Justice with the request for an advisory opinion which shall be transmitted to the Security Council at an early date:

‘What are the legal consequences for States of the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia, notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970)?’

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to transmit the present resolution to the International Court of Justice, in accordance with Article 65 of the Statute of the Court, accompanied by all documents likely to throw light upon the question.”

2. On 5 August 1970, that is to say, after the despatch of the Secretary-General's letter but before its receipt by the Registry, the English and French texts of resolution 284 (1970) of the Security Council were communicated to the President of the Court by telegram from the United Nations Secretariat. The President thereupon decided that the States Members of the United Nations were likely to be able to furnish information on the question, in accordance with Article 66, paragraph 2, of the Statute, and by an Order dated 5 August 1970, the President fixed 23 September 1970 as the time-limit within which the

Court would be prepared to receive written statements from them. The same day, the Registrar sent to the States Members of the United Nations the special and direct communication provided for in Article 66 of the Statute.

3. The notice of the request for advisory opinion, prescribed by Article 66, paragraph 1, of the Statute, was given by the Registrar to all States entitled to appear before the Court by letter of 14 August 1970.

4. On 21 August 1970, the President decided that in addition to the States Members of the United Nations, the non-member States entitled to appear before the Court were also likely to be able to furnish information on the question. The same day the Registrar sent to those States the special and direct communication provided for in Article 66 of the Statute.

5. On 24 August 1970, a letter was received by the Registrar from the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of South Africa, whereby the Government of South Africa, for the reasons therein set out, requested the extension to 31 January 1971 of the time-limit for the submission of a written statement. The President of the Court, by an Order dated 28 August 1970, extended the time-limit for the submission of written statements to 19 November 1970.

6. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, in two instalments, and the following States submitted to the Court written statements or letters setting forth their views: Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Hungary, India, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, South Africa, the United States of America, Yugoslavia. Copies of these communications were transmitted to all States entitled to appear before the Court, and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and, in pursuance of Articles 44, paragraph 3, and 82, paragraph 1, of the Rules of Court, they were made accessible to the public as from 5 February 1971.

7. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, in pursuance of Article 65, paragraph 2, of the Statute transmitted to the Court a dossier of documents likely to throw light upon the question, together with an Introductory Note; these documents were received in the Registry in instalments between 5 November and 29 December 1970.

8. Before holding public sittings to hear oral statements in accordance with Article 66, paragraph 2, of the Statute, the Court had first to resolve two questions relating to its composition for the further proceedings.

9. In its written statement, filed on 19 November 1970, the Government of South Africa had taken objection to the participation of three Members of the Court in the proceedings. Its objections were based on statements made or other participation by the Members concerned, in their former capacity as representatives of their Governments, in United Nations organs which were dealing with matters concerning South West Africa. The Court gave careful consideration to the objections raised by the Government of South Africa, examining each case separately. In each of them the Court reached the conclusion that the participation of the Member concerned in his former capacity as representative of his Government, to which objection was taken in the South African Government's written statement, did not attract the application of Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court. In making Order No. 2 of 26 January 1971, the Court found no reason to depart in the present advisory proceedings from the decision adopted by the Court in the Order of 18 March 1965 in the *South West Africa* cases (*Ethiopia v. South Africa*; *Liberia v. South Africa*) after hearing the same contentions as have now been advanced by the Government of South Africa. In deciding the other two objections, the

Court took into consideration that the activities in United Nations organs of the Members concerned, prior to their election to the Court, and which are referred to in the written statement of the Government of South Africa, do not furnish grounds for treating these objections differently from those raised in the application to which the Court decided not to accede in 1965, a decision confirmed by its Order No. 2 of 26 January 1971. With reference to Order No. 3 of the same date, the Court also took into consideration a circumstance to which its attention was drawn, although it was not mentioned in the written statement of the Government of South Africa, namely the participation of the Member concerned, prior to his election to the Court, in the formulation of Security Council resolution 246 (1968), which concerned the trial at Pretoria of thirty-seven South West Africans and which in its preamble took into account General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). The Court considered that this participation of the Member concerned in the work of the United Nations, as a representative of his Government, did not justify a conclusion different from that already reached with regard to the objections raised by the Government of South Africa. Account must also be taken in this respect of precedents established by the present Court and the Permanent Court wherein judges sat in certain cases even though they had taken part in the formulation of texts the Court was asked to interpret. (*P.C.I.J., Series A, No. 1*, p. 11; *P.C.I.J., Series C, No. 84*, p. 535; *P.C.I.J., Series E, No. 4*, p. 270; *P.C.I.J., Series E, No. 8*, p. 251.) After deliberation, the Court decided, by three Orders dated 26 January 1971, and made public on that date, not to accede to the objections which had been raised.

10. By a letter from the Secretary for Foreign Affairs dated 13 November 1970, the Government of South Africa made an application for the appointment of a judge *ad hoc* to sit in the proceedings, in terms of Article 31, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court. The Court decided, in accordance with the terms of Article 46 of the Statute of the Court, to hear the contentions of South Africa on this point in camera, and a closed hearing, at which representatives of India, the Netherlands, Nigeria and the United States of America were also present, was held for the purpose on 27 January 1971.

11. By an Order dated 29 January 1971, the Court decided to reject the application of the Government of South Africa. The Court thereafter decided that the record of the closed hearing should be made accessible to the public.

12. On 29 January 1971, the Court decided, upon the application of the Organization of African Unity, that that Organization was also likely to be able to furnish information on the question before the Court, and that the Court would therefore be prepared to hear an oral statement on behalf of the Organization.

13. The States entitled to appear before the Court had been informed by the Registrar on 27 November 1970 that oral proceedings in the case would be likely to open at the beginning of February 1971. On 4 February 1971, notification was given to those States which had expressed an intention to make oral statements, and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity, that 8 February had been fixed as the opening date. At 23 public sittings held between 8 February and 17 March 1971, oral statements were made to the Court by the following representatives:

| | |
|---|---|
| for the Secretary-General of the United Nations: | Mr. C. A. Stavropoulos, Under-Secretary-General, Legal Counsel of the United Nations, and Mr. D. B. H. Vickers, Senior Legal Officer, Office of Legal Affairs; |
| for Finland: | Mr. E. J. S. Castrén, Professor of International Law in the University of Helsinki; |
| for the Organization of African Unity: | Mr. T. O. Elias, Attorney-General and Commissioner for Justice of Nigeria; |
| for India: | Mr. M. C. Chagla, M.P., Former Minister for Foreign Affairs in the Government of India; |
| for the Netherlands: | Mr. W. Riphagen, Legal Adviser to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; |
| for Nigeria: | Mr. T. O. Elias, Attorney-General and Commissioner for Justice; |
| for Pakistan: | Mr. S. S. Pirzada, S.Pk., Attorney-General of Pakistan; |
| for South Africa: | Mr. J. D. Viall, Legal Adviser to the Department of Foreign Affairs, Mr. D. P. de Villiers, S.C., Advocate of the Supreme Court of South Africa, Mr. E. M. Grosskopf, S.C., Member of the South African Bar, Mr. H. J. O. van Heerden, Member of the South African Bar, Mr. R. F. Botha, Member of the South African Bar, Mr. M. Wiechers, Professor of Law in the University of South Africa; |
| for the Republic of Viet-Nam: | Mr. Le Tai Trien, Attorney-General, Supreme Court of Viet-Nam; |
| for the United States of America: | Mr. J. R. Stevenson, The Legal Adviser, Department of State. |

14. Prior to the opening of the public sittings, the Court decided to examine first of all certain observations made by the Government of South Africa in its written statement, and in a letter dated 14 January 1971, in support of its submission that the Court should decline to give an advisory opinion.

15. At the opening of the public sittings on 8 February 1971, the President of the Court announced that the Court had reached a unanimous decision thereon. The substance of the submission of the Government of South Africa and the decision of the Court are dealt with in paragraphs 28 and 29 of the Advisory Opinion, below.

16. By a letter of 27 January 1971, the Government of South Africa had submitted a proposal to the Court regarding the holding of a plebiscite in the Territory of Namibia (South West Africa), and this proposal was elaborated in a further letter of 6 February 1971, which explained that the plebiscite was to determine whether it was the wish of the inhabitants "that the Territory should continue to be administered by the South African Government or should henceforth be administered by the United Nations".

17. At the hearing of 5 March 1971, the representative of South Africa explained further the position of his Government with regard to the proposed plebiscite, and indicated that his Government considered it necessary to adduce considerable evidence on the factual issues which it regarded as underlying the question before the Court. At the close of the hearing, on 17 March 1971, the President made the following statement:

“The Court has considered the request submitted by the representative of South Africa in his letter of 6 February 1971 that a plebiscite should be held in the Territory of Namibia (South West Africa) under the joint supervision of the Court and the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

The Court cannot pronounce upon this request at the present stage without anticipating, or appearing to anticipate, its decision on one or more of the main issues now before it. Consequently, the Court must defer its answer to this request until a later date.

The Court has also had under consideration the desire of the Government of the Republic to supply the Court with further factual material concerning the situation in Namibia (South West Africa). However, until the Court has been able first to examine some of the legal issues which must, in any event, be dealt with, it will not be in a position to determine whether it requires additional material on the facts. The Court must accordingly defer its decision on this matter as well.

If, at any time, the Court should find itself in need of further arguments or information, on these or any other matters, it will notify the governments and organizations whose representatives have participated in the oral hearings.”

18. On 14 May 1971 the President sent the following letter to the representatives of the Secretary-General, of the Organization of African Unity and of the States which had participated in the oral proceedings:

“I have the honour to refer to the statement which I made at the end of the oral hearing on the advisory proceedings relating to the Territory of Namibia (South West Africa) on 17 March last . . . , to the effect that the Court considered it appropriate to defer until a later date its decision regarding the requests of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (*a*) for the holding in that Territory of a plebiscite under the joint supervision of the Court and the Government of the Republic; and (*b*) to be allowed to supply the Court with further factual material concerning the situation there.

I now have the honour to inform you that the Court, having examined the matter, does not find itself in need of further arguments or information, and has decided to refuse both these requests.”

* * *

19. Before examining the merits of the question submitted to it the Court must consider the objections that have been raised to its doing so.

20. The Government of South Africa has contended that for several reasons resolution 284 (1970) of the Security Council, which requested

the advisory opinion of the Court, is invalid, and that, therefore, the Court is not competent to deliver the opinion. A resolution of a properly constituted organ of the United Nations which is passed in accordance with that organ's rules of procedure, and is declared by its President to have been so passed, must be presumed to have been validly adopted. However, since in this instance the objections made concern the competence of the Court, the Court will proceed to examine them.

21. The first objection is that in the voting on the resolution two permanent members of the Security Council abstained. It is contended that the resolution was consequently not adopted by an affirmative vote of nine members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members, as required by Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations.

22. However, the proceedings of the Security Council extending over a long period supply abundant evidence that presidential rulings and the positions taken by members of the Council, in particular its permanent members, have consistently and uniformly interpreted the practice of voluntary abstention by a permanent member as not constituting a bar to the adoption of resolutions. By abstaining, a member does not signify its objection to the approval of what is being proposed; in order to prevent the adoption of a resolution requiring unanimity of the permanent members, a permanent member has only to cast a negative vote. This procedure followed by the Security Council, which has continued unchanged after the amendment in 1965 of Article 27 of the Charter, has been generally accepted by Members of the United Nations and evidences a general practice of that Organization.

23. The Government of South Africa has also argued that as the question relates to a dispute between South Africa and other Members of the United Nations, South Africa, as a Member of the United Nations, not a member of the Security Council and a party to a dispute, should have been invited under Article 32 of the Charter to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to it. It further contended that the proviso at the end of Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter, requiring members of the Security Council which are parties to a dispute to abstain from voting, should have been complied with.

24. The language of Article 32 of the Charter is mandatory, but the question whether the Security Council must extend an invitation in accordance with that provision depends on whether it has made a determination that the matter under its consideration is in the nature of a dispute. In the absence of such a determination Article 32 of the Charter does not apply.

25. The question of Namibia was placed on the agenda of the Security Council as a "situation" and not as a "dispute". No member State made any suggestion or proposal that the matter should be examined as a dispute, although due notice was given of the placing of the question

on the Security Council's agenda under the title "Situation in Namibia". Had the Government of South Africa considered that the question should have been treated in the Security Council as a dispute, it should have drawn the Council's attention to that aspect of the matter. Having failed to raise the question at the appropriate time in the proper forum, it is not open to it to raise it before the Court at this stage.

26. A similar answer must be given to the related objection based on the proviso to paragraph 3 of Article 27 of the Charter. This proviso also requires for its application the prior determination by the Security Council that a dispute exists and that certain members of the Council are involved as parties to such a dispute.

* * *

27. In the alternative the Government of South Africa has contended that even if the Court had competence to give the opinion requested, it should nevertheless, as a matter of judicial propriety, refuse to exercise its competence.

28. The first reason invoked in support of this contention is the supposed disability of the Court to give the opinion requested by the Security Council, because of political pressure to which the Court, according to the Government of South Africa, has been or might be subjected.

29. It would not be proper for the Court to entertain these observations, bearing as they do on the very nature of the Court as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, an organ which, in that capacity, acts only on the basis of the law, independently of all outside influence or interventions whatsoever, in the exercise of the judicial function entrusted to it alone by the Charter and its Statute. A court functioning as a court of law can act in no other way.

30. The second reason advanced on behalf of the Government of South Africa in support of its contention that the Court should refuse to accede to the request of the Security Council is that the relevant legal question relates to an existing dispute between South Africa and other States. In this context it relies on the case of *Eastern Carelia* and argues that the Permanent Court of International Justice declined to rule upon the question referred to it because it was directly related to the main point of a dispute actually pending between two States.

31. However, that case is not relevant, as it differs from the present one. For instance one of the States concerned in that case was not at the time a Member of the League of Nations and did not appear before the Permanent Court. South Africa, as a Member of the United Nations, is bound by Article 96 of the Charter, which empowers the Security Council to request advisory opinions on any legal question. It has appeared before the Court, participated in both the written and oral pro-

ceedings and, while raising specific objections against the competence of the Court, has addressed itself to the merits of the question.

32. Nor does the Court find that in this case the Security Council's request relates to a legal dispute actually pending between two or more States. It is not the purpose of the request to obtain the assistance of the Court in the exercise of the Security Council's functions relating to the pacific settlement of a dispute pending before it between two or more States. The request is put forward by a United Nations organ with reference to its own decisions and it seeks legal advice from the Court on the consequences and implications of these decisions. This objective is stressed by the preamble to the resolution requesting the opinion, in which the Security Council has stated "that an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice would be useful for the Security Council in its further consideration of the question of Namibia and in furtherance of the objectives the Council is seeking". It is worth recalling that in its Advisory Opinion on *Reservations to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, the Court stated: "The object of this request for an Opinion is to guide the United Nations in respect of its own action" (*I.C.J. Reports 1951*, p. 19).

33. The Court does not find either that in this case the advisory opinion concerns a dispute between South Africa and the United Nations. In the course of the oral proceedings Counsel for the Government of South Africa stated:

"... our submission is not that the question is a dispute, but that in order to answer the question the Court will have to decide legal and factual issues which are actually in dispute between South Africa and other States"

34. The fact that, in the course of its reasoning, and in order to answer the question submitted to it, the Court may have to pronounce on legal issues upon which radically divergent views exist between South Africa and the United Nations, does not convert the present case into a dispute nor bring it within the compass of Articles 82 and 83 of the Rules of Court. A similar position existed in the three previous advisory proceedings concerning South West Africa: in none of them did South Africa claim that there was a dispute, nor did the Court feel it necessary to apply the Rules of Court concerning "a legal question actually pending between two or more States". Differences of views among States on legal issues have existed in practically every advisory proceeding; if all were agreed, the need to resort to the Court for advice would not arise.

35. In accordance with Article 83 of the Rules of Court, the question whether the advisory opinion had been requested "upon a legal question actually pending between two or more States" was also of decisive im-

portance in the Court's consideration of the request made by the Government of South Africa for the appointment of a judge *ad hoc*. As already indicated, the Court heard argument in support of that request and, after due deliberation, decided, by an Order of 29 January 1971, not to accede to it. This decision was based on the conclusion that the terms of the request for advisory opinion, the circumstances in which it had been submitted (which are described in para. 32 above), as well as the considerations set forth in paragraphs 33 and 34 above, were such as to preclude the interpretation that an opinion had been "requested upon a legal question actually pending between two or more States". Thus, in the opinion of the Court, South Africa was not entitled under Article 83 of the Rules of Court to the appointment of a judge *ad hoc*.

36. It has been urged that the possible existence of a dispute was a point of substance which was prematurely disposed of by the Order of 29 January 1971. Now the question whether a judge *ad hoc* should be appointed is of course a matter concerning the composition of the Bench and possesses, as the Government of South Africa recognized, absolute logical priority. It has to be settled prior to the opening of the oral proceedings, and indeed before any further issues, even of procedure, can be decided. Until it is disposed of the Court cannot proceed with the case. It is thus a logical necessity that any request for the appointment of a judge *ad hoc* must be treated as a preliminary matter on the basis of a *prima facie* appreciation of the facts and the law. This cannot be construed as meaning that the Court's decision thereon may involve the irrevocable disposal of a point of substance or of one related to the Court's competence. Thus, in a contentious case, when preliminary objections have been raised, the appointment of judges *ad hoc* must be decided before the hearing of those objections. That decision, however, does not prejudice the Court's competence if, for instance, it is claimed that no dispute exists. Conversely, to assert that the question of the judge *ad hoc* could not be validly settled until the Court had been able to analyse substantive issues is tantamount to suggesting that the composition of the Court could be left in suspense, and thus the validity of its proceedings left in doubt, until an advanced stage in the case.

37. The only question which was in fact settled with finality by the Order of 29 January 1971 was the one relating to the Court's composition for the purpose of the present case. That decision was adopted on the authority of Article 3, paragraph 1, of the Rules of Court and in accordance with Article 55, paragraph 1, of the Statute. Consequently, after the adoption of that decision, while differing views might still be held as to the applicability of Article 83 of the Rules of Court in the present case, the regularity of the composition of the Court for the

purposes of delivering the present Advisory Opinion, in accordance with the Statute and the Rules of Court, is no longer open to question.

38. In connection with the possible appointment of judges *ad hoc*, it has further been suggested that the final clause in paragraph 1 of Article 82 of the Rules of Court obliges the Court to determine as a preliminary question whether the request relates to a legal question actually pending between two or more States. The Court cannot accept this reading, which overstrains the literal meaning of the words "*avant tout*". It is difficult to conceive that an Article providing general guidelines in the relatively unschematic context of advisory proceedings should prescribe a rigid sequence in the action of the Court. This is confirmed by the practice of the Court, which in no previous advisory proceedings has found it necessary to make an independent preliminary determination of this question or of its own competence, even when specifically requested to do so. Likewise, the interpretation of the Rules of Court as imposing a procedure *in limine litis*, which has been suggested, corresponds neither to the text of the Article nor to its purpose, which is to regulate advisory proceedings without impairing the flexibility which Articles 66, paragraph 4, and 68 of the Statute allow the Court so that it may adjust its procedure to the requirements of each particular case. The phrase in question merely indicates that the test of legal pendency is to be considered "above all" by the Court for the purpose of exercising the latitude granted by Article 68 of the Statute to be guided by the provisions which apply in contentious cases to the extent to which the Court recognizes them to be applicable. From a practical point of view it may be added that the procedure suggested, analogous to that followed in contentious procedure with respect to preliminary objections, would not have dispensed with the need to decide on the request for the appointment of a judge *ad hoc* as a previous, independent decision, just as in contentious cases the question of judges *ad hoc* must be settled before any hearings on the preliminary objections may be proceeded with. Finally, it must be observed that such proposed preliminary decision under Article 82 of the Rules of Court would not necessarily have predetermined the decision which it is suggested should have been taken subsequently under Article 83, since the latter provision envisages a more restricted hypothesis: that the advisory opinion is requested *upon* a legal question actually pending and not that it *relates* to such a question.

39. The view has also been expressed that even if South Africa is not entitled to a judge *ad hoc* as a matter of right, the Court should, in the exercise of the discretion granted by Article 68 of the Statute, have allowed such an appointment, in recognition of the fact that South Africa's interests are specially affected in the present case. In this connection the Court wishes to recall a decision taken by the Permanent Court at a time when the Statute did not include any provision concerning advisory opinions, the entire regulation of the procedure in the matter being thus left to the Court (*P.C.I.J., Series E, No. 4, p. 76*). Confronted with a

request for the appointment of a judge *ad hoc* in a case in which it found there was no dispute, the Court, in rejecting the request, stated that "the decision of the Court must be in accordance with its Statute and with the Rules duly framed by it in pursuance of Article 30 of the Statute" (Order of 31 October 1935, *P.C.I.J., Series A/B, No. 65*, Annex 1, p. 69 at p. 70). It found further that the "exception cannot be given a wider application than is provided for by the Rules" (*ibid.*, p. 71). In the present case the Court, having regard to the Rules of Court adopted under Article 30 of the Statute, came to the conclusion that it was unable to exercise discretion in this respect.

40. The Government of South Africa has also expressed doubts as to whether the Court is competent to, or should, give an opinion, if, in order to do so, it should have to make findings as to extensive factual issues. In the view of the Court, the contingency that there may be factual issues underlying the question posed does not alter its character as a "legal question" as envisaged in Article 96 of the Charter. The reference in this provision to legal questions cannot be interpreted as opposing legal to factual issues. Normally, to enable a court to pronounce on legal questions, it must also be acquainted with, take into account and, if necessary, make findings as to the relevant factual issues. The limitation of the powers of the Court contended for by the Government of South Africa has no basis in the Charter or the Statute.

41. The Court could, of course, acting on its own, exercise the discretion vested in it by Article 65, paragraph 1, of the Statute and decline to accede to the request for an advisory opinion. In considering this possibility the Court must bear in mind that: "A reply to a request for an Opinion should not, in principle, be refused." (*I.C.J. Reports 1951*, p. 19.) The Court has considered whether there are any "compelling reasons", as referred to in the past practice of the Court, which would justify such a refusal. It has found no such reasons. Moreover, it feels that by replying to the request it would not only "remain faithful to the requirements of its judicial character" (*I.C.J. Reports 1960*, p. 153), but also discharge its functions as "the principal judicial organ of the United Nations" (Art. 92 of the Charter).

* * *

42. Having established that it is properly seised of a request for an advisory opinion, the Court will now proceed to an analysis of the question placed before it: "What are the legal consequences for States of the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia, notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970)?"

43. The Government of South Africa in both its written and oral statements has covered a wide field of history, going back to the origin and functioning of the Mandate. The same and similar problems were

dealt with by other governments, the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in their written and oral statements.

44. A series of important issues is involved: the nature of the Mandate, its working under the League of Nations, the consequences of the demise of the League and of the establishment of the United Nations and the impact of further developments within the new organization. While the Court is aware that this is the sixth time it has had to deal with the issues involved in the Mandate for South West Africa, it has nonetheless reached the conclusion that it is necessary for it to consider and summarize some of the issues underlying the question addressed to it. In particular, the Court will examine the substance and scope of Article 22 of the League Covenant and the nature of "C" mandates.

45. The Government of South Africa, in its written statement, presented a detailed analysis of the intentions of some of the participants in the Paris Peace Conference, who approved a resolution which, with some alterations and additions, eventually became Article 22 of the Covenant. At the conclusion and in the light of this analysis it suggested that it was quite natural for commentators to refer to "'C' mandates as being in their practical effect not far removed from annexation". This view, which the Government of South Africa appears to have adopted, would be tantamount to admitting that the relevant provisions of the Covenant were of a purely nominal character and that the rights they enshrined were of their very nature imperfect and unenforceable. It puts too much emphasis on the intentions of some of the parties and too little on the instrument which emerged from those negotiations. It is thus necessary to refer to the actual text of Article 22 of the Covenant, paragraph 1 of which declares:

"1. To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilisation and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant."

As the Court recalled in its 1950 Advisory Opinion on the *International Status of South-West Africa*, in the setting-up of the mandates system "two principles were considered to be of paramount importance: the principle of non-annexation and the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form 'a sacred trust of civilization'" (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 131).

46. It is self-evident that the "trust" had to be exercised for the benefit of the peoples concerned, who were admitted to have interests of their

own and to possess a potentiality for independent existence on the attainment of a certain stage of development: the mandates system was designed to provide peoples "not yet" able to manage their own affairs with the help and guidance necessary to enable them to arrive at the stage where they would be "able to stand by themselves". The requisite means of assistance to that end is dealt with in paragraph 2 of Article 22:

"2. The best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience or their geographical position can best undertake this responsibility, and who are willing to accept it, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as Mandatories on behalf of the League."

This made it clear that those Powers which were to undertake the task envisaged would be acting exclusively as mandatories on behalf of the League. As to the position of the League, the Court found in its 1950 Advisory Opinion that: "The League was not, as alleged by [the South African] Government, a 'mandator' in the sense in which this term is used in the national law of certain States." The Court pointed out that: "The Mandate was created, in the interest of the inhabitants of the territory, and of humanity in general, as an international institution with an international object—a sacred trust of civilisation." Therefore, the Court found, the League "had only assumed an international function of supervision and control" (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 132).

47. The acceptance of a mandate on these terms connoted the assumption of obligations not only of a moral but also of a binding legal character; and, as a corollary of the trust, "securities for [its] performance" were instituted (para. 7 of Art. 22) in the form of legal accountability for its discharge and fulfilment:

"7. In every case of mandate, the Mandatory shall render to the Council an annual report in reference to the territory committed to its charge."

48. A further security for the performance of the trust was embodied in paragraph 9 of Article 22:

"9. A permanent Commission shall be constituted to receive and examine the annual reports of the Mandatories and to advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the mandates."

Thus the reply to the essential question, *quis custodiet ipsos custodes?*, was given in terms of the mandatory's accountability to international

organs. An additional measure of supervision was introduced by a resolution of the Council of the League of Nations, adopted on 31 January 1923. Under this resolution the mandatory Governments were to transmit to the League petitions from communities or sections of the populations of mandated territories.

49. Paragraph 8 of Article 22 of the Covenant gave the following directive:

“8. The degree of authority, control or administration to be exercised by the Mandatory shall, if not previously agreed upon by the Members of the League, be explicitly defined in each case by the Council.”

In pursuance of this directive, a Mandate for German South West Africa was drawn up which defined the terms of the Mandatory's administration in seven articles. Of these, Article 6 made explicit the obligation of the Mandatory under paragraph 7 of Article 22 of the Covenant by providing that “The Mandatory shall make to the Council of the League of Nations an annual report to the satisfaction of the Council, containing full information with regard to the territory, and indicating the measures taken to carry out the obligations assumed under Articles 2, 3, 4 and 5” of the Mandate. As the Court said in 1950: “the Mandatory was to observe a number of obligations, and the Council of the League was to supervise the administration and see to it that these obligations were fulfilled” (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 132). In sum the relevant provisions of the Covenant and those of the Mandate itself preclude any doubt as to the establishment of definite legal obligations designed for the attainment of the object and purpose of the Mandate.

50. As indicated in paragraph 45 above, the Government of South Africa has dwelt at some length on the negotiations which preceded the adoption of the final version of Article 22 of the League Covenant, and has suggested that they lead to a different reading of its provisions. It is true that as that Government points out, there had been a strong tendency to annex former enemy colonial territories. Be that as it may, the final outcome of the negotiations, however difficult of achievement, was a rejection of the notion of annexation. It cannot tenably be argued that the clear meaning of the mandate institution could be ignored by placing upon the explicit provisions embodying its principles a construction at variance with its object and purpose.

51. Events subsequent to the adoption of the instruments in question should also be considered. The Allied and Associated Powers, in their Reply to Observations of the German Delegation, referred in 1919 to “the mandatory Powers, which in so far as they may be appointed trustees by the League of Nations will derive no benefit from such trusteeship”. As to the Mandate for South West Africa, its preamble

recited that “His Britannic Majesty, for and on behalf of the Government of the Union of South Africa, has agreed to accept the Mandate in respect of the said territory and has undertaken to exercise it on behalf of the League of Nations”.

52. Furthermore, the subsequent development of international law in regard to non-self-governing territories, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, made the principle of self-determination applicable to all of them. The concept of the sacred trust was confirmed and expanded to all “territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government” (Art. 73). Thus it clearly embraced territories under a colonial régime. Obviously the sacred trust continued to apply to League of Nations mandated territories on which an international status had been conferred earlier. A further important stage in this development was the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which embraces all peoples and territories which “have not yet attained independence”. Nor is it possible to leave out of account the political history of mandated territories in general. All those which did not acquire independence, excluding Namibia, were placed under trusteeship. Today, only two out of fifteen, excluding Namibia, remain under United Nations tutelage. This is but a manifestation of the general development which has led to the birth of so many new States.

53. All these considerations are germane to the Court’s evaluation of the present case. Mindful as it is of the primary necessity of interpreting an instrument in accordance with the intentions of the parties at the time of its conclusion, the Court is bound to take into account the fact that the concepts embodied in Article 22 of the Covenant—“the strenuous conditions of the modern world” and “the well-being and development” of the peoples concerned—were not static, but were by definition evolutionary, as also, therefore, was the concept of the “sacred trust”. The parties to the Covenant must consequently be deemed to have accepted them as such. That is why, viewing the institutions of 1919, the Court must take into consideration the changes which have occurred in the supervening half-century, and its interpretation cannot remain unaffected by the subsequent development of law, through the Charter of the United Nations and by way of customary law. Moreover, an international instrument has to be interpreted and applied within the framework of the entire legal system prevailing at the time of the interpretation. In the domain to which the present proceedings relate, the last fifty years, as indicated above, have brought important developments. These developments leave little doubt that the ultimate objective of the sacred trust was the self-determination and independence of the peoples concerned. In this domain, as elsewhere, the *corpus iuris gentium* has been

considerably enriched, and this the Court, if it is faithfully to discharge its functions, may not ignore.

54. In the light of the foregoing, the Court is unable to accept any construction which would attach to "C" mandates an object and purpose different from those of "A" or "B" mandates. The only differences were those appearing from the language of Article 22 of the Covenant, and from the particular mandate instruments, but the objective and safeguards remained the same, with no exceptions such as considerations of geographical contiguity. To hold otherwise would mean that territories under "C" mandate belonged to the family of mandates only in name, being in fact the objects of disguised cessions, as if the affirmation that they could "be best administered under the laws of the Mandatory as integral portions of its territory" (Art. 22, para. 6) conferred upon the administering Power a special title not vested in States entrusted with "A" or "B" mandates. The Court would recall in this respect what was stated in the 1962 Judgment in the *South West Africa* cases as applying to all categories of mandate:

"The rights of the Mandatory in relation to the mandated territory and the inhabitants have their foundation in the obligations of the Mandatory and they are, so to speak, mere tools given to enable it to fulfil its obligations." (*I.C.J. Reports 1962*, p. 329.)

* * *

55. The Court will now turn to the situation which arose on the demise of the League and with the birth of the United Nations. As already recalled, the League of Nations was the international organization entrusted with the exercise of the supervisory functions of the Mandate. Those functions were an indispensable element of the Mandate. But that does not mean that the mandates institution was to collapse with the disappearance of the original supervisory machinery. To the question whether the continuance of a mandate was inseparably linked with the existence of the League, the answer must be that an institution established for the fulfilment of a sacred trust cannot be presumed to lapse before the achievement of its purpose. The responsibilities of both mandatory and supervisor resulting from the mandates institution were complementary, and the disappearance of one or the other could not affect the survival of the institution. That is why, in 1950, the Court remarked, in connection with the obligations corresponding to the sacred trust:

"Their *raison d'être* and original object remain. Since their fulfilment did not depend on the existence of the League of Nations, they could not be brought to an end merely because this supervisory

organ ceased to exist. Nor could the right of the population to have the Territory administered in accordance with these rules depend thereon." (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 133.)

In the particular case, specific provisions were made and decisions taken for the transfer of functions from the organization which was to be wound up to that which came into being.

56. Within the framework of the United Nations an international trusteeship system was established and it was clearly contemplated that mandated territories considered as not yet ready for independence would be converted into trust territories under the United Nations international trusteeship system. This system established a wider and more effective international supervision than had been the case under the mandates of the League of Nations.

57. It would have been contrary to the overriding purpose of the mandates system to assume that difficulties in the way of the replacement of one régime by another designed to improve international supervision should have been permitted to bring about, on the dissolution of the League, a complete disappearance of international supervision. To accept the contention of the Government of South Africa on this point would have entailed the reversion of mandated territories to colonial status, and the virtual replacement of the mandates régime by annexation, so determinedly excluded in 1920.

58. These compelling considerations brought about the insertion in the Charter of the United Nations of the safeguarding clause contained in Article 80, paragraph 1, of the Charter, which reads as follows:

"1. Except as may be agreed upon in individual trusteeship agreements, made under Articles 77, 79 and 81, placing each territory under the trusteeship system, and until such agreements have been concluded, nothing in this Chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any States or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which Members of the United Nations may respectively be parties."

59. A striking feature of this provision is the stipulation in favour of the preservation of the rights of "any peoples", thus clearly including the inhabitants of the mandated territories and, in particular, their indigenous populations. These rights were thus confirmed to have an existence independent of that of the League of Nations. The Court, in the 1950 Advisory Opinion on the *International Status of South-West Africa*, relied on this provision to reach the conclusion that "no such rights of the peoples could be effectively safeguarded without inter-

national supervision and a duty to render reports to a supervisory organ” (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 137). In 1956 the Court confirmed the conclusion that “the effect of Article 80 (1) of the Charter” was that of “preserving the rights of States and peoples” (*I.C.J. Reports 1956*, p. 27).

60. Article 80, paragraph 1, of the Charter was thus interpreted by the Court as providing that the system of replacement of mandates by trusteeship agreements, resulting from Chapter XII of the Charter, shall not “be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any States or any peoples”.

61. The exception made in the initial words of the provision, “Except as may be agreed upon in individual trusteeship agreements, made under Articles 77, 79 and 81, placing each territory under the trusteeship system, and until such agreements have been concluded”, established a particular method for changing the status quo of a mandate régime. This could be achieved only by means of a trusteeship agreement, unless the “sacred trust” had come to an end by the implementation of its objective, that is, the attainment of independent existence. In this way, by the use of the expression “until such agreements have been concluded”, a legal hiatus between the two systems was obviated.

62. The final words of Article 80, paragraph 1, refer to “the terms of existing international instruments to which Members of the United Nations may respectively be parties”. The records of the San Francisco Conference show that these words were inserted in replacement of the words “any mandate” in an earlier draft in order to preserve “any rights set forth in paragraph 4 of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations”.

63. In approving this amendment and inserting these words in the report of Committee II/4, the States participating at the San Francisco Conference obviously took into account the fact that the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations would render the disappearance of the League of Nations inevitable. This shows the common understanding and intention at San Francisco that Article 80, paragraph 1, of the Charter had the purpose and effect of keeping in force all rights whatsoever, including those contained in the Covenant itself, against any claim as to their possible lapse with the dissolution of the League.

64. The demise of the League could thus not be considered as an unexpected supervening event entailing a possible termination of those rights, entirely alien to Chapter XII of the Charter and not foreseen by the safeguarding provisions of Article 80, paragraph 1. The Members of the League, upon effecting the dissolution of that organization, did not declare, or accept even by implication, that the mandates would be cancelled or lapse with the dissolution of the League. On the contrary,

paragraph 4 of the resolution on mandates of 18 April 1946 clearly assumed their continuation.

65. The Government of South Africa, in asking the Court to reappraise the 1950 Advisory Opinion, has argued that Article 80, paragraph 1, must be interpreted as a mere saving clause having a purely negative effect.

66. If Article 80, paragraph 1, were to be understood as a mere interpretative provision preventing the operation of Chapter XII from affecting any rights, then it would be deprived of all practical effect. There is nothing in Chapter XII—which, as interpreted by the Court in 1950, constitutes a framework for future agreements—susceptible of affecting existing rights of States or of peoples under the mandates system. Likewise, if paragraph 1 of Article 80 were to be understood as a mere saving clause, paragraph 2 of the same Article would have no purpose. This paragraph provides as follows:

“2. Paragraph 1 of this Article shall not be interpreted as giving grounds for delay or postponement of the negotiation and conclusion of agreements for placing mandated and other territories under the trusteeship system as provided for in Article 77.”

This provision was obviously intended to prevent a mandatory Power from invoking the preservation of its rights resulting from paragraph 1 as a ground for delaying or postponing what the Court described as “the normal course indicated by the Charter, namely, conclude Trusteeship Agreements” (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 140). No method of interpretation would warrant the conclusion that Article 80 as a whole is meaningless.

67. In considering whether negative effects only may be attributed to Article 80, paragraph 1, as contended by South Africa, account must be taken of the words at the end of Article 76 (*d*) of the Charter, which, as one of the basic objectives of the trusteeship system, ensures equal treatment in commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals. The proviso “subject to the provisions of Article 80” was included at the San Francisco Conference in order to preserve the existing right of preference of the mandatory Powers in “C” mandates. The delegate of the Union of South Africa at the Conference had pointed out earlier that “the ‘open door’ had not previously applied to the ‘C’ mandates”, adding that “his Government could not contemplate its application to their mandated territory”. If Article 80, paragraph 1, had no conservatory and positive effects, and if the rights therein preserved could have been extinguished with the disappearance of the League of Nations, then the proviso in Article 76 (*d*) *in fine* would be deprived of any practical meaning.

68. The Government of South Africa has invoked as “new facts” not fully before the Court in 1950 a proposal introduced by the Chinese delegation at the final Assembly of the League of Nations and another submitted by the Executive Committee to the United Nations Preparatory Commission, both providing in explicit terms for the transfer of supervisory functions over mandates from the League of Nations to United Nations organs. It is argued that, since neither of these two proposals was adopted, no such transfer was envisaged.

69. The Court is unable to accept the argument advanced. The fact that a particular proposal is not adopted by an international organ does not necessarily carry with it the inference that a collective pronouncement is made in a sense opposite to that proposed. There can be many reasons determining rejection or non-approval. For instance, the Chinese proposal, which was never considered but was ruled out of order, would have subjected mandated territories to a form of supervision which went beyond the scope of the existing supervisory authority in respect of mandates, and could have raised difficulties with respect to Article 82 of the Charter. As to the establishment of a Temporary Trusteeship Committee, it was opposed because it was felt that the setting up of such an organ might delay the negotiation and conclusion of trusteeship agreements. Consequently two United States proposals, intended to authorize this Committee to undertake the functions previously performed by the Mandates Commission, could not be acted upon. The non-establishment of a temporary subsidiary body empowered to assist the General Assembly in the exercise of its supervisory functions over mandates cannot be interpreted as implying that the General Assembly lacked competence or could not itself exercise its functions in that field. On the contrary, the general assumption appeared to be that the supervisory functions over mandates previously performed by the League were to be exercised by the United Nations. Thus, in the discussions concerning the proposed setting-up of the Temporary Trusteeship Committee, no observation was made to the effect that the League’s supervisory functions had not been transferred to the United Nations. Indeed, the South African representative at the United Nations Preparatory Commission declared on 29 November 1945 that “it seemed reasonable to create an interim body as the Mandates Commission was now in abeyance and countries holding mandates should have a body to which they could report”.

70. The Government of South Africa has further contended that the provision in Article 80, paragraph 1, that the terms of “existing international instruments” shall not be construed as altered by anything in Chapter XII of the Charter, cannot justify the conclusion that the duty to report under the Mandate was transferred from the Council of the

League to the United Nations.

71. This objection fails to take into consideration Article 10 in Chapter IV of the Charter, a provision which was relied upon in the 1950 Opinion to justify the transference of supervisory powers from the League Council to the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Court then said:

“The competence of the General Assembly of the United Nations to exercise such supervision and to receive and examine reports is derived from the provisions of Article 10 of the Charter, which authorizes the General Assembly to discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the Charter and to make recommendations on these questions or matters to the Members of the United Nations.” (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 137.)

72. Since a provision of the Charter—Article 80, paragraph 1—had maintained the obligations of the Mandatory, the United Nations had become the appropriate forum for supervising the fulfilment of those obligations. Thus, by virtue of Article 10 of the Charter, South Africa agreed to submit its administration of South West Africa to the scrutiny of the General Assembly, on the basis of the information furnished by the Mandatory or obtained from other sources. The transfer of the obligation to report, from the League Council to the General Assembly, was merely a corollary of the powers granted to the General Assembly. These powers were in fact exercised by it, as found by the Court in the 1950 Advisory Opinion. The Court rightly concluded in 1950 that—

“... the General Assembly of the United Nations is legally qualified to exercise the supervisory functions previously exercised by the League of Nations with regard to the administration of the Territory, and that the Union of South Africa is under an obligation to submit to supervision and control of the General Assembly and to render annual reports to it” (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 137).

In its 1955 Advisory Opinion on *Voting Procedure on Questions relating to Reports and Petitions concerning the Territory of South-West Africa*, after recalling some passages from the 1950 Advisory Opinion, the Court stated:

“Thus, the authority of the General Assembly to exercise supervision over the administration of South-West Africa as a mandated Territory is based on the provisions of the Charter.” (*I.C.J. Reports 1955*, p. 76.)

In the 1956 Advisory Opinion on *Admissibility of Hearings of Petitioners by the Committee on South West Africa*, again after referring to certain passages from the 1950 Advisory Opinion, the Court stated:

“Accordingly, the obligations of the Mandatory continue unimpaired with this difference, that the supervisory functions exercised by the Council of the League of Nations are now to be exercised by the United Nations.” (*I.C.J. Reports 1956*, p. 27.)

In the same Opinion the Court further stated:

“... the paramount purpose underlying the taking over by the General Assembly of the United Nations of the supervisory functions in respect of the Mandate for South West Africa formerly exercised by the Council of the League of Nations was to safeguard the sacred trust of civilization through the maintenance of effective international supervision of the administration of the Mandated Territory” (*ibid.*, p. 28).

* * *

73. With regard to the intention of the League, it is essential to recall that, at its last session, the Assembly of the League, by a resolution adopted on 12 April 1946, attributed to itself the responsibilities of the Council in the following terms:

“The Assembly, with the concurrence of all the Members of the Council which are represented at its present session: Decides that, so far as required, it will, during the present session, assume the functions falling within the competence of the Council.”

Thereupon, before finally dissolving the League, the Assembly on 18 April 1946, adopted a resolution providing as follows for the continuation of the mandates and the mandates system:

“The Assembly . . .

3. Recognises that, on the termination of the League’s existence, its functions with respect to the mandated territories will come to an end, but notes that Chapters XI, XII and XIII of the Charter of the United Nations embody principles corresponding to those declared in Article 22 of the Covenant of the League;

4. Takes note of the expressed intentions of the Members of the League now administering territories under mandate to continue to administer them for the well-being and development of the peoples concerned in accordance with the obligations contained in the respective Mandates, until other arrangements have been agreed between the United Nations and the respective mandatory Powers.”

As stated in the Court's 1962 Judgment:

"... the League of Nations in ending its own existence did not terminate the Mandates but ... definitely intended to continue them by its resolution of 18 April 1946" (*I.C.J. Reports 1962*, p. 334).

74. That the Mandate had not lapsed was also admitted by the Government of South Africa on several occasions during the early period of transition, when the United Nations was being formed and the League dissolved. In particular, on 9 April 1946, the representative of South Africa, after announcing his Government's intention to transform South West Africa into an integral part of the Union, declared before the Assembly of the League:

"In the meantime, the Union will continue to administer the territory scrupulously in accordance with the obligations of the Mandate, for the advancement and promotion of the interests of the inhabitants, as she has done during the past six years when meetings of the Mandates Commission could not be held.

The disappearance of those organs of the League concerned with the supervision of mandates, primarily the Mandates Commission and the League Council, will necessarily preclude complete compliance with the letter of the Mandate. The Union Government will nevertheless regard the dissolution of the League as in no way diminishing its obligations under the Mandate, which it will continue to discharge with the full and proper appreciation of its responsibilities until such time as other arrangements are agreed upon concerning the future status of the territory."

The Court referred to this statement in its Judgment of 1962, finding that "there could be no clearer recognition on the part of the Government of South Africa of the continuance of its obligations under the Mandate after the dissolution of the League of Nations" (*I.C.J. Reports 1962*, p. 340).

75. Similar assurances were given on behalf of South Africa in a memorandum transmitted on 17 October 1946 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and in statements to the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly on 4 November and 13 November 1946. Referring to some of these and other assurances the Court stated in 1950: "These declarations constitute recognition by the Union Government of the continuance of its obligations under the Mandate and not a mere indication of the future conduct of that Government." (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 135.)

76. Even before the dissolution of the League, on 22 January 1946, the Government of the Union of South Africa had announced to the General Assembly of the United Nations its intention to ascertain the

views of the population of South West Africa, stating that “when that had been done, the decision of the Union would be submitted to the General Assembly for judgment”. Thereafter, the representative of the Union of South Africa submitted a proposal to the Second Part of the First Session of the General Assembly in 1946, requesting the approval of the incorporation of South West Africa into the Union. On 14 December 1946 the General Assembly adopted resolution 65 (I) noting—

“... *with satisfaction* that the Union of South Africa, by presenting this matter to the United Nations, recognizes the interest and concern of the United Nations in the matter of the future status of territories now held under mandate”

and declared that it was—

“... *unable to accede* to the incorporation of the territory of South West Africa in the Union of South Africa”.

The General Assembly, the resolution went on,

“*Recommends* that the mandated territory of South West Africa be placed under the international trusteeship system and invites the Government of the Union of South Africa to propose for the consideration of the General Assembly a trusteeship agreement for the aforesaid Territory.”

A year later the General Assembly, by resolution 141 (II) of 1 November 1947, took note of the South African Government's decision not to proceed with its plan for the incorporation of the Territory. As the Court stated in 1950:

“By thus submitting the question of the future international status of the Territory to the ‘judgment’ of the General Assembly as the ‘competent international organ’, the Union Government recognized the competence of the General Assembly in the matter.” (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 142.)

77. In the course of the following years South Africa's acts and declarations made in the United Nations in regard to South West Africa were characterized by contradictions. Some of these acts and declarations confirmed the recognition of the supervisory authority of the United Nations and South Africa's obligations towards it, while others clearly signified an intention to withdraw such recognition. It was only on 11 July 1949 that the South African Government addressed to the Secretary-General a letter in which it stated that it could “no longer see that any

real benefit is to be derived from the submission of special reports on South West Africa to the United Nations and [had] regretfully come to the conclusion that in the interests of efficient administration no further reports should be forwarded”.

78. In the light of the foregoing review, there can be no doubt that, as consistently recognized by this Court, the Mandate survived the demise of the League, and that South Africa admitted as much for a number of years. Thus the supervisory element, an integral part of the Mandate, was bound to survive, and the Mandatory continued to be accountable for the performance of the sacred trust. To restrict the responsibility of the Mandatory to the sphere of conscience or of moral obligation would amount to conferring upon that Power rights to which it was not entitled, and at the same time to depriving the peoples of the Territory of rights which they had been guaranteed. It would mean that the Mandatory would be unilaterally entitled to decide the destiny of the people of South West Africa at its discretion. As the Court, referring to its Advisory Opinion of 1950, stated in 1962:

“The findings of the Court on the obligation of the Union Government to submit to international supervision are thus crystal clear. Indeed, to exclude the obligations connected with the Mandate would be to exclude the very essence of the Mandate.” (*I.C.J. Reports 1962*, p. 334.)

79. The cogency of this finding is well illustrated by the views presented on behalf of South Africa, which, in its final submissions in the *South West Africa* cases, presented as an alternative submission, “in the event of it being held that the Mandate as such continued in existence despite the dissolution of the League of Nations”,

“... that the Respondent’s former obligations under the Mandate to report and account to, and to submit to the supervision, of the Council of the League of Nations, lapsed upon the dissolution of the League, and have not been replaced by any similar obligations relative to supervision by any organ of the United Nations or any other organization or body” (*I.C.J. Reports 1966*, p. 16).

The principal submission, however, had been:

“That the whole Mandate for South West Africa lapsed on the dissolution of the League of Nations and that Respondent is, in consequence thereof, no longer subject to any legal obligations thereunder.” (*Ibid.*)

80. In the present proceedings, at the public sitting of 15 March 1971, the representative of South Africa summed up his Government's position in the following terms:

“Our contentions concerning the falling away of supervisory and accountability provisions are, accordingly, absolute and unqualified. On the other hand, our contentions concerning the possible lapse of the Mandate as a whole are secondary and consequential and depend on our primary contention that the supervision and the accountability provisions fell away on the dissolution of the League.

In the present proceedings we accordingly make the formal submission that the Mandate has lapsed as a whole by reason of the falling away of supervision by the League, but for the rest we assume that the Mandate still continued . . .

. . . on either hypothesis we contend that after dissolution of the League there no longer was any obligation to report and account under the Mandate.”

He thus placed the emphasis on the “falling-away” of the “supervisory and accountability provisions” and treated “the possible lapse of the Mandate as a whole” as a “secondary and consequential” consideration.

81. Thus, by South Africa's own admission, “supervision and accountability” were of the essence of the Mandate, as the Court had consistently maintained. The theory of the lapse of the Mandate on the demise of the League of Nations is in fact inseparable from the claim that there is no obligation to submit to the supervision of the United Nations, and vice versa. Consequently, both or either of the claims advanced, namely that the Mandate has lapsed and/or that there is no obligation to submit to international supervision by the United Nations, are destructive of the very institution upon which the presence of South Africa in Namibia rests, for:

“The authority which the Union Government exercises over the Territory is based on the Mandate. If the Mandate lapsed, as the Union Government contends, the latter's authority would equally have lapsed. To retain the rights derived from the Mandate and to deny the obligations thereunder could not be justified.” (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 133; cited in *I.C.J. Reports 1962*, p. 333.)

82. Of this South Africa would appear to be aware, as is evidenced by its assertion at various times of other titles to justify its continued presence in Namibia, for example before the General Assembly on 5 October 1966:

“South Africa has for a long time contended that the Mandate is no longer legally in force, and that South Africa’s right to administer the Territory is not derived from the Mandate but from military conquest, together with South Africa’s openly declared and consistent practice of continuing to administer the Territory as a sacred trust towards the inhabitants.”

In the present proceedings the representative of South Africa maintained on 15 March 1971:

“... if it is accepted that the Mandate has lapsed, the South African Government would have the right to administer the Territory by reason of a combination of factors, being (a) its original conquest; (b) its long occupation; (c) the continuation of the sacred trust basis agreed upon in 1920; and, finally (d) because its administration is to the benefit of the inhabitants of the Territory and is desired by them. In these circumstances the South African Government cannot accept that any State or organization can have a better title to the Territory.”

83. These claims of title, which apart from other considerations are inadmissible in regard to a mandated territory, lead by South Africa’s own admission to a situation which vitiates the object and purpose of the Mandate. Their significance in the context of the sacred trust has best been revealed by a statement made by the representative of South Africa in the present proceedings on 15 March 1971: “it is the view of the South African Government that no legal provision prevents its annexing South West Africa.” As the Court pointed out in its Advisory Opinion on the *International Status of South-West Africa*, “the principle of non-annexation” was “considered to be of paramount importance” when the future of South West Africa and other territories was the subject of decision after the First World War (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 131). What was in consequence excluded by Article 22 of the League Covenant is even less acceptable today.

* * *

84. Where the United Nations is concerned, the records show that, throughout a period of twenty years, the General Assembly, by virtue of the powers vested in it by the Charter, called upon the South African Government to perform its obligations arising out of the Mandate. On 9 February 1946 the General Assembly, by resolution 9 (I), invited all States administering territories held under mandate to submit trusteeship agreements. All, with the exception of South Africa, responded by placing the respective territories under the trusteeship system or offering

them independence. The General Assembly further made a special recommendation to this effect in resolution 65 (I) of 14 December 1946; on 1 November 1947, in resolution 141 (II), it "urged" the Government of the Union of South Africa to propose a trusteeship agreement; by resolution 227 (III) of 26 November 1948 it maintained its earlier recommendations. A year later, in resolution 337 (IV) of 6 December 1949, it expressed "regret that the Government of the Union of South Africa has withdrawn its previous undertaking to submit reports on its administration of the Territory of South West Africa for the information of the United Nations", reiterated its previous resolutions and invited South Africa "to resume the submission of such reports to the General Assembly". At the same time, in resolution 338 (IV), it addressed specific questions concerning the international status of South West Africa to this Court. In 1950, by resolution 449 (V) of 13 December, it accepted the resultant Advisory Opinion and urged the Government of the Union of South Africa "to take the necessary steps to give effect to the Opinion of the International Court of Justice". By the same resolution, it established a committee "to confer with the Union of South Africa concerning the procedural measures necessary for implementing the Advisory Opinion . . .". In the course of the ensuing negotiations South Africa continued to maintain that neither the United Nations nor any other international organization had succeeded to the supervisory functions of the League. The Committee, for its part, presented a proposal closely following the terms of the Mandate and providing for implementation "through the United Nations by a procedure as nearly as possible analogous to that which existed under the League of Nations, thus providing terms no more extensive or onerous than those which existed before". This procedure would have involved the submission by South Africa of reports to a General Assembly committee, which would further set up a special commission to take over the functions of the Permanent Mandates Commission. Thus the United Nations, which undoubtedly conducted the negotiations in good faith, did not insist on the conclusion of a trusteeship agreement; it suggested a system of supervision which "should not exceed that which applied under the Mandates System . . .". These proposals were rejected by South Africa, which refused to accept the principle of the supervision of its administration of the Territory by the United Nations.

85. Further fruitless negotiations were held from 1952 to 1959. In total, negotiations extended over a period of thirteen years, from 1946 to 1959. In practice the actual length of negotiations is no test of whether the possibilities of agreement have been exhausted; it may be sufficient to show that an early deadlock was reached and that one side adamantly refused compromise. In the case of Namibia (South West Africa) this

stage had patently been reached long before the United Nations finally abandoned its efforts to reach agreement. Even so, for so long as South Africa was the mandatory Power the way was still open for it to seek an arrangement. But that chapter came to an end with the termination of the Mandate.

86. To complete this brief summary of the events preceding the present request for advisory opinion, it must be recalled that in 1955 and 1956 the Court gave at the request of the General Assembly two further advisory opinions on matters concerning the Territory. Eventually the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) on the termination of the Mandate for South West Africa. Subsequently the Security Council adopted resolution 276 (1970), which declared the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia to be illegal and called upon States to act accordingly.

* * *

87. The Government of France in its written statement and the Government of South Africa throughout the present proceedings have raised the objection that the General Assembly, in adopting resolution 2145 (XXI), acted *ultra vires*.

88. Before considering this objection, it is necessary for the Court to examine the observations made and the contentions advanced as to whether the Court should go into this question. It was suggested that though the request was not directed to the question of the validity of the General Assembly resolution and of the related Security Council resolutions, this did not preclude the Court from making such an enquiry. On the other hand it was contended that the Court was not authorized by the terms of the request, in the light of the discussions preceding it, to go into the validity of these resolutions. It was argued that the Court should not assume powers of judicial review of the action taken by the other principal organs of the United Nations without specific request to that effect, nor act as a court of appeal from their decisions.

89. Undoubtedly, the Court does not possess powers of judicial review or appeal in respect of the decisions taken by the United Nations organs concerned. The question of the validity or conformity with the Charter of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) or of related Security Council resolutions does not form the subject of the request for advisory opinion. However, in the exercise of its judicial function and since objections have been advanced the Court, in the course of its reasoning, will consider these objections before determining any legal consequences arising from those resolutions.

90. As indicated earlier, with the entry into force of the Charter of the United Nations a relationship was established between all Members of the United Nations on the one side, and each mandatory Power on the other. The mandatory Powers while retaining their mandates assumed,

under Article 80 of the Charter, vis-à-vis all United Nations Members, the obligation to keep intact and preserve, until trusteeship agreements were executed, the rights of other States and of the peoples of mandated territories, which resulted from the existing mandate agreements and related instruments, such as Article 22 of the Covenant and the League Council's resolution of 31 January 1923 concerning petitions. The mandatory Powers also bound themselves to exercise their functions of administration in conformity with the relevant obligations emanating from the United Nations Charter, which member States have undertaken to fulfil in good faith in all their international relations.

91. One of the fundamental principles governing the international relationship thus established is that a party which disowns or does not fulfil its own obligations cannot be recognized as retaining the rights which it claims to derive from the relationship.

92. The terms of the preamble and operative part of resolution 2145 (XXI) leave no doubt as to the character of the resolution. In the preamble the General Assembly declares itself "*Convinced* that the administration of the Mandated Territory by South Africa has been conducted in a manner contrary" to the two basic international instruments directly imposing obligations upon South Africa, the Mandate and the Charter of the United Nations, as well as to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In another paragraph of the preamble the conclusion is reached that, after having insisted with no avail upon performance for more than twenty years, the moment has arrived for the General Assembly to exercise the right to treat such violation as a ground for termination.

93. In paragraph 3 of the operative part of the resolution the General Assembly "*Declares* that South Africa has failed to fulfil its obligations in respect of the administration of the Mandated Territory and to ensure the moral and material well-being and security of the indigenous inhabitants of South West Africa and has, in fact, disavowed the Mandate". In paragraph 4 the decision is reached, as a consequence of the previous declaration "that the Mandate conferred upon His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa is *therefore* terminated . . ." (Emphasis added.) It is this part of the resolution which is relevant in the present proceedings.

94. In examining this action of the General Assembly it is appropriate to have regard to the general principles of international law regulating termination of a treaty relationship on account of breach. For even if the mandate is viewed as having the character of an institution, as is maintained, it depends on those international agreements which created the system and regulated its application. As the Court indicated in 1962 "this Mandate, like practically all other similar Mandates" was "a special type of instrument composite in nature and instituting a novel international régime. It incorporates a definite agreement . . ." (*I.C.J. Reports 1962*, p. 331). The Court stated conclusively in that Judgment that the

Mandate "... in fact and in law, is an international agreement having the character of a treaty or convention" (*I.C.J. Reports 1962*, p. 330). The rules laid down by the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties concerning termination of a treaty relationship on account of breach (adopted without a dissenting vote) may in many respects be considered as a codification of existing customary law on the subject. In the light of these rules, only a material breach of a treaty justifies termination, such breach being defined as:

- "(a) a repudiation of the treaty not sanctioned by the present Convention; or
- (b) the violation of a provision essential to the accomplishment of the object or purpose of the treaty" (Art. 60, para. 3).

95. General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) determines that both forms of material breach had occurred in this case. By stressing that South Africa "has, in fact, disavowed the Mandate", the General Assembly declared in fact that it had repudiated it. The resolution in question is therefore to be viewed as the exercise of the right to terminate a relationship in case of a deliberate and persistent violation of obligations which destroys the very object and purpose of that relationship.

* * *

96. It has been contended that the Covenant of the League of Nations did not confer on the Council of the League power to terminate a mandate for misconduct of the mandatory and that no such power could therefore be exercised by the United Nations, since it could not derive from the League greater powers than the latter itself had. For this objection to prevail it would be necessary to show that the mandates system, as established under the League, excluded the application of the general principle of law that a right of termination on account of breach must be presumed to exist in respect of all treaties, except as regards provisions relating to the protection of the human person contained in treaties of a humanitarian character (as indicated in Art. 60, para. 5, of the Vienna Convention). The silence of a treaty as to the existence of such a right cannot be interpreted as implying the exclusion of a right which has its source outside of the treaty, in general international law, and is dependent on the occurrence of circumstances which are not normally envisaged when a treaty is concluded.

97. The Government of South Africa has contended that it was the intention of the drafters of the mandates that they should not be revocable even in cases of serious breach of obligation or gross misconduct on the part of the mandatory. This contention seeks to draw support from the fact that at the Paris Peace Conference a resolution was adopted in which the proposal contained in President Wilson's draft of the Covenant regarding a right of appeal for the substitution of the mandatory was not

included. It should be recalled that the discussions at the Paris Peace Conference relied upon by South Africa were not directly addressed to an examination of President Wilson's proposals concerning the regulation of the mandates system in the League Covenant, and the participants were not contesting these particular proposals. What took place was a general exchange of views, on a political plane, regarding the questions of the disposal of the former German colonies and whether the principle of annexation or the mandatory principle should apply to them.

98. President Wilson's proposed draft did not include a specific provision for revocation, on the assumption that mandates were revocable. What was proposed was a special procedure reserving "to the people of any such territory or governmental unit the right to appeal to the League for the redress or correction of any breach of the mandate by the mandatory State or agency or for the substitution of some other State or agency, as mandatory". That this special right of appeal was not inserted in the Covenant cannot be interpreted as excluding the application of the general principle of law according to which a power of termination on account of breach, even if unexpressed, must be presumed to exist as inherent in any mandate, as indeed in any agreement.

99. As indicated earlier, at the Paris Peace Conference there was opposition to the institution of the mandates since a mandate would be inherently revocable, so that there would be no guarantee of long-term continuance of administration by the mandatory Power. The difficulties thus arising were eventually resolved by the assurance that the Council of the League would not interfere with the day-to-day administration of the territories and that the Council would intervene only in case of a fundamental breach of its obligations by the mandatory Power.

100. The revocability of a mandate was envisaged by the first proposal which was made concerning a mandates system:

"In case of any flagrant and prolonged abuse of this trust the population concerned should be able to appeal for redress to the League, who should in a proper case assert its authority to the full, even to the extent of removing the mandate and entrusting it to some other State if necessary." (J. C. Smuts, *The League of Nations: A Practical Suggestion*, 1918, pp. 21-22.)

Although this proposal referred to different territories, the principle remains the same. The possibility of revocation in the event of gross violation of the mandate was subsequently confirmed by authorities on international law and members of the Permanent Mandates Commission

who interpreted and applied the mandates system under the League of Nations.

101. It has been suggested that, even if the Council of the League had possessed the power of revocation of the Mandate in an extreme case, it could not have been exercised unilaterally but only in co-operation with the mandatory Power. However, revocation could only result from a situation in which the Mandatory had committed a serious breach of the obligations it had undertaken. To contend, on the basis of the principle of unanimity which applied in the League of Nations, that in this case revocation could only take place with the concurrence of the Mandatory, would not only run contrary to the general principle of law governing termination on account of breach, but also postulate an impossibility. For obvious reasons, the consent of the wrongdoer to such a form of termination cannot be required.

102. In a further objection to General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) it is contended that it made pronouncements which the Assembly, not being a judicial organ, and not having previously referred the matter to any such organ, was not competent to make. Without dwelling on the conclusions reached in the 1966 Judgment in the *South West Africa* contentious cases, it is worth recalling that in those cases the applicant States, which complained of material breaches of substantive provisions of the Mandate, were held not to "possess any separate self-contained right which they could assert . . . to require the due performance of the Mandate in discharge of the 'sacred trust'" (*I.C.J. Reports 1966*, pp. 29 and 51). On the other hand, the Court declared that: ". . . any divergences of view concerning the conduct of a mandate were regarded as being matters that had their place in the political field, the settlement of which lay between the mandatory and the competent organs of the League" (*ibid.*, p. 45). To deny to a political organ of the United Nations which is a successor of the League in this respect the right to act, on the argument that it lacks competence to render what is described as a judicial decision, would not only be inconsistent but would amount to a complete denial of the remedies available against fundamental breaches of an international undertaking.

103. The Court is unable to appreciate the view that the General Assembly acted unilaterally as party and judge in its own cause. In the 1966 Judgment in the *South West Africa* cases, referred to above, it was found that the function to call for the due execution of the relevant provisions of the mandate instruments appertained to the League acting as an entity through its appropriate organs. The right of the League "in the pursuit of its collective, institutional activity, to require the due performance of the Mandate in discharge of the 'sacred trust'", was specifically recognized (*ibid.*, p. 29). Having regard to this finding, the United Nations as a successor to the League, acting through its competent organs, must be seen above all as the supervisory institution, competent to pronounce, in that capacity, on the conduct of the man-

datory with respect to its international obligations, and competent to act accordingly.

* * *

104. It is argued on behalf of South Africa that the consideration set forth in paragraph 3 of resolution 2145 (XXI) of the General Assembly, relating to the failure of South Africa to fulfil its obligations in respect of the administration of the mandated territory, called for a detailed factual investigation before the General Assembly could adopt resolution 2145 (XXI) or the Court pronounce upon its validity. The failure of South Africa to comply with the obligation to submit to supervision and to render reports, an essential part of the Mandate, cannot be disputed in the light of determinations made by this Court on more occasions than one. In relying on these, as on other findings of the Court in previous proceedings concerning South West Africa, the Court adheres to its own jurisprudence.

* * *

105. General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), after declaring the termination of the Mandate, added in operative paragraph 4 "that South Africa has no other right to administer the Territory". This part of the resolution has been objected to as deciding a transfer of territory. That in fact is not so. The pronouncement made by the General Assembly is based on a conclusion, referred to earlier, reached by the Court in 1950:

"The authority which the Union Government exercises over the Territory is based on the Mandate. If the Mandate lapsed, as the Union Government contends, the latter's authority would equally have lapsed." (*I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 133.)

This was confirmed by the Court in its Judgment of 21 December 1962 in the *South West Africa* cases (*Ethiopia v. South Africa; Liberia v. South Africa*) (*I.C.J. Reports 1962*, p. 333). Relying on these decisions of the Court, the General Assembly declared that the Mandate having been terminated "South Africa has no other right to administer the Territory". This is not a finding on facts, but the formulation of a legal situation. For it would not be correct to assume that, because the General Assembly is in principle vested with recommendatory powers, it is debarred from adopting, in specific cases within the framework of its competence, resolutions which make determinations or have operative design.

* * *

106. By resolution 2145 (XXI) the General Assembly terminated the Mandate. However, lacking the necessary powers to ensure the withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory, it enlisted the co-operation of the Security Council by calling the latter's attention to the resolution, thus acting in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

107. The Security Council responded to the call of the General Assembly. It "took note" of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) in the preamble of its resolution 245 (1968); it took it "into account" in resolution 246 (1968); in resolutions 264 (1969) and 269 (1969) it adopted certain measures directed towards the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and, finally, in resolution 276 (1970), it reaffirmed resolution 264 (1969) and recalled resolution 269 (1969).

108. Resolution 276 (1970) of the Security Council, specifically mentioned in the text of the request, is the one essential for the purposes of the present advisory opinion. Before analysing it, however, it is necessary to refer briefly to resolutions 264 (1969) and 269 (1969), since these two resolutions have, together with resolution 276 (1970), a combined and a cumulative effect. Resolution 264 (1969), in paragraph 3 of its operative part, calls upon South Africa to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately. Resolution 269 (1969), in view of South Africa's lack of compliance, after recalling the obligations of Members under Article 25 of the Charter, calls upon the Government of South Africa, in paragraph 5 of its operative part, "to withdraw its administration from the territory immediately and in any case before 4 October 1969". The preamble of resolution 276 (1970) reaffirms General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and espouses it, by referring to the decision, not merely of the General Assembly, but of the United Nations "that the Mandate of South-West Africa was terminated". In the operative part, after condemning the non-compliance by South Africa with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions pertaining to Namibia, the Security Council declares, in paragraph 2, that "the continued presence of the South African authorities in Namibia is illegal" and that consequently all acts taken by the Government of South Africa "on behalf of or concerning Namibia after the termination of the Mandate are illegal and invalid". In paragraph 5 the Security Council "*Calls upon* all States, particularly those which have economic and other interests in Namibia, to refrain from any dealings with the Government of South Africa which are inconsistent with operative paragraph 2 of this resolution".

109. It emerges from the communications bringing the matter to the Security Council's attention, from the discussions held and particularly from the text of the resolutions themselves, that the Security Council, when it adopted these resolutions, was acting in the exercise of what it deemed to be its primary responsibility, the maintenance of peace and security, which, under the Charter, embraces situations which might

lead to a breach of the peace. (Art. 1, para. 1.) In the preamble of resolution 264 (1969) the Security Council was “*Mindful* of the grave consequences of South Africa’s continued occupation of Namibia” and in paragraph 4 of that resolution it declared “that the actions of the Government of South Africa designed to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia through the establishment of Bantustans are contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter”. In operative paragraph 3 of resolution 269 (1969) the Security Council decided “that the continued occupation of the territory of Namibia by the South African authorities constitutes an aggressive encroachment on the authority of the United Nations, . . .”. In operative paragraph 3 of resolution 276 (1970) the Security Council declared further “that the defiant attitude of the Government of South Africa towards the Council’s decisions undermines the authority of the United Nations”.

110. As to the legal basis of the resolution, Article 24 of the Charter vests in the Security Council the necessary authority to take action such as that taken in the present case. The reference in paragraph 2 of this Article to specific powers of the Security Council under certain chapters of the Charter does not exclude the existence of general powers to discharge the responsibilities conferred in paragraph 1. Reference may be made in this respect to the Secretary-General’s Statement, presented to the Security Council on 10 January 1947, to the effect that “the powers of the Council under Article 24 are not restricted to the specific grants of authority contained in Chapters VI, VII, VIII and XII . . . the Members of the United Nations have conferred upon the Security Council powers commensurate with its responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security. The only limitations are the fundamental principles and purposes found in Chapter I of the Charter.”

111. As to the effect to be attributed to the declaration contained in paragraph 2 of resolution 276 (1970), the Court considers that the qualification of a situation as illegal does not by itself put an end to it. It can only be the first, necessary step in an endeavour to bring the illegal situation to an end.

112. It would be an untenable interpretation to maintain that, once such a declaration had been made by the Security Council under Article 24 of the Charter, on behalf of all member States, those Members would be free to act in disregard of such illegality or even to recognize violations of law resulting from it. When confronted with such an internationally unlawful situation, Members of the United Nations would be expected to act in consequence of the declaration made on their behalf. The question therefore arises as to the effect of this decision of the Security Council for States Members of the United Nations in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter.

113. It has been contended that Article 25 of the Charter applies only

to enforcement measures adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter. It is not possible to find in the Charter any support for this view. Article 25 is not confined to decisions in regard to enforcement action but applies to "the decisions of the Security Council" adopted in accordance with the Charter. Moreover, that Article is placed, not in Chapter VII, but immediately after Article 24 in that part of the Charter which deals with the functions and powers of the Security Council. If Article 25 had reference solely to decisions of the Security Council concerning enforcement action under Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter, that is to say, if it were only such decisions which had binding effect, then Article 25 would be superfluous, since this effect is secured by Articles 48 and 49 of the Charter.

114. It has also been contended that the relevant Security Council resolutions are couched in exhortatory rather than mandatory language and that, therefore, they do not purport to impose any legal duty on any State nor to affect legally any right of any State. The language of a resolution of the Security Council should be carefully analysed before a conclusion can be made as to its binding effect. In view of the nature of the powers under Article 25, the question whether they have been in fact exercised is to be determined in each case, having regard to the terms of the resolution to be interpreted, the discussions leading to it, the Charter provisions invoked and, in general, all circumstances that might assist in determining the legal consequences of the resolution of the Security Council.

115. Applying these tests, the Court recalls that in the preamble of resolution 269 (1969), the Security Council was "*Mindful* of its responsibility to take necessary action to secure strict compliance with the obligations entered into by States Members of the United Nations under the provisions of Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations". The Court has therefore reached the conclusion that the decisions made by the Security Council in paragraphs 2 and 5 of resolutions 276 (1970), as related to paragraph 3 of resolution 264 (1969) and paragraph 5 of resolution 269 (1969), were adopted in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter and in accordance with its Articles 24 and 25. The decisions are consequently binding on all States Members of the United Nations, which are thus under obligation to accept and carry them out.

116. In pronouncing upon the binding nature of the Security Council decisions in question, the Court would recall the following passage in its Advisory Opinion of 11 April 1949 on *Reparation for Injuries Suffered in the Service of the United Nations*:

"The Charter has not been content to make the Organization created by it merely a centre 'for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends' (Article 1, para. 4). It has equipped that centre with organs, and has given it special tasks. It has defined the position of the Members in relation to the Organization

by requiring them to give it every assistance in any action undertaken by it (Article 2, para. 5), and to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council." (*I.C.J. Reports 1949*, p. 178.)

Thus when the Security Council adopts a decision under Article 25 in accordance with the Charter, it is for member States to comply with that decision, including those members of the Security Council which voted against it and those Members of the United Nations who are not members of the Council. To hold otherwise would be to deprive this principal organ of its essential functions and powers under the Charter.

* * *

117. Having reached these conclusions, the Court will now address itself to the legal consequences arising for States from the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia, notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970). A binding determination made by a competent organ of the United Nations to the effect that a situation is illegal cannot remain without consequence. Once the Court is faced with such a situation, it would be failing in the discharge of its judicial functions if it did not declare that there is an obligation, especially upon Members of the United Nations, to bring that situation to an end. As this Court has held, referring to one of its decisions declaring a situation as contrary to a rule of international law: "This decision entails a legal consequence, namely that of putting an end to an illegal situation" (*I.C.J. Reports 1951*, p. 82).

118. South Africa, being responsible for having created and maintained a situation which the Court has found to have been validly declared illegal, has the obligation to put an end to it. It is therefore under obligation to withdraw its administration from the Territory of Namibia. By maintaining the present illegal situation, and occupying the Territory without title, South Africa incurs international responsibilities arising from a continuing violation of an international obligation. It also remains accountable for any violations of its international obligations, or of the rights of the people of Namibia. The fact that South Africa no longer has any title to administer the Territory does not release it from its obligations and responsibilities under international law towards other States in respect of the exercise of its powers in relation to this Territory. Physical control of a territory, and not sovereignty or legitimacy of title, is the basis of State liability for acts affecting other States.

119. The member States of the United Nations are, for the reasons given in paragraph 115 above, under obligation to recognize the illegality and invalidity of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia. They are also under obligation to refrain from lending any support or any form of assistance to South Africa with reference to its occupation of Namibia, subject to paragraph 125 below.

120. The precise determination of the acts permitted or allowed—what measures are available and practicable, which of them should be selected, what scope they should be given and by whom they should be applied—is a matter which lies within the competence of the appropriate political organs of the United Nations acting within their authority under the Charter. Thus it is for the Security Council to determine any further measures consequent upon the decisions already taken by it on the question of Namibia. In this context the Court notes that at the same meeting of the Security Council in which the request for advisory opinion was made, the Security Council also adopted resolution 283 (1970) which defined some of the steps to be taken. The Court has not been called upon to advise on the legal effects of that resolution.

121. The Court will in consequence confine itself to giving advice on those dealings with the Government of South Africa which, under the Charter of the United Nations and general international law, should be considered as inconsistent with the declaration of illegality and invalidity made in paragraph 2 of resolution 276 (1970), because they may imply a recognition that South Africa's presence in Namibia is legal.

122. For the reasons given above, and subject to the observations contained in paragraph 125 below, member States are under obligation to abstain from entering into treaty relations with South Africa in all cases in which the Government of South Africa purports to act on behalf of or concerning Namibia. With respect to existing bilateral treaties, member States must abstain from invoking or applying those treaties or provisions of treaties concluded by South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia which involve active intergovernmental co-operation. With respect to multilateral treaties, however, the same rule cannot be applied to certain general conventions such as those of a humanitarian character, the non-performance of which may adversely affect the people of Namibia. It will be for the competent international organs to take specific measures in this respect.

123. Member States, in compliance with the duty of non-recognition imposed by paragraphs 2 and 5 of resolution 276 (1970), are under obligation to abstain from sending diplomatic or special missions to South Africa including in their jurisdiction the Territory of Namibia, to abstain from sending consular agents to Namibia, and to withdraw any such agents already there. They should also make it clear to the South African authorities that the maintenance of diplomatic or consular relations with South Africa does not imply any recognition of its authority with regard to Namibia.

124. The restraints which are implicit in the non-recognition of South Africa's presence in Namibia and the explicit provisions of paragraph 5 of resolution 276 (1970) impose upon member States the obligation to abstain from entering into economic and other forms of relationship

or dealings with South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia which may entrench its authority over the Territory.

125. In general, the non-recognition of South Africa's administration of the Territory should not result in depriving the people of Namibia of any advantages derived from international co-operation. In particular, while official acts performed by the Government of South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia after the termination of the Mandate are illegal and invalid, this invalidity cannot be extended to those acts, such as, for instance, the registration of births, deaths and marriages, the effects of which can be ignored only to the detriment of the inhabitants of the Territory.

126. As to non-member States, although not bound by Articles 24 and 25 of the Charter, they have been called upon in paragraphs 2 and 5 of resolution 276 (1970) to give assistance in the action which has been taken by the United Nations with regard to Namibia. In the view of the Court, the termination of the Mandate and the declaration of the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia are opposable to all States in the sense of barring *erga omnes* the legality of a situation which is maintained in violation of international law: in particular, no State which enters into relations with South Africa concerning Namibia may expect the United Nations or its Members to recognize the validity or effects of such relationship, or of the consequences thereof. The Mandate having been terminated by decision of the international organization in which the supervisory authority over its administration was vested, and South Africa's continued presence in Namibia having been declared illegal, it is for non-member States to act in accordance with those decisions.

127. As to the general consequences resulting from the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia, all States should bear in mind that the injured entity is a people which must look to the international community for assistance in its progress towards the goals for which the sacred trust was instituted.

* * *

128. In its oral statement and in written communications to the Court, the Government of South Africa expressed the desire to supply the Court with further factual information concerning the purposes and objectives of South Africa's policy of separate development or *apartheid*, contending that to establish a breach of South Africa's substantive international obligations under the Mandate it would be necessary to prove that a particular exercise of South Africa's legislative or administrative powers was not directed in good faith towards the purpose of promoting to the utmost the well-being and progress of the inhabitants. It is claimed by the Government of South Africa that no act or omission on its part would constitute a violation of its international obligations unless it is

shown that such act or omission was actuated by a motive, or directed towards a purpose other than one to promote the interests of the inhabitants of the Territory.

129. The Government of South Africa having made this request, the Court finds that no factual evidence is needed for the purpose of determining whether the policy of *apartheid* as applied by South Africa in Namibia is in conformity with the international obligations assumed by South Africa under the Charter of the United Nations. In order to determine whether the laws and decrees applied by South Africa in Namibia, which are a matter of public record, constitute a violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the question of intent or governmental discretion is not relevant; nor is it necessary to investigate or determine the effects of those measures upon the welfare of the inhabitants.

130. It is undisputed, and is amply supported by documents annexed to South Africa's written statement in these proceedings, that the official governmental policy pursued by South Africa in Namibia is to achieve a complete physical separation of races and ethnic groups in separate areas within the Territory. The application of this policy has required, as has been conceded by South Africa, restrictive measures of control officially adopted and enforced in the Territory by the coercive power of the former Mandatory. These measures establish limitations, exclusions or restrictions for the members of the indigenous population groups in respect of their participation in certain types of activities, fields of study or of training, labour or employment and also submit them to restrictions or exclusions of residence and movement in large parts of the Territory.

131. Under the Charter of the United Nations, the former Mandatory had pledged itself to observe and respect, in a territory having an international status, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race. To establish instead, and to enforce, distinctions, exclusions, restrictions and limitations exclusively based on grounds of race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin which constitute a denial of fundamental human rights is a flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter.

* * *

132. The Government of South Africa also submitted a request that a plebiscite should be held in the Territory of Namibia under the joint supervision of the Court and the Government of South Africa (para. 16 above). This proposal was presented in connection with the request to submit additional factual evidence and as a means of bringing evidence before the Court. The Court having concluded that no further evidence

was required, that the Mandate was validly terminated and that in consequence South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal and its acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia are illegal and invalid, it follows that it cannot entertain this proposal.

* * *

133. For these reasons,

THE COURT IS OF OPINION,

in reply to the question:

“What are the legal consequences for States of the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia, notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970)?”

by 13 votes to 2,

- (1) that, the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory;

by 11 votes to 4,

- (2) that States Members of the United Nations are under obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and the invalidity of its acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia, and to refrain from any acts and in particular any dealings with the Government of South Africa implying recognition of the legality of, or lending support or assistance to, such presence and administration;
- (3) that it is incumbent upon States which are not Members of the United Nations to give assistance, within the scope of subparagraph (2) above, in the action which has been taken by the United Nations with regard to Namibia.

Done in English and in French, the English text being authoritative, at the Peace Palace, The Hague, this twenty-first day of June, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-one, in two copies, one of which will be placed in the archives of the Court and the other transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

(Signed) ZAFRULLA KHAN,
President.

(Signed) S. AQUARONE,
Registrar.

President Sir Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN makes the following declaration:

I am in entire agreement with the Opinion of the Court but would wish to add some observations on two or three aspects of the presentation made to the Court on behalf of South Africa.

It was contended that under the supervisory system as devised in the Covenant of the League and the different mandate agreements, the mandatory could, in the last resort, flout the wishes of the Council of the League by casting its vote in opposition to the directions which the Council might propose to give to the mandatory. The argument runs that this system was deliberately so devised, with open eyes, as to leave the Council powerless in face of the veto of the mandatory if the latter chose to exercise it. In support of this contention reliance was placed on paragraph 5 of Article 4 of the Covenant of the League by virtue of which any Member of the League not represented on the Council was to be invited to send a representative to sit as a member at any meeting of the Council during the consideration of matters specially affecting the interests of that Member. This entitled the mandatory to sit as a member at any meeting of the Council in which a matter affecting its interests as a mandatory came under consideration. Under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Covenant decisions of the Council required the agreement of all the Members of the League represented at the meeting. This is known as the unanimity rule and by virtue thereof it was claimed that a mandatory possessed a right of veto when attending a meeting of the Council in pursuance of paragraph 5 of Article 4 and consequently the last word on the manner and method of the administration of the mandate rested with the mandatory. This contention is untenable. Were it well founded it would reduce the whole system of mandates to mockery. As the Court, in its Judgment of 1966, observed:

“In practice, the unanimity rule was frequently not insisted upon, or its impact was mitigated by a process of give-and-take, and by various procedural devices to which both the Council and the mandatories lent themselves. So far as the Court’s information goes, there never occurred any case in which a mandatory ‘vetoed’ what would otherwise have been a Council decision. Equally, however, much trouble was taken to avoid situations in which the mandatory would have been forced to acquiesce in the views of the rest of the Council short of casting an adverse vote. The occasional deliberate absence of the mandatory from a meeting, enabled decisions to be taken that the mandatory might have felt obliged to vote against if it had been present. This was part of the above-mentioned process for arriving at generally acceptable conclusions.” (*I.C.J. Reports 1966*, pp. 44-45.)

The representative of South Africa, in answer to a question by a Member of the Court, confessed that there was not a single case on record in which the representative of a mandatory Power ever cast a negative vote in a meeting of the Council so as to block a decision of the Council. It is thus established that in practice the last word always rested with the Council of the League and not with the mandatory.

The Covenant of the League made ample provision to secure the effectiveness of the Covenant and conformity to its provisions in respect of the obligations entailed by membership of the League. A Member of the League which had violated any covenant of the League could be declared to be no longer a Member of the League by a vote of the Council concurred in by the representatives of all the other Members of the League represented thereon (para. 4, Art. 16, of the Covenant).

The representative of South Africa conceded that:

“... if a conflict between a mandatory and the Council occurred and if all the Members of the Council were of the opinion that the mandatory had violated a covenant of the League, it would have been legally possible for the Council to expel the mandatory from the League and thereafter decisions of the Council could no longer be thwarted by the particular mandatory—for instance, a decision to revoke the mandate. The mandatory would then no longer be a Member of the League and would then accordingly no longer be entitled to attend and vote in Council meetings.

... we agree that by expelling a mandatory the Council could have overcome the practical or mechanical difficulties created by the unanimity requirement.” (Hearing of 15 March 1971.)

It was no doubt the consciousness of this position which prompted the deliberate absence of a mandatory from a meeting of the Council of the League which enabled the Council to take decisions that the mandatory might have felt obliged to vote against if it had been present.

If a mandatory ceased to be a Member of the League and the Council felt that the presence of its representative in a meeting of the Council dealing with matters affecting the mandate would be helpful, it could still be invited to attend as happened in the case of Japan after it ceased to be a Member of the League. But it could not attend as of right under paragraph 5 of Article 4 of the Covenant.

In addition, if need arose the Covenant could be amended under Article 26 of the Covenant. In fact no such need arose but the authority was provided in the Covenant. It would thus be idle to contend that the mandates system was deliberately devised, with open eyes, so as to leave the Council of the League powerless against the veto of the mandatory if the latter chose to exercise it.

Those responsible for the Covenant were anxious and worked hard

to institute a system which would be effective in carrying out to the full the sacred trust of civilization. Had they deliberately devised a framework which might enable a mandatory so inclined to defy the system with impunity, they would have been guilty of defeating the declared purpose of the mandates system and this is not to be thought of; nor is it to be imagined that these wise statesmen, despite all the care that they took and the reasoning and persuasion that they brought into play, were finally persuaded into accepting as reality that which could so easily be turned into a fiction.

* * *

In my view the supervisory authority of the General Assembly of the United Nations in respect of the mandated territory, being derived from the Covenant of the League and the Mandate Agreement, is not restricted by any provision of the Charter of the United Nations. The extent of that authority must be determined by reference to the relevant provisions of the Covenant of the League and the Mandate Agreement. The General Assembly was entitled to exercise the same authority in respect of the administration of the Territory by the Mandatory as was possessed by the Council of the League and its decisions and determinations in that respect had the same force and effect as the decisions and determinations of the Council of the League. This was well illustrated in the case of General Assembly resolution 289 (IV), adopted on 21 November 1949 recommending that Libya shall become independent as soon as possible and in any case not later than 1 January 1952. A detailed procedure for the achievement of this objective was laid down, including the appointment by the General Assembly of a United Nations Commissioner in Libya and a Council to aid and advise him, etc. All the recommendations contained in this resolution constituted binding decisions; decisions which had been adopted in accordance with the provisions of the Charter but whose binding character was derived from Annex XI to the Treaty of Peace with Italy.

* * *

The representative of South Africa, during the course of his oral submission, refrained from using the expression "*apartheid*" but urged:

"... South Africa is in the position that its conduct would be unlawful if the differentiation which it admittedly practises should be directed at, and have the result of subordinating the interests of one or certain groups on a racial or ethnic basis to those of others, . . . If that can be established in fact, then South Africa would be guilty of violation of its obligations in that respect, otherwise not." (Hearing of 17 March 1971.)

The policy of *apartheid* was initiated by Prime Minister Malan and was then vigorously put into effect by his successors, Strijdom and Verwoerd. It has been continuously proclaimed that the purpose and object of the policy are the maintenance of White domination. Speaking to the South African House of Assembly, as late as 1963, Dr. Verwoerd said:

“Reduced to its simplest form the problem is nothing else than this: We want to keep South Africa White . . . Keeping it White can only mean one thing, namely, White domination, not leadership, not guidance, but control, supremacy. If we are agreed that it is the desire of the people that the White man should be able to continue to protect himself by White domination . . . we say that it can be achieved by separate development.” (*I.C.J. Pleadings, South West Africa*, Vol. IV, p. 264.)

South Africa's reply to this in its Rejoinder in the 1966 cases was in effect that these and other similar pronouncements were qualified by “the promise to provide separate homelands for the Bantu groups” wherein the Bantu would be free to develop his capacities to the same degree as the White could do in the rest of the country. But this promise itself was always subject to the qualification that the Bantu homelands would develop under the guardianship of the White. In this connection it was urged that in 1961 the “Prime Minister spoke of a greater degree of ultimate independence for Bantu homelands than he had mentioned a decade earlier”. This makes little difference in respect of the main purpose of the policy which continued to be the domination of the White.

It needs to be remembered, however, that the Court is not concerned in these proceedings with conditions in South Africa. The Court is concerned with the administration of South West Africa as carried on by the Mandatory in discharge of his obligations under the Mandate which prescribed that the well-being and development of people who were not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world constituted a sacred trust of civilization and that the best method of giving effect to this principle was that the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who, by reason of their resources, their experience and their geographical position could best undertake this responsibility (Art. 22, paras. 1 and 2, of the Covenant of the League of Nations).

The administration was to be carried on “in the interests of the indigenous population” (para. 6, Art. 22). For the discharge of this obligation it is not enough that the administration should believe in good faith that the policy it proposes to follow is in the best interests of all sections of the population. The supervisory authority must be satisfied that it is in the

best interests of the indigenous population of the Territory. This follows from Article 6 of the Mandate Agreement for South West Africa, read with paragraph 6 of Article 22 of the Covenant.

The representative of South Africa, while admitting the right of the people of South West Africa to self-determination, urged in his oral statement that the exercise of that right must take into full account the limitations imposed, according to him, on such exercise by the tribal and cultural divisions in the Territory. He concluded that in the case of South West Africa self-determination "may well find itself practically restricted to some kind of autonomy and local self-government within a larger arrangement of co-operation" (hearing of 17 March 1971). This in effect means a denial of self-determination as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations.

Whatever may have been the conditions in South Africa calling for special measures, those conditions did not exist in the case of South West Africa at the time when South Africa assumed the obligation of a mandatory in respect of the Territory, nor have they come into existence since. In South West Africa the small White element was not and is not indigenous to the Territory. There can be no excuse in the case of South West Africa for the application of the policy of *apartheid* so far as the interests of the White population are concerned. It is claimed, however, that the various indigenous groups of the population have reached different stages of development and that there are serious ethnic considerations which call for the application of the policy of separate development of each group. The following observations of the Director of the Institute of Race Relations, London, are apposite in this context:

"... White South African arguments are based on the different stages of development reached by various groups of people. It is undisputed fact that groups have developed at different paces in respect of the control of environment (although understanding of other aspects of life has not always grown at the same pace). But the aspect of South African thought which is widely questioned elsewhere is the assumption that an individual is permanently limited by the limitations of his group. His ties with it may be strong; indeed, when considering politics and national survival, the assumption that they will be strong is altogether reasonable. Again, as a matter of choice, people may prefer to mix socially with those of their own group, but to say that by law people of one group must mix with no others can really only proceed from a conviction not only that the other groups are inferior but that every member of each of the other groups is permanently and irremediably inferior. It is this that rankles. 'Separate but equal' is possible so long as it is a matter of choice by both parties; legally imposed by one, it must be regarded by the other as a humiliation, and far more so if it applies not only

to the group as a whole but to individuals. In fact, of course, what separate development has meant has been anything but equal.

These are some reasons why it will be hard to find natives of Africa who believe that to extend the policy of separate development to South West Africa even more completely than at present is in the interest of any but the White inhabitants." (Quoted in *I.C.J. Pleadings, South West Africa*, Vol. IV, p. 339.)

* * *

Towards the close of his oral presentation the representative of South Africa made a plea to the Court in the following terms:

"In our submission, the general requirement placed by the Charter on all United Nations activities is that they must further peace, friendly relations, and co-operation between nations, and especially between member States. South Africa, as a member State, is under a duty to contribute towards those ends, and she desires to do so, although she has no intention of abdicating what she regards as her responsibilities on the sub-continent of southern Africa.

If there are to be genuine efforts at achieving a peaceful solution, they will have to satisfy certain criteria. They will have to respect the will of the self-determining peoples of South West Africa. They will have to take into account the facts of geography, of economics, of budgetary requirements, of the ethnic conditions and of the state of development.

If this Court, even in an opinion on legal questions, could indicate the road towards a peaceful and constructive solution along these lines, then the Court would have made a great contribution, in our respectful submission, to the cause of international peace and security and, more, to the cause of friendly relations amongst not only the nations but amongst all men." (Hearing of 5 March 1971.)

The representative of the United States of America, in his oral presentation, observed that:

"... the question of holding a free and proper plebiscite under appropriate auspices and with conditions and arrangements which would ensure a fair and informed expression of the will of the people of Namibia deserves study. It is a matter which might be properly submitted to the competent political organs of the United Nations, which have consistently manifested their concern that the

Namibians achieve self-determination. The Court may wish to so indicate in its opinion to the Security Council.” (Hearing of 9 March 1971.)

The Court having arrived at the conclusion that the Mandate has been terminated and that the presence of South Africa in South West Africa is illegal, I would, in response to the plea made by the representative of South Africa, suggest that South Africa should offer to withdraw its administration from South West Africa in consultation with the United Nations so that a process of withdrawal and substitution in its place of United Nations' control may be agreed upon and carried into effect with the minimum disturbance of present administrative arrangements. It should also be agreed upon that, after the expiry of a certain period but not later than a reasonable time-limit thereafter, a plebiscite may be held under the supervision of the United Nations, which should ensure the freedom and impartiality of the plebiscite, to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants of the Territory with regard to their political future. If the result of the plebiscite should reveal a clear preponderance of views in support of a particular course and objective, that course should be adopted so that the desired objective may be achieved as early as possible.

South Africa's insistence upon giving effect to the will of the peoples of South West Africa proceeds presumably from the conviction that an overwhelming majority of the peoples of the Territory desire closer political integration with the Republic of South Africa. Should that prove in fact to be the case the United Nations, being wholly committed to the principle of self-determination of peoples, would be expected to readily give effect to the clearly expressed wishes of the peoples of the Territory. Should the result of the plebiscite disclose their preference for a different solution, South Africa should equally readily accept and respect such manifestation of the will of the peoples concerned and should co-operate with the United Nations in giving effect to it.

The Government of South Africa, being convinced that an overwhelming majority of the peoples of South West Africa truly desire incorporation with the Republic, would run little risk of a contrary decision through the adoption of the procedure here suggested. If some such procedure is adopted and the conclusion that may emerge therefrom, whatever it may prove to be, is put into effect, South Africa would have vindicated itself in the eyes of the world and in the estimation of the peoples of South West Africa, whose freely expressed wishes must be supreme. There would still remain the possibility, and, if South Africa's estimation of the situation is close enough to reality, the strong probability, that once the peoples of South West Africa have been put in a position to manage their own affairs without any outside influence or control and they have had greater experience of the difficulties and problems with which they would be confronted, they may freely decide, in the exercise of their sovereignty, to establish a closer political relationship with South Africa. The adoption

of the course here suggested would indeed make a great contribution “to the cause of international peace and security and, more, to the cause of friendly relations amongst not only the nations but amongst all men”.

Vice-President AMMOUN and Judges PADILLA NERVO, PETRÉN, ONYEAMA, DILLARD and DE CASTRO append separate opinions to the Opinion of the Court.

Judges Sir Gerald FITZMAURICE and GROS append dissenting opinions to the Opinion of the Court.

(Initialed) Z.K.

(Initialed) S.A.
