

**CHAPTER XXIII**  
**LAW OF TREATIES**

**1. VIENNA CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF TREATIES**

*Vienna, 23 May 1969*

**ENTRY INTO FORCE:** 27 January 1980, in accordance with article 84(1).  
**REGISTRATION:** 27 January 1980, No. 18232.  
**STATUS:** Signatories: 45. Parties: 116.  
**TEXT:** United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1155, p. 331.

*Note:* The Convention was adopted on 22 May 1969 and opened for signature on 23 May 1969 by the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties. The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolutions [2166 \(XXI\)](#)<sup>1</sup> of 5 December 1966 and [2287 \(XXII\)](#)<sup>2</sup> of 6 December 1967. The Conference held two sessions, both at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, the first session from 26 March to 24 May 1968 and the second session from 9 April to 22 May 1969. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and certain declarations and resolutions, which are annexed to that Act. By unanimous decision of the Conference, the original of the Final Act was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria. The text of the Final Act is included in document [A/CONF.39/11/Add.2](#).

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification</i>	<i>Participant</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification</i>
Afghanistan.....	23 May 1969		Republic.....		
Albania.....		27 Jun 2001 a	Chile.....	23 May 1969	9 Apr 1981
Algeria.....		8 Nov 1988 a	China <sup>4</sup> .....		3 Sep 1997 a
Andorra.....		5 Apr 2004 a	Colombia.....	23 May 1969	10 Apr 1985
Argentina.....	23 May 1969	5 Dec 1972	Congo.....	23 May 1969	12 Apr 1982
Armenia.....		17 May 2005 a	Costa Rica.....	23 May 1969	22 Nov 1996
Australia.....		13 Jun 1974 a	Côte d'Ivoire.....	23 Jul 1969	
Austria.....		30 Apr 1979 a	Croatia <sup>3</sup> .....		12 Oct 1992 d
Azerbaijan.....		11 Jan 2018 a	Cuba.....		9 Sep 1998 a
Barbados.....	23 May 1969	24 Jun 1971	Cyprus.....		28 Dec 1976 a
Belarus.....		1 May 1986 a	Czech Republic <sup>5</sup> .....		22 Feb 1993 d
Belgium.....		1 Sep 1992 a	Democratic Republic of the Congo.....		25 Jul 1977 a
Benin.....		2 Nov 2017 a	Denmark.....	18 Apr 1970	1 Jun 1976
Bolivia (Plurinational State of).....	23 May 1969		Dominican Republic.....		1 Apr 2010 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina <sup>3</sup> .....		1 Sep 1993 d	Ecuador.....	23 May 1969	11 Feb 2005
Brazil.....	23 May 1969	25 Sep 2009	Egypt.....		11 Feb 1982 a
Bulgaria.....		21 Apr 1987 a	El Salvador.....	16 Feb 1970	
Burkina Faso.....		25 May 2006 a	Estonia.....		21 Oct 1991 a
Cambodia.....	23 May 1969		Ethiopia.....	30 Apr 1970	
Cameroon.....		23 Oct 1991 a	Finland.....	23 May 1969	19 Aug 1977
Canada.....		14 Oct 1970 a	Gabon.....		5 Nov 2004 a
Central African		10 Dec 1971 a	Georgia.....		8 Jun 1995 a

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification</i>	<i>Participant</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification</i>
Germany <sup>6,7</sup> .....	30 Apr 1970	21 Jul 1987	Nepal.....	23 May 1969	
Ghana.....	23 May 1969		Netherlands <sup>9</sup> .....		9 Apr 1985 a
Greece.....		30 Oct 1974 a	New Zealand.....	29 Apr 1970	4 Aug 1971
Guatemala.....	23 May 1969	21 Jul 1997	Niger.....		27 Oct 1971 a
Guinea.....		16 Sep 2005 a	Nigeria.....	23 May 1969	31 Jul 1969
Guyana.....	23 May 1969	15 Sep 2005	North Macedonia <sup>3</sup> .....		8 Jul 1999 d
Haiti.....		25 Aug 1980 a	Oman.....		18 Oct 1990 a
Holy See.....	30 Sep 1969	25 Feb 1977	Pakistan.....	29 Apr 1970	
Honduras.....	23 May 1969	20 Sep 1979	Panama.....		28 Jul 1980 a
Hungary.....		19 Jun 1987 a	Paraguay.....		3 Feb 1972 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of).....	23 May 1969		Peru.....	23 May 1969	14 Sep 2000
Ireland.....		7 Aug 2006 a	Philippines.....	23 May 1969	15 Nov 1972
Italy.....	22 Apr 1970	25 Jul 1974	Poland.....		2 Jul 1990 a
Jamaica.....	23 May 1969	28 Jul 1970	Portugal.....		6 Feb 2004 a
Japan.....		2 Jul 1981 a	Republic of Korea <sup>10</sup> .....	27 Nov 1969	27 Apr 1977
Kazakhstan.....		5 Jan 1994 a	Republic of Moldova.....		26 Jan 1993 a
Kenya.....	23 May 1969		Russian Federation.....		29 Apr 1986 a
Kiribati.....		15 Sep 2005 a	Rwanda.....		3 Jan 1980 a
Kuwait.....		11 Nov 1975 a	Saudi Arabia.....		14 Apr 2003 a
Kyrgyzstan.....		11 May 1999 a	Senegal.....		11 Apr 1986 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic.....		31 Mar 1998 a	Serbia <sup>3</sup> .....		12 Mar 2001 d
Latvia.....		4 May 1993 a	Slovakia <sup>5</sup> .....		28 May 1993 d
Lesotho.....		3 Mar 1972 a	Slovenia <sup>3</sup> .....		6 Jul 1992 d
Liberia.....	23 May 1969	29 Aug 1985	Solomon Islands.....		9 Aug 1989 a
Libya.....		22 Dec 2008 a	Spain.....		16 May 1972 a
Liechtenstein.....		8 Feb 1990 a	St. Vincent and the Grenadines.....		27 Apr 1999 a
Lithuania.....		15 Jan 1992 a	State of Palestine.....		2 Apr 2014 a
Luxembourg.....	4 Sep 1969	23 May 2003	Sudan.....	23 May 1969	18 Apr 1990
Madagascar.....	23 May 1969		Suriname.....		31 Jan 1991 a
Malawi.....		23 Aug 1983 a	Sweden.....	23 Apr 1970	4 Feb 1975
Malaysia.....		27 Jul 1994 a	Switzerland.....		7 May 1990 a
Maldives.....		14 Sep 2005 a	Syrian Arab Republic.....		2 Oct 1970 a
Mali.....		31 Aug 1998 a	Tajikistan.....		6 May 1996 a
Malta.....		26 Sep 2012 a	Timor-Leste.....		8 Jan 2013 a
Mauritius.....		18 Jan 1973 a	Togo.....		28 Dec 1979 a
Mexico.....	23 May 1969	25 Sep 1974	Trinidad and Tobago.....	23 May 1969	
Mongolia.....		16 May 1988 a	Tunisia.....		23 Jun 1971 a
Montenegro <sup>8</sup> .....		23 Oct 2006 d	Turkmenistan.....		4 Jan 1996 a
Morocco.....	23 May 1969	26 Sep 1972	Ukraine.....		14 May 1986 a
Mozambique.....		8 May 2001 a	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.....	20 Apr 1970	25 Jun 1971
Myanmar.....		16 Sep 1998 a	United Republic of Tanzania.....		12 Apr 1976 a
Nauru.....		5 May 1978 a			

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification</i>	<i>Participant</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification</i>
United States of America.....	24 Apr 1970		Uzbekistan .....		12 Jul 1995 a
Uruguay .....	23 May 1969	5 Mar 1982	Viet Nam.....		10 Oct 2001 a
			Zambia.....	23 May 1969	

***Declarations and Reservations***  
***(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)***

**AFGHANISTAN**

"Afghanistan's understanding of article 62 (fundamental change of circumstances) is as follows:

"Sub-paragraph 2 (a) of this article does not cover unequal and illegal treaties, or any treaties which were contrary to the principle of self-determination. This view was also supported by the Expert Consultant in his statement of 11 May 1968 in the Committee of the Whole and on 14 May 1969 (doc. A/CONF.39/L.40) to the Conference."

**ALGERIA**

The accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria to the present Convention does not in any way mean recognition of Israel.

This accession shall not be interpreted as involving the establishment of relations of any kind whatever with Israel.

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria considers that the competence of the International Court of Justice cannot be exercised with respect to a dispute such as that envisaged in article 66 (a) at the request of one of the parties alone.

It declares that, in each case, the prior agreement of all the parties concerned is necessary for the dispute to be submitted to the said Court.

**ARGENTINA**

(a) The Argentine Republic does not regard the rule contained in article 45 (b) as applicable to it inasmuch as the rule in question provides for the renunciation of rights in advance.

(b) The Argentine Republic does not accept the idea that a fundamental change of circumstances which has occurred with regard to those existing at the time of the conclusion of a treaty, and which was not foreseen by the parties, may be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from the treaty; moreover, it objects to the reservations made by Afghanistan, Morocco and Syria with respect to article 62, paragraph 2 (a), and to any reservations to the same effect as those of the States referred to which may be made in the future with respect to article 62.

The application of this Convention to territories whose sovereignty is a subject of dispute between two or more States, whether or not they are parties to it, cannot be deemed to imply a modification, renunciation or abandonment of the position heretofore maintained by each of them.

**ARMENIA<sup>11</sup>**

"The Republic of Armenia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that for any dispute among the Contracting Parties concerning the

application or the interpretation of any article of part V of the Convention to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision or to the Conciliation Commission for consideration the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case."

**BELARUS**

*[Same reservations and declaration, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by the Russian Federation.]*

**BELGIUM<sup>12</sup>**

The Belgian State will not be bound by articles 53 and 64 of the Convention with regard to any party which, in formulating a reservation concerning article 66 (a), objects to the settlement procedure established by this article.

**BOLIVIA (PLURINATIONAL STATE OF)**

1. The shortcomings of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties are such as to postpone the realization of the aspirations of mankind.

2. Nevertheless, the rules endorsed by the Convention do represent significant advances, based on the principles of international justice which Bolivia has traditionally supported.

**BRAZIL**

... with a reservation to articles 25 and 66.

**BULGARIA<sup>13</sup>**

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers it necessary to underline that articles 81 and 83 of the Convention, which preclude a number of States from becoming parties to it, are of an unjustifiably restrictive character. These provisions are incompatible with the very nature of the Convention, which is of a universal character and should be open for accession by all States.

**CANADA**

"In acceding to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the Government of Canada declares its understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to exclude the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under the provisions of any treaty in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In relation to states parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of Canada declares that it does not regard the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing 'some other method of peaceful settlement' within the meaning of paragraph 2 (a) of the declaration of the Government of Canada accepting as

compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on April 7, 1970."

#### CHILE

The Republic of Chile declares its adherence to the general principle of the immutability of treaties, without prejudice to the right of States to stipulate, in particular, rules which modify this principle, and for this reason formulates a reservation relating to the provisions of article 62, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the Convention, which it considers inapplicable to Chile.

#### CHINA

1. The People's Republic of China makes its reservation to article 66 of the said Convention.

2. The signature to the said Convention by the Taiwan authorities on 27 April 1970 in the name of "China" is illegal and therefore null and void.

#### COLOMBIA

With regard to article 25, Colombia formulates the reservation that the Political Constitution of Colombia does not recognize the provisional application of treaties; it is the responsibility of the National Congress to approve or disapprove any treaties and conventions which the Government concludes with other States or with international legal entities.

#### COSTA RICA<sup>14</sup>

1. With regard to articles 11 and 12, the delegation of Costa Rica wishes to make a reservation to the effect that the Costa Rican system of constitutional law does not authorize any form of consent which is not subject to ratification by the Legislative Assembly.

2. With regard to article 25, it wishes to make a reservation to the effect that the Political Constitution of Costa Rica does not permit the provisional application of treaties, either.

3. With regard to article 27, it interprets this article as referring to secondary law and not to the provisions of the Political Constitution.

4. With regard to article 38, its interpretation is that no customary rule of general international law shall take precedence over any rule of the Inter-American System to which, in its view, this Convention is supplementary.

#### CUBA

The Government of the Republic of Cuba enters an explicit reservation to the procedure established under article 66 of the Convention, since it believes that any dispute should be settled by any means adopted by agreement between the parties to the dispute; the Republic of Cuba therefore cannot accept solutions which provide means for one of the parties, without the consent of the other to submit the dispute to procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation.

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties essentially codified and systematized the norms that had been established by custom and other sources of international law concerning negotiation, signature, ratification, entry into force, termination and other stipulations relating to international treaties; hence, those provisions, owing to their compulsory character, by virtue of having been established by universally recognized sources of international law, particularly those relating to invalidity, termination and suspension of the application of treaties, are applicable [to] any treaty negotiated by the Republic of Cuba prior to the aforesaid convention, essentially, treaties, covenants and concessions negotiated under

conditions of inequality or which disregard or diminish its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

#### CZECH REPUBLIC<sup>5</sup>

#### DENMARK

As between itself and any State which formulates, wholly or in part, a reservation relating to the provisions of article 66 of the Convention concerning the compulsory settlement of certain disputes, Denmark will not consider itself bound by those provisions of part V of the Convention, according to which the procedures for settlement set forth in article 66 are not to apply in the event of reservations formulated by other States.

#### ECUADOR

In signing this Convention, Ecuador has not considered it necessary to make any reservation in regard to article 4 of the Convention because it understands that the rules referred to in the first part of article 4 include the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, which is set forth in Article 2, paragraph 3 of the Charter of the United Nations and which, as *jus cogens*, has universal and mandatory force.

Ecuador also considers that the first part of article 4 is applicable to existing treaties.

It wishes to place on record, in this form, its view that the said article 4 incorporates the indisputable principle that, in cases where the Convention codifies rules of *lex lata*, these rules, as pre-existing rules, may be invoked and applied to treaties signed before the entry into force of this Convention, which is the instrument codifying the rules.

In ratifying this Convention, Ecuador wishes to place on record its adherence to the principles, norms and methods of peaceful settlement of disputes provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and in other international instruments on the subject, which have been expressly included in the Ecuadorian legal system in article 4, paragraph 3, of the Political Constitution of the Republic.

#### FINLAND<sup>15</sup>

"Finland also declares that as to its relation with any State which has made or makes a reservation to the effect that this State will not be bound by some or all of the provisions of article 66, Finland will consider itself bound neither by those procedural provisions nor by the substantive provisions of part V of the Convention to which the procedures provided for in article 66 do not apply as a result of the said reservation."

#### GERMANY<sup>6</sup>

"The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right, upon ratifying the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, to state its views on the declarations made by other States upon signing or ratifying or acceding to that Convention and to make reservations regarding certain provisions of the said Convention."

2. The Federal Republic of Germany assumes that the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice brought about by consent of States outside the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties cannot be excluded by invoking the provisions of article 66 (b) of the Convention.

3. The Federal Republic of Germany interprets 'measures taken in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations', as referred to in article 75, to mean future decisions by the Security Council of the United Nations in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

## GUATEMALA<sup>16</sup>

I. Guatemala cannot accept any provision of this Convention which would prejudice its rights and its claim to the Territory of Belize.

II. Guatemala will not apply articles [...], 25 and 66 in so far as they are contrary to the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic.

III. Guatemala will apply the provision contained in article 38 only in cases where it considers that it is in the national interest to do so.

(a) The Republic of Guatemala formally confirms reservations I and III which it formulated upon signing the [said Convention], to the effect, respectively, that Guatemala could not accept any provision of the Convention which would prejudice its rights and its claim to the territory of Belize and that it would apply the provision contained in article 38 of the Convention only in cases where it considered that it was in the national interest to do so;

(b) With respect to reservation II, which was formulated on the same occasion and which indicated that the Republic of Guatemala would not apply articles [...], 25 and 66 of the [said Convention] insofar as they were contrary to the Constitution, Guatemala states:

(b) (I) That it confirms the reservation with respect to the non-application of articles 25 and 66 of the Convention, insofar as both are incompatible with provisions of the Political Constitution currently in force;

(b) (II) [...]

Guatemala's consent to be bound by a treaty is subject to compliance with the requirements and procedures established in its Political Constitution. For Guatemala, the signature or initialling of a treaty by its representative is always understood to be *ad referendum* and subject, in either case, to confirmation by its Government.

(c) A reservation is hereby formulated with respect to article 27 of the Convention, to the effect that the article is understood to refer to the provisions of the secondary legislation of Guatemala and not to those of its Political Constitution, which take precedence over any law or treaty.

## HUNGARY<sup>17</sup>

### KUWAIT

The participation of Kuwait in this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait and that furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

## MONGOLIA<sup>18</sup>

1. The Mongolian People's Republic declares that it reserves the right to take any measures to safeguard its interests in the case of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

2. The Mongolian People's Republic deems it appropriate to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of article 81 and 83 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that the Convention should be open for accession by all States.

## MOROCCO

1. Morocco interprets paragraph 2 (a) of article 62 (Fundamental change of circumstances) as not applying to unlawful or inequitable treaties, or to any treaty contrary to the principle of self-determination. Morocco's views on paragraph 2 (a) were supported by the Expert Consultant in his statements in the Committee of the Whole on 11 May 1968 and before the Conference in

plenary on 14 May 1969 (see Document A/CONF.39/L.40).

2. It shall be understood that Morocco's signature of this Convention does not in any way imply that it recognized Israel. Furthermore, no treaty relationships will be established between Morocco and Israel.

## NETHERLANDS

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not regard the provisions of Article 66 (b) of the Convention as providing "some other method of peaceful settlement" within the meaning of the declaration of the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 1 August 1956."

## NEW ZEALAND

The Government of New Zealand declares its understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to exclude the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under the provisions of any treaty in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In relations to states parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of New Zealand declares that it will not regard the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing "some other method of peaceful settlement" within the meaning of this phrase where it appears in the declaration of the Government of New Zealand accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on 8 April 1940."

## OMAN

According to the understanding of the Government of the Sultanate of Oman the implementation of paragraph (2) of article (62) of the said Convention does not include those Treaties which are contrary to the right to self-determination.

## PERU<sup>19</sup>

For the Government of Peru, the application of articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention must be understood in accordance with, and subject to, the process of treaty signature, approval, ratification, accession and entry into force stipulated by its constitutional provisions.

## PORTUGAL

"Article 66" of the Vienna of the Convention is inextricably linked with the provisions of Part V to which it relates. Therefore, Portugal declares that as to its relation with any State which has made or makes a reservation to the effect that this State will not be bound by some or all of the provisions of article 66, it will consider itself bound neither by those procedural norms nor by the substantive norms of Part V of the Convention to which the procedures provided for in Article 66 do not apply as a result of the said reservation. However, Portugal does not object to the entry into force of the remaining of the Convention between the Portuguese Republic and such a State and considers that the absence of treaty relations between itself and that State with regard to all or certain norms of Part V will not in any way impair the latter to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law in dependently of the Convention".

#### **RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that, in order for any dispute among the Contracting Parties concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64 to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision or for any dispute concerning the application or interpretation of any other articles in Part V of the Convention to be submitted for consideration by the Conciliation Commission, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case, and that the conciliators constituting the Conciliation Commission may only be persons appointed by the parties to the dispute by common consent.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will consider that it is not obligated by the provisions of article 20, paragraph 3 or of article 45 (b) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, since they are contrary to established international practice.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that it reserves the right to take any measures to safeguard its interests in the event of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

#### **SAUDI ARABIA**

"... with a reservation regarding Article 66 so that the recourse to judgement or to arbitration should be preceded by agreement between the two countries concerned."

#### **SLOVAKIA<sup>5</sup>**

#### **SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC**

A—Acceptance of this Convention by the Syrian Arab Republic and ratification of it by its Government shall in no way signify recognition of Israel and cannot have as a result the establishment with the latter of any contact governed by the provisions of this Convention.

B—The Syrian Arab Republic considers that article 81 is not in conformity with the aims and purposes of the Convention in that it does not allow all States, without distinction or discrimination, to become parties to it.

C—The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic does not in any case accept the non-applicability of the principle of a fundamental change of circumstances with regard to treaties establishing boundaries, referred to in article 62, paragraph 2 (a), inasmuch as it regards this as a flagrant violation of an obligatory norm which forms part of general international law and which recognizes the right of peoples to self-determination.

D—The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic interprets the provisions in article 52 as follows:

The expression "the threat or use of force" used in this article extends also to the employment of economic, political, military and psychological coercion and to all types of coercion constraining a State to conclude a treaty against its wishes or its interests.

E—The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention and the ratification of it by its Government shall not apply to the Annex to the Convention, which concerns obligatory conciliation.

#### **TUNISIA**

The dispute referred to in article 66 (a) requires the consent of all parties thereto in order to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision.

#### **UKRAINE**

[ *Same reservations and declaration, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.* ]

#### **UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND<sup>20</sup>**

"In signing the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare their understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to oust the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under any provisions in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In particular, and in relation to States parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that they will not regard the provisions of sub-paragraph (b) of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing 'some other method of peaceful settlement' within the meaning of sub-paragraph (i) (a) of the Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the 1st of January 1969.

"The Government of the United Kingdom, while reserving their position for the time being with regard to other declarations and reservations made by various States on signing the Convention, consider it necessary to state that the United Kingdom does not accept that Guatemala has any rights or any valid claim in respect of the territory of British Honduras."

It is [the United Kingdom's] understanding that nothing in Article 66 of the Convention is intended to oust the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under any provisions in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In particular, and in relation to States parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court, the United Kingdom will not regard the provisions of sub-paragraph (b) of Article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties as providing 'some other method of peaceful settlement' within the meaning of sub-paragraph (i) (a) of the Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the 1st of January 1969.

#### **UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA**

"Article 66 of the Convention shall not be applied to the United Republic of Tanzania by any State which enters a reservation on any provision of part V or the whole of that part of the Convention."

#### **VIET NAM**

"Acceding to this Convention, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam makes its reservation to article 66 of the said Convention."

**Objections**  
**(Unless otherwise indicated the objections were made upon**  
**ratification, accession or succession.)**

**ALGERIA**

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, dedicated to the principle of the inviolability of the frontiers inherited on accession to independence, expresses an objection to the reservation entered by the Kingdom of Morocco with regard to paragraph 2 (a) of article 62 of the Convention.

**AUSTRIA**

"Austria is of the view that the Guatemalan reservations refer almost exclusively to general rules of [the said Convention] many of which are solidly based on international customary law. The reservations could call into question well-established and universally accepted norms. Austria is of the view that the reservations also raise doubts as to their compatibility with the object and purpose of the [said Convention]. Austria therefore objects to these reservations.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the [said Convention] between Austria and Guatemala."

**CANADA**

". . . Canada does not consider itself in treaty relations with the Syrian Arab Republic in respect of those provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties to which the compulsory conciliation procedures set out in the annex to that Convention are applicable."

**CHILE**

The Republic of Chile formulates an objection to the reservations which have been made or may be made in the future relating to article 62, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

**DENMARK**

"These reservations refer to general rules of [the said Convention], many of which are solidly based on customary international law. The reservation - if accepted - could call to question well established and universally accepted norms.

It is the opinion of the Government of Denmark that the reservations are not compatible with the object and purpose of [said Convention].

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Guatemala to [the said Convention]. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of [the said Convention] between Guatemala and Denmark and will thus enter into force between Guatemala and Denmark without Guatemala benefitting from these reservations."

**EGYPT**

The Arab Republic of Egypt does not consider itself bound by part V of the Convention vis-à-vis States which formulate reservations concerning the procedures for judicial settlement and compulsory arbitration set forth in article 66 and in the annex to the Convention, and it

rejects reservations made to the provisions of part V of the Convention.

**FINLAND**

"These reservations which consist of general references to national law and which do not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the provisions of the Convention, may create serious doubts about the Commitment of the reserving State as to the object and purpose of the Convention and may contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. In addition, the Government of Finland considers the reservation to article 27 of the Convention particularly problematic as it is a well-established rule of customary international law. The Government of Finland would like to recall that according to article 19 c of the [said] Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to these reservations made by the Government of Guatemala to the [said] Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Guatemala and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Guatemala benefitting from these reservations."

**GERMANY<sup>6</sup>**

**GERMANY<sup>6</sup>**

1. The Federal Republic of Germany rejects the reservations made by Tunisia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic and with regard to article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties as incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention. In this connection it wishes to point out that, as stressed on numerous other occasions, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers articles 53 and 64 to be inextricably linked to article 66 (a).

Objections, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, were also formulated by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

(i) 27 January 1988: in respect of reservations formulated by Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

(ii) 21 September 1988: in respect of the reservation made by Mongolia;

(iii) 30 January 1989: in respect of the reservation made by Algeria.

*With respect to the reservation made by Viet Nam upon accession:*

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the reservation to article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties made by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam at the time of its accession to the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that the dispute settlement procedure provided for by article 66 is inextricably linked with the provisions of Part V of the Convention and was indeed the basis on which the Vienna Conference accepted elements of Part V. The dispute settlement set forth in article 66 therefore is an essential part of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Germany is thus of the view that the reservation excluding that procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation to be followed in case of a dispute, raises doubts as to the full commitment of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to the object and purpose of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of the Republic of Germany, therefore, objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam".

#### ISRAEL

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of paragraph 2 in the declaration made by the Government of Morocco on that occasion. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, that declaration cannot in any way affect the obligations of Morocco already existing under general international law or under particular treaties. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Morocco an attitude of complete reciprocity."

*[With respect of declaration "A" made by the Syrian Arab Republic, same declaration, in essence, as the one above.]*

#### JAPAN

1. "The Government of Japan objects to any reservation intended to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions of article 66 and the Annex concerning the obligatory procedures for settlement of disputes and does not consider Japan to be in treaty relations with any State which has formulated or will formulate such reservation, in respect of those provisions of Part V of the Convention regarding which the application of the obligatory procedures mentioned above are to be excluded as a result of the said reservation. Accordingly, the treaty relations between Japan and the Syrian Arab Republic will not include those provisions of Part V of the Convention to which the conciliation procedure in the Annex applies and the treaty relations between Japan and Tunisia will not include articles 53 and 64 of the Convention.

2. The Government of Japan does not accept the interpretation of article 52 put forward by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, since that interpretation does not correctly reflect the conclusions reached at the Conference of Vienna on the subject of coercion."

"[In view of its declaration made upon accession] . . . the Government of Japan objects to the reservations made by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 66 and the Annex of the Convention and reaffirms the position of Japan that [it] will not be in treaty relations with the above States in respect of the provisions of Part V of the Convention.

2. The Government of Japan objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20, paragraph 3.

3. The Government of Japan objects to the declarations made by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics reserving their right to take any measures to safeguard their interests in the event of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Convention."

#### NETHERLANDS

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the opinion that the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes, as laid down in Article 66 of the Convention, are an important part of the Convention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected. Consequently, the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers it necessary to object to any reservation which is made by another State and whose aim is to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. While not objecting to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and such a State, the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that their treaty relations will not include the provisions of Part V of the Convention with regard to which the application of the procedures regarding the settlement of disputes, as laid down in Article 66, wholly or in part is excluded.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the absence of treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and such a State with regard to all or certain provisions of Part V will not in any way impair the duty of the latter to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independently of the Convention.

For the reasons set out above, the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which its accession to the Convention shall not include the Annex, and to the reservation of Tunisia, according to which the submission to the International Court of Justice of a dispute referred to in Article 66 (a) requires the consent of all parties thereto. Accordingly, the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Syrian Arab Republic will not include the provisions to which the conciliation procedure in the Annex applies and the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Tunisia will not include Article 53 and 64 of the Convention."

Objections, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, were also formulated by the Government of the Netherlands in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

(i) 25 September 1987: in respect of reservations formulated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic;

(ii) 14 July 1988: in respect of reservations made by the Government of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Hungary;

(iii) 28 July 1988: in respect of one of the reservations made by Mongolia;

(iv) 30 January 1989: in respect of the reservation made by Algeria.

v) 14 September 1998: in respect of the reservation to article 66 made by Guatemala.

"In conformity with the terms of the objections the Kingdom of the Netherlands must be deemed to have objected to the reservation, excluding wholly or in part the procedures for the settlement of disputes, contained in article 66 of the Convention, as formulated by Cuba.

Accordingly, the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Cuba under the Convention do not include any of the provisions contained in Part V of the Convention. The Kingdom of the Netherlands reiterates that the absence of treaty relations between itself and Cuba in respect of Part V of the Convention will not in any way impair the duty of Cuba to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independent of the Convention."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the Government of Peru at the time of its ratification of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The



Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Peru.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, this reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Peru as to the object and purpose of the Convention and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Peru to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Peru."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation with regard to article 66 made by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam at the time of its accession to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, concluded on 23 May 1969, and refers to the objections formulated by the Kingdom of the Netherlands upon its accession to the above-mentioned Convention on 9 April 1985.

In conformity with the terms of the objections the Kingdom of the Netherlands must be deemed to have objected to the reservation formulated by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, excluding wholly the procedures for the settlement of disputes contained in article 66 of the Convention. Accordingly, the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam under the Convention do not include any of the provisions contained in Part V of the Convention.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands stresses that the absence of treaty relations between itself and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam in respect of Part V of the Convention will not in any way impair the duty of Viet Nam to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions, to which it is bound under international law, independent of the Convention."

#### NEW ZEALAND

"... The New Zealand Government objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Syria to the obligatory conciliation procedures contained in the Annex to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between New Zealand and Syria."

"... The New Zealand Government objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Tunisia in respect of Article 66 (a) of the Convention and does not consider New Zealand to be in treaty relations with Tunisia in respect of those provisions of the Convention to which the dispute settlement procedure provided for in Article 66 (a) is applicable."

#### SWEDEN

"Article 66 of the Convention contains certain provisions regarding procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation. According to these provisions a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64, which deal with the so called *jus cogens*, may be submitted to the International Court of Justice. If the dispute concerns the application or

the interpretation of any of the other articles in Part V of the Convention, the conciliation procedure specified in the Annex to the Convention may be set in motion.

"The Swedish Government considers that these provisions regarding the settlement of disputes are an important part of the Convention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected. Consequently, the Swedish Government considers it necessary to raise objections to any reservation which is made by another State and whose aim is to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. While not objecting to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and such a State, the Swedish Government considers that their treaty relations will not include either the procedural provision in respect of which a reservation has been made or the substantive provisions to which that procedural provision relates.

"For the reasons set out above, the Swedish Government objects to the reservation of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which its accession to the Convention shall not include the Annex, and to the reservation of Tunisia, according to which the dispute referred to in article 66 (a) requires the consent of all parties thereto in order to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision. In view of these reservations, the Swedish Government considers, *firstly*, that the treaty relations between Sweden and the Syrian Arab Republic will not include those provisions of Part V of the Convention to which the conciliation procedure in the Annex applies and, *secondly*, that the treaty relations between Sweden and Tunisia will not include articles 53 and 64 of the Convention.

"The Swedish Government has also taken note of the declaration of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which it interprets the expression "the threat or use of force" as used in article 52 of the Convention so as to extend also to the employment of economic, political, military and psychological coercion and to all types of coercion constraining a State to conclude a treaty against its wishes or its interests. On this point, the Swedish Government observes that since article 52 refers to threat or use of force in violation of the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, it should be interpreted in the light of the practice which has developed or will develop on the basis of the Charter."

*With regard to reservations made by Guatemala upon ratification:*

"The Government of Sweden is of the view that these reservations raise doubts as to their compatibility with the object and purpose of the Convention. The reservations refer almost exclusively to general rules of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, many of which are solidly based on customary international law. The reservations could call into question well established and universally accepted norms.

The Government of Sweden notes in particular that the Government of Guatemala has entered a reservation that it would apply the provisions contained in article 38 of the Convention only in cases where it considered that it was in the national interest to do so; and furthermore a reservation with respect to article 27 of the Convention, to the effect that the article is understood to refer to the provisions of the secondary legislation of Guatemala and not to those of its Political Constitution, which take precedence over any law or treaty.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Guatemala to the [said] Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Guatemala and Sweden. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Guatemala benefiting from this reservation."

"The Government of Sweden wishes to recall its statements of the 4th of February 1975, made in connection with its ratification of the Convention, relating to the accession of the Syrian Arab Republic and the Republic of Tunisia respectively, which reads as follows:

"Article 66 of the Convention contains certain provisions regarding procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation. According to these provisions a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64, which deal with the so called *ius cogens*, may be submitted to the International Court of Justice. If the dispute concerns the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles in Part V of the Convention, the conciliation procedure specified in the Annex to the Convention may be set in motion. The Swedish Government considers that these provisions regarding the settlement of disputes are an important part of the Convention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected. Consequently, the Swedish Government considers it necessary to raise objections to any reservation which is made by another State and whose aim is to exclude the application, wh or in part, of the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. While not objecting to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and such a State, the Swedish Government considers that their treaty relations will not include either the procedural provision in respect of which a reservation has been made or the substantive provisions to which that procedural provision relates.' For the reasons set out above, which also apply to the reservation made by the Republic of Cuba, the Swedish Government objects to the reservation entered by the Government of the Republic of Cuba to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties."

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Peru at the time of its ratification of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The Government of Sweden notes that articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Peru. The Government of Sweden is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, this reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Peru to the object and purpose of the Convention and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation by the Government of Peru to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Peru and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Peru benefiting from its reservation."

#### **UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND**

"The United Kingdom does not accept that the interpretation of Article 52 put forward by the Government of Syria correctly reflects the conclusions reached at the Conference of Vienna on the subject of

coercion; the Conference dealt with this matter by adopting a Declaration on this subject which forms part of the Final Act;

"The United Kingdom objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Syria in respect of the Annex to the Convention and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and Syria;

"With reference to a reservation in relation to the territory of British Honduras made by Guatemala on signing the Convention, the United Kingdom does not accept that Guatemala has any rights or any valid claim with respect to that territory; "The United Kingdom fully reserves its position in other respects with regard to the declarations made by various States on signature, to some of which the United Kingdom would object, if they were to be confirmed on ratification."

"... The United Kingdom objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Tunisia in respect of Article 66 (a) of the Convention and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and Tunisia."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland note that the instrument of ratification of the Government of Finland, which was deposited with the Secretary-General on 19 August 1977, contains a declaration relating to paragraph 2 of article 7 of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Secretary-General that they do not regard that declaration as in any way affecting the interpretation or application of article 7."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland object to the reservation entered by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by which it rejects the application of article 66 of the Convention. Article 66 provides in certain circumstances for the compulsory settlement of disputes by the International Court of Justice (in the case of disputes concerning the application or interpretation of articles 53 or 64) or by a conciliation procedure (in the case of the rest of Part V of the Convention). These provisions are inextricably linked with the provisions of Part V to which they relate. Their inclusion was the basis on which those parts of Part V which represent progressive development of international law were accepted by the Vienna Conference. Accordingly the United Kingdom does not consider that the treaty relations between it and the Soviet Union include Part V of the Convention.

With respect to any other reservation the intention of which is to exclude the application, in whole or in part, of the provisions of article 66, to which the United Kingdom has already objected or which is made after the reservation by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom will not consider its treaty relations with the State which has formulated or will formulate such a reservation as including those provisions of Part V of the Convention with regard to which the application of article 66 is rejected by the reservation.

The instrument of accession deposited by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics included also a declaration that it reserves the right to take "any measures" to safeguard its interests in the event of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Convention. The purpose and scope of this statement is unclear; but, given that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has rejected the application of article 66 of the Convention, it would seem to apply rather to acts by Parties to the Convention in respect of treaties where such acts are in breach of the Convention. In such circumstances a State would not be limited in its response to the measures in article 60: under customary international law it would be entitled to take other measures, provided always that they are reasonable and in proportion to the breach."

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish in this context to recall their declaration of 5 June 1987 [in respect of the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics] which in accordance with its terms applies to the reservations mentioned above, and will similarly apply to any like reservations which any other State may formulate."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland objects to the reservation [...]. The Government of the United Kingdom wishes in this context to recall their declaration of 5 June 1987 (in respect of the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) which in accordance with its terms applies to the reservation mentioned above, and will apply similarly to any like reservation which any other State may formulate. Accordingly the United Kingdom does not consider that the treaty relations between it and the Republic of Cuba include Part V of the Convention."

"The instrument of accession deposited by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam contains a reservation in respect of article 66 of the Convention. The United Kingdom objects to the reservation entered by the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in respect of article 66 and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam."

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Government of the United States of America objects to reservation E of the Syrian instrument of accession:

"In the view of the United States Government that reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and undermines the principle of impartial settlement of disputes concerning the invalidity, termination, and suspension of the operation of treaties, which was the subject of extensive negotiation at the Vienna Conference.

"The United States Government intends, at such time as it may become a party to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, to reaffirm its objection to the foregoing reservation and to reject treaty relations with the Syrian

Arab Republic under all provisions in Part V of the Convention with regard to which the Syrian Arab Republic has rejected the obligatory conciliation procedures set forth in the Annex to the Convention.

"The United States Government is also concerned about Syrian reservation C declaring that the Syrian Arab Republic does not accept the non-applicability of the principle of a fundamental change of circumstances with regard to treaties establishing boundaries, as stated in Article 62, 2 (a), and Syrian reservation D concerning its interpretation of the expression 'the threat or use of force' in Article 52. However, in view of the United States Government's intention to reject treaty relations with the Syrian Arab Republic under all provisions in Part V to which reservations C and D relate, we do not consider it necessary at this time to object formally to those reservations.

"The United States Government will consider that the absence of treaty relations between the United States of America and the Syrian Arab Republic with regard to certain provisions in Part V will not in any way impair the duty of the latter to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independently of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties."

"... The United States of America objects to the reservation by Tunisia to paragraph (a) of Article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties regarding a dispute as to the interpretation or application of Article 53 or 64. The right of a party to invoke the provisions of Article 53 or 64 is inextricably linked with the provisions of Article 42 regarding impeachment of the validity of a treaty and paragraph (a) of Article 66 regarding the right of any party to submit to the International Court of Justice for decision any dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of Article 53 or 64.

"Accordingly, the United States Government intends, at such time as it becomes a party to the Convention, to reaffirm its objection to the Tunisian reservation and declare that it will not consider that Article 53 or 64 of the Convention is in force between the United States of America and Tunisia."

***Notifications made under the Annex (paragraphs 1 and 2) (List of conciliators nominated for the purpose of constituting a conciliation commission) (For the list of conciliators whose nomination was not renewed, see note 21 hereinafter).<sup>21</sup>***

<b><i>Participant</i></b>	<b><i>Nominations:</i></b>	<b><i>Date of deposit of notification with the Secretary-General:</i></b>
Austria <sup>22</sup> .....	Ambassador Helmut Türk	8 Jan 2001
Austria <sup>22</sup> .....	Professor Karl Zemanek	8 Jan 2001
Croatia .....	Dr. Stanko Nick	14 Dec 1992
Croatia .....	Professor Dr. Budislav Vukas	14 Dec 1992
Denmark <sup>22</sup> .....	Prof. Isi Foighel	7 Mar 1995
Denmark <sup>22</sup> .....	Ambassador Skjold Gustav Mellbin	7 Mar 1995
Germany .....	Prof. Dr. Wolff Heintschel von Heinegg	12 Mar 2001
Germany .....	Professor Dr. Andreas Zimmermann	12 March 2001
Paraguay .....	Dr. Luis María Ramírez Boettner	22 Sep 1994
Paraguay .....	Dr. Jerónimo Irala Burgos	22 Sept 1994
Portugal.....	Professor Wladimir Brito	5 Oct 2011
Portugal.....	Professor Francisco Ferreira de Almelda	5 Oct 2011
Slovakia .....	Dr. Igor Grexa, Director-General for Legal and Consular Affairs, Ministry of Foreign	9 Jul 2004

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Nominations:</i>	<i>Date of deposit of notification with the Secretary-General:</i>
	Affairs of Slovakia	
Spain .....	Sr. D. José Antonio Pastor Ridruejo	3 Jan 2001
Spain .....	Sr. D. Aurelio Pérez Giralda	3 Jan 2001
Sweden <sup>22</sup> .....	Mr. Hans Danelius	17 Feb 1994
Sweden <sup>22</sup> .....	Mr. Love Gustav-Adolf Kellberg	17 Feb 1994
Switzerland .....	Mr. Lucius Caflisch, Judge at the European Court of Human Rights	6 March 2008
Switzerland .....	Mr. Walter Kälin, Professor of Public Law and International Law at the University of Berne	6 March 2008
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia .....	Mrs. Elena Andreevska, Director of the Directorate on International Law	3 Mar 1999
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia .....	Mr. Goran Stevceviski, Director of the Directorate on International Law	27 April 2011

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 16 (A/6316), p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 16 (A/6716), p. 80.

<sup>3</sup> The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 23 May 1969 and 27 August 1970, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

<sup>4</sup> Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 27 April 1970. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature, the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the said signature was irregular since the so-called "Government of China" represented no one and had no right to speak on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State in the world—the People's Republic of China.

The Permanent Mission of Bulgaria to the United Nations later addressed to the Secretary-General a similar communication.

In two letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties in 1968 and 1969, contributed to the formulation of the Convention concerned and signed it, and that "any statements or reservations to the said Convention that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the

Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China as a signatory of the said Convention".

<sup>5</sup> Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 July 1987, with a reservation. By a communication received on 19 October 1990, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with respect to article 66 of the Convention, which reads as follows:

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention and declares that, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, for any dispute to be submitted to the International Court of Justice or to a conciliation procedure, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case.

See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

<sup>6</sup> The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 20 October 1986 with the following reservation and declarations:

Reservation:

The German Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention.

In order to submit a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision or to submit a dispute on the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles of Part V of the Convention to the Conciliation Commission for consideration it shall be necessary in every single case to have the consent of all

Parties to the dispute. The members of the Conciliation commission shall be appointed jointly by the Parties to the dispute.

Declarations:

The German Democratic Republic declares that it reserves itself the right to take measures to protect its interests in the case that other States would not comply with the provisions of the Convention.

The German Democratic Republic holds the view that the provisions of articles 81 and 83 of the Convention are in contradiction to the principle according to which any State, the policy of which is guided by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, has the right to become a Party to Conventions affecting the interests of all States.

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

<sup>7</sup> See note 1 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

<sup>8</sup> See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

<sup>9</sup> See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

<sup>10</sup> With reference to this signature, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Mongolia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, stating that the said signature was illegal inasmuch as the South Korean authorities could not under any circumstances speak on behalf of Korea.

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations declared that the above-mentioned statement by the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was without legal foundation and therefore neither affected the legitimate act of signing the Convention by the Government of the Republic of Korea nor prejudiced the rights and obligations of the Republic of Korea under it. He further stated that "in this connexion, it should be noted that the General Assembly of the United Nations declared at its third session and has continuously reaffirmed thereafter that the Government of the Republic of Korea is the only lawful Government in Korea".

Subsequently, in a communication received on 24 October 2002, the Government of Bulgaria informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"... upon signature of the above Convention by the Republic of Korea, in 1971, the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria[,] in [a] communication addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature, ... stated that its Government considered the said signature was illegal inasmuch as the South Korean authorities could not speak on behalf of Korea.

Now therefore [the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria declares] that the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria,

having reviewed the said declaration, hereby withdraws the same."

<sup>11</sup> Within a period of one year from the date of the depositary notification transmitting the reservation (i.e. 13 July 2005), none of the Contracting Parties to the said Convention had notified the Secretary-General of an objection either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged. Consequently, the reservation in question was accepted for deposit upon the above-stipulated one year period, that is on 13 July 2006.

<sup>12</sup> On 18 February 1993, the Government of Belgium notified the Secretary-General that its instrument of accession should have specified that the said accession was made subject to the said reservation. None of the Contracting Parties to the Agreement having notified the Secretary-General of an objection either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date its circulation (23 March 1993), the reservation is deemed to have been accepted.

<sup>13</sup> In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with regard to article 66 (a), which read as follows:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 66, paragraph a) of the Convention, according to which any one of the parties to a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 may, by a written application, submit it to the International Court of Justice for a decision unless the parties by common consent agree to submit the dispute to arbitration. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria states that for the submission of such a dispute to the International Court of Justice for a decision, the preliminary consent of all parties to the dispute is needed.

<sup>14</sup> In this regard, on 13 October 1998, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication: "The Government of the United Kingdom object to the reservation entered by Costa Rica in respect of article 27 and reiterate their observation in respect of the similar reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala."

<sup>15</sup> On 20 April 2001, the Government of Finland informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration in respect of article 7 (2) made upon ratification. The text of the declaration reads as follows:

"Finland declares its understanding that nothing in paragraph 2 of article 7 of the Convention is intended to modify any provisions of internal law in force in any Contracting State concerning competence to conclude treaties. Under the Constitution of Finland the competence to conclude treaties is given to the President of the Republic, who also decides on the issuance of full powers to the Head of Government and the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

<sup>16</sup> On 15 March 2007, the Government of Guatemala informed the Secretary-General of that it had decided the following:

"Withdraw in their entirety the reservations formulated by the Republic of Guatemala on 23 May 1969 and confirmed upon 14 May 1997 to Articles 11 and 12 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties."

The text of the reservations made upon signature and ratification read as follows:

Upon signature:

Reservations:

I. Guatemala cannot accept any provision of this Convention which would prejudice its rights and its claim to the Territory of Belize.

II. Guatemala will not apply articles 11, 12, 25 and 66 in so far as they are contrary to the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic.

III. Guatemala will apply the provision contained in article 38 only in cases where it considers that it is in the national interest to do so.

Upon ratification:

Reservations:

(a) The Republic of Guatemala formally confirms reservations I and III which it formulated upon signing the [said Convention], to the effect, respectively, that Guatemala could not accept any provision of the Convention which would prejudice its rights and its claim to the territory of Belize and that it would apply the provision contained in article 38 of the Convention only in cases where it considered that it was in the national interest to do so; (b) With respect to reservation II, which was formulated on the same occasion and which indicated that the Republic of Guatemala would not apply articles 11, 12, 25 and 66 of the [said Convention] insofar as they were contrary to the Constitution, Guatemala states: (b) (I) That it confirms the reservation with respect to the non-application of articles 25 and 66 of the Convention, insofar as both are incompatible with provisions of the Political Constitution currently in force; (b) (II) That it also confirms the reservation with respect to the non-application of articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.

Guatemala's consent to be bound by a treaty is subject to compliance with the requirements and procedures established in its Political Constitution. For Guatemala, the signature or initialling of a treaty by its representative is always understood to be *ad referendum* and subject, in either case, to confirmation by its Government.

(c) A reservation is hereby formulated with respect to article 27 of the Convention, to the effect that the article is understood to refer to the provisions of the secondary legislation of Guatemala and not to those of its Political Constitution, which take precedence over any law or treaty.

It will be recalled that the Secretary-General received communications in regard to the said reservations from the various States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Germany (21 September 1998):

These reservations refer almost exclusively to general rules of the Convention many of which are solidly based on customary international law. The reservations could call into question well-established and universally-accepted norms of international law, especially insofar as the reservations concern articles 27 and 38 of the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that the reservations also raise doubts as to their compatibility with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to these reservations. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Germany and Guatemala.

Belgium (30 September 1998):

The reservations entered by Guatemala essentially concern general rules laid down in the [said Convention], many of which form part of customary international law. These reservations could call into question firmly established and universally accepted norms. The Kingdom of Belgium therefore raises an objection to the reservations. This objection does not prevent the [said Convention] from taking effect between the Kingdom of Belgium and Guatemala.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (13 October 1998):

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland object to the reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala in respect of article 27, and wish to observe that the customary international law rule set out in that article applies to constitutional as well as to other internal laws. The Government of the United Kingdom object also to the reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala in respect of article 38, by which the Republic of Guatemala seek subjective application of the rule of customary international law set out in that article. The Government of the United Kingdom wish to recall their declaration of 5 June 1987 (in respect of the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), which, in accordance with its terms, applies to the reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala in respect of article 66 and will similarly apply to any like reservation which any other State may formulate."

<sup>17</sup> In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw as from that date, its reservation regarding article 66 made upon accession which reservation reads as follows:

The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision or submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any articles in Part V of the Convention to a conciliation commission for consideration shall be subject to the consent of all the parties to the dispute and that the conciliators constituting the conciliation commission shall have been nominated exclusively with the common consent of the parties to the dispute.

<sup>18</sup> In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its

decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession, which reads as follows:

1. The Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention.

The Mongolian People's Republic declares that submission of any dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 and 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision as well as submission of any dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any other articles in Part V of the Convention to a conciliation commission for consideration shall be subject to the consent of all the parties to the dispute in each separate case, and that the conciliators constituting the conciliation commission shall be appointed by the parties to the dispute by common consent.

2. The Mongolian People's Republic is not obligated by the provisions of article 45 (b) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, since they are contrary to established international practice.

<sup>19</sup> On 14 November 2001, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Austria the following communication:

"Austria has examined the reservation made by the Government of Peru at the time of its ratification of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, regarding the application of articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention.

The fact that Peru is making the application of the said articles subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing national legislation, in the absence of further clarification raises doubts as to the commitment of Peru to the object and purpose of the Convention. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. In Austria's view the reservation in question is therefore inadmissible to the extent that its application could negatively affect the compliance by Peru with its obligations under articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention.

For these reasons, Austria objects to the reservation made by the Government of Peru to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Peru and Austria, without Peru benefiting from its reservation."

In this regard, the Secretary-General received, on 21 January 2002, from the Government of Peru the following communication:

[The Government of Peru refers to the communication made by the Government of Austria relating to the reservation made by Peru upon ratification]. In this document, Member States are informed of a communication from the Government of Austria stating its objection to the reservation entered in respect of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties by the Government of Peru on 14 September 2000 when depositing the corresponding instrument of ratification.

As the [Secretariat] is aware, article 20, paragraph 5, of the Vienna Convention states that "a reservation is considered to

have been accepted by a State if it shall have raised no objection to the reservation by the end of a period of twelve months after it was notified of the reservation (...)". The ratification and reservation by Peru in respect of the Vienna Convention were communicated to Member States on 9 November 2000.

Since the communication from the Austrian Government was received by the Secretariat on 14 November 2001 and circulated to Member States on 28 November 2001, the Peruvian Mission is of the view that there is tacit acceptance on the part of the Austrian Government of the reservation entered by Peru, the 12-month period referred to in article 20, paragraph 5, of the Vienna Convention having elapsed without any objection being raised. The Peruvian Government considers the communication from the Austrian Government as being without legal effect, since it was not submitted in a timely manner.

<sup>20</sup> On 24 February 1998, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala the following communication:

Guatemala maintains a territorial dispute over the illegal occupation of part of its territory by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, succeeded by the Government of Belize, and Guatemala therefore continues to assert a valid claim based on international law which must be settled by restoring to it the territory which historically and legally belongs to it.

<sup>21</sup> The nomination of the conciliators listed hereinafter was not renewed after five years. For the date of their nomination and their titles, see the preceding editions of the present publication:

<i>State:</i>	<i>Conciliators:</i>
Australia	Mr. Patrick Brazil
Austria	Professor Stephen Verosta, Dr. Helmut Tuerk, Dr. Karl Zemanek
Cyprus	M. Criton Tornaritis, Mr. Michalakis Triantafyllides, Mrs. Stella Soulioti
Denmark	Ambassador Paul Fischer
Finland	Professor Isi Foighel, Professor Erik Castrén
Germany	Professor Thomas Oppermann (German Democratic Republic), Professor Günther Jaenicke (German Democratic Republic)
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Mr. Morteza Kalantarian
Italy	Professor Riccardo Monaco, Professor Luigi Ferrari- Bravo
Japan	Professor Shigejiro Tabata, Judge Masato Fujisaki
Kenya	Mr. John Maximian Nazareth
Mexico	Mr. S. Amos Wako Mr. Antonio Gomez Robledo, Mr. César Sepúlveda, Ambassador Alfonso de Rosenzweig- Diáz

<b>State:</b>	<b>Conciliators:</b>
Morocco	Mr. Abdelaziz Amine Filali, Mr. Ibrahim Keddara, Mr. Abdelaziz Benjelloun
Netherlands	Professor W. Riphagen, Professor A.M. Stuyt,
Panama	Mr. Jorge E. Illueca, Mr. Nanader A. Pitty Velasquez
Spain	Professor Julio Diego González Campos, Professor Manuel Diez de VelascoVallejo
Sweden	Mr. Gunnar Lagergren, Mr. Ivan Wallenberg
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Professor R.Y. Jennings, Sir Ian Sinclair
Yugoslavia (former)	Dr. Milan Bulajic, Dr. Milivoj Despot, Dr. Budislav Vukas, Dr. Borut Bohte

<sup>22</sup> Designation renewed on that date for a term of five years.



