

CONTENTS — TABLE DES MATIÈRES

	<i>Page</i>
Preliminary Objections Submitted by the United States of America — Exceptions préliminaires présentées par les Etats-Unis d'Amérique	
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	3
PART I. STATEMENT OF FACTS RELEVANT TO JURISDICTION	9
Chapter I. Iranian attacks on merchant shipping during the Iran-Iraq war threatened the freedom of navigation and prompted the deployment of military forces by various nations to the Gulf	15
Chapter II. On 3 July 1988, Iranian gunboats and U.S. naval vessels were engaged in combat when an unidentified Iranian aircraft rapidly approached the U.S. vessels and, upon failure to respond to repeated radio warnings, was shot down	26
Chapter III. Once it became known that the aircraft shot down was a civilian airliner, the United States investigated the incident with a view to preventing such tragedies in the future and sought to compensate the families of the victims, while Iran immediately sought political condemnation of the United States by the United Nations and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)	44
Section I. The United States immediately announced its intention to compensate the families of the victims of Iran Air Flight 655 while at the same time investigating the incident and taking steps to avoid its recurrence	46
Section II. The Government of Iran did not approach the United States either directly or indirectly, but rather immediately sought political condemnation of the United States by the United Nations and ICAO	58
Section III. The ICAO Council resolved to undertake an investigation of the incident for the purpose of taking steps to ensure safety of civil aviation	62
Chapter IV. Iran, unsatisfied with the response of ICAO and the United Nations to the incident, filed suit before this Court on 17 May 1989	73
PART II. THE COURT HAS AUTHORITY IN THESE PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS TO UPHOLD THE OBJECTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE COURT'S JURISDICTION	75
PART III. THE COURT DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION UNDER ARTICLE 84 OF THE CHICAGO CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION	89
Chapter I. The Chicago Convention and the ICAO Rules clearly distinguish between the ICAO Council's quasi-judicial functions under Article 84 (for which there is a possibility of appeal to the Court) and	

	<i>Page</i>
PART IV. THE JURISDICTION OF THE COURT OVER THE ICAO COUNCIL DECISION OF 17 MARCH 1989 PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 84 OF THE CHICAGO CONVENTION	396
Chapter I. The Court's jurisdiction derives from Article 84 of the Chicago Convention	400
Chapter II. The Council's handling of the dispute arising from the shoot-down of Flight IR 655	405
Section A. The Islamic Republic submitted a disagreement over the interpretation or application of the Convention to the Council . .	408
(i) The Islamic Republic's communications of 3-4 July 1988 . . .	408
(ii) The Islamic Republic's application to the ICAO Council . . .	411
(iii) The Islamic Republic maintained its legal claims before the ICAO Council throughout the Council's deliberations	414
Section B. The response of the United States before the ICAO Coun- cil confirms that a disagreement over the interpretation and appli- cation of the Convention had been submitted to the Council . . .	417
(i) The United States immediately took issue with the Islamic Republic's position	418
Section C. The ICAO Council's approach to the shoot-down of Flight IR 655	421
(i) The ICAO Council's consideration of the disagreement	422
(ii) The Council's decision of 17 March 1989 was of a nature appealable to the Court	425
Section D. Conclusion	428
Chapter III. The United States' emphasis on the significance of the Rules is misplaced	429
Section A. The Rules are neither detailed, comprehensive, exclusive nor mandatory	430
Section B. The Rules are not well established within the practice of the ICAO Council	432
Section C. The Council has the obligation to determine its pro- cedures, not the applicant State	434
Section D. The Rules were followed in essence	438
Chapter IV. Even if made under Article 54, decisions of the Council on the interpretation or application of the Convention are appealable .	445
Section A. The structure of the Chicago Convention does not pro- vide a clear-cut distinction between Articles 54 and 55 of the Con- vention, on the one hand, and Article 84, on the other	446
Section B. Under Article 54 the Council may be called upon to make decisions on the interpretation or application of the Convention .	448
Section C. The United States acknowledges that the provisions of Articles 54 and 55 may involve the Council making decisions over the interpretation or application of the Convention	450
Chapter V. Policy considerations why the court should accept jurisdic- tion in this case	452
Section A. The limitations of the ICAO Council justify an appeal .	452
Section B. An appeal is justified given the nature of the proceedings in this case	457

	<i>Page</i>
Section C. The operation of ICAO would not be hampered by the Court's accepting jurisdiction concerning the dispute over Flight IR 655	459
Section D. The integrity of ICAO would be strengthened by granting a right of appeal in this case	462
Section E. The United States has recognized that this kind of incident should be heard by the Court	465
Section F. Conclusions	466
PART V. THE JURISDICTION OF THE COURT ON THE BASIS OF THE MONTREAL CONVENTION	468
Chapter I. The conditions of prior negotiation and arbitration under Article 14 (1) of the Montreal Convention	470
Section A. The condition of prior negotiation	470
(i) Prior to the submission of the case to the Court the dispute had been clearly defined	471
(ii) Prior negotiations did not prove necessary in view of the strong disagreement between the Parties	475
Section B. The condition of prior arbitration	477
(i) The purpose and scope of international clauses requiring prior recourse to arbitration	479
(ii) The inapplicability of the prior arbitration clause in the case under discussion	486
Chapter II. The Montreal Convention is relevant to the facts upon which the claims of the Islamic Republic rest	488
Section A. The expression "any person" used in Article 1 of the Montreal Convention does not distinguish between a private individual and a State agent	491
(i) The text of the Montreal Convention	492
(ii) The preparatory works	493
(iii) The international practice bears out the interpretation of Article 1 of the Montreal Convention set out above	498
(iv) Conclusions as to Article 1	503
Section B. The practice followed by ICAO is not germane to the question whether the Montreal Convention is applicable to the present dispute	504
(i) The lack of legal relevance of the "subsequent practice" referred to by the United States	505
(ii) The discussions in ICAO on other aerial incidents	507
(iii) The irrelevance of ICAO's suggestions for new agreements or amendments to existing agreements	512
Chapter III. The Montreal Convention and international armed conflict	517
Section A. At the time of the shoot-down of Flight IR 655 the United States and the Islamic Republic were not engaged in an international armed conflict	517
(i) The factual aspects of the issue	517
(ii) Legal considerations	520

	<i>Page</i>
Section B. Even assuming that the United States and the Islamic Republic were engaged in an international armed conflict, <i>quod non</i> , the Montreal Convention was nevertheless applicable	525
PART VI. JURISDICTION UNDER THE TREATY OF AMITY	532
Chapter I. The United States is precluded from objecting to the Treaty as a basis of jurisdiction	537
Section A. The Treaty remains in force between the Parties	537
Section B. The Islamic Republic is not barred from invoking the Treaty	540
Chapter II. The Islamic Republic has not changed the nature of the dispute by invoking the Treaty	545
Section A. The dual nature of the Islamic Republic's claims	546
(i) The claims based on the illegal use of force by the United States	546
(ii) The claims based on illegal interference with the Islamic Republic's commerce and navigation	547
(iii) The appropriateness of the Islamic Republic's submissions	548
Section B. The United States' admission as to the relevance of the background facts	549
Chapter III. The Treaty of Amity is directly relevant to the subject-matter of the dispute	555
Section A. The existence of a dispute over the Treaty's interpretation or application	555
Section B. The relevance of the Treaty to the subject-matter of the dispute	561
Chapter IV. The dispute has been shown to be one "not satisfactorily adjusted by diplomacy"	570
Section A. Article XXI (2) of the Treaty does not require prior negotiations	571
Section B. The Parties' positions were so positively opposed to each other that negotiations would not be required in any event	574
PART VII. CONCLUSIONS AND SUBMISSIONS	579
SUBMISSIONS	583
<i>Annex.</i> The illegal U.S. NOTAMs and the lack of coordination by U.S. forces with civilian ATS authorities in the Persian Gulf region	585
<i>List of exhibits</i>	605
Observations of the International Civil Aviation Organization	
LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION TO THE REGISTRAR OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE	617
INTRODUCTION	618

	<i>Page</i>
FACTUAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ICAO COUNCIL FOLLOWING THE DESTRUCTION OF THE IRAN AIRBUS A300 FLIGHT NO. IR 655	618
CONCLUSION	619
<i>Attachment A.</i> The Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), at its Extraordinary Session held on 13 and 14 July 1988, approved as its decision the following statement by the President of the Council	620
<i>Attachment B.</i> Decision of the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)	621
<i>Attachment C.</i> Resolution adopted by the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization at the 20th meeting of its 126th session on 17 March 1989	622
 Observations de l'Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale	
INTRODUCTION	623
NARRATION DES FAITS CONCERNANT LES TRAVAUX DU CONSEIL À LA SUITE DE LA DESTRUCTION DE L'AIRBUS A300 D'IRAN AIR ASSURANT LE VOL N° IR 655	623
CONCLUSION	624
<i>Pièce jointe A.</i> Le Conseil de l'Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale (OACI), siégeant en session extraordinaire les 13 et 14 juillet 1988, a approuvé comme décision la déclaration ci-après du président du Conseil	625
<i>Pièce jointe B.</i> Décision du Conseil de l'Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale (OACI)	626
<i>Pièce jointe C.</i> Résolution adoptée par le Conseil de l'Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale à la 20 ^e séance de sa 126 ^e session le 17 mars 1989	627
Correspondence — Correspondance	629
Settlement Agreement — Arrangement amiable	647

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE
PLEADINGS, ORAL ARGUMENTS, DOCUMENTS

**CASE CONCERNING THE
AERIAL INCIDENT OF 3 JULY 1988**

(ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN *v.* UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA)


VOLUME II

COUR INTERNATIONALE DE JUSTICE
MÉMOIRES, PLAIDOIRIES ET DOCUMENTS

**AFFAIRE DE L'INCIDENT AÉRIEN
DU 3 JUILLET 1988**

(RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D'IRAN *c.* ÉTATS-UNIS
D'AMÉRIQUE)

VOLUME II



	<i>Page</i>
Section B. The relevance of the background facts to the shoot-down of Flight IR 655	316
(i) The non-neutral policy of the United States towards the Islamic Republic	316
(ii) The role of U.S. military forces in the Persian Gulf	321
(iii) Iranian forces acted in a non-aggressive manner towards U.S. forces	325
(iv) U.S. forces showed an aggressive and hostile attitude	328
Section C. The relevance of the background facts concerning the NOTAMs and the issue of civil/military coordination	330
Chapter II. The shoot-down of Flight IR 655	333
Section A. Events immediately prior to the shoot-down of Flight IR 655	334
(i) The week preceding the shoot-down	334
(ii) The morning of 3 July 1988	337
Section B. The flight of IR 655 and the alleged warnings given by the U.S. vessels	344
Chapter III. Conclusions: the relevance of the facts relating to the shoot-down of Flight IR 655 to the jurisdictional issues in this case	353
PART III. THE RELEVANT FACTS CONCERNING NEGOTIATIONS AND THE EMERGENCE OF THE DISPUTE FOLLOWING THE SHOOT-DOWN	357
Chapter I. The crystallization of the dispute and the irreconcilable nature of the Parties' positions	359
Section A. Debates before the United Nations Security Council	359
Section B. The debates before the ICAO Council	363
Chapter II. The refusal of the United States to negotiate with the Islamic Republic	365
Section A. Official U.S. documents evidencing the United States' refusal to deal with the Islamic Republic on the matter	367
Section B. The Hearings before the Defense Policy Panel of the U.S. House of Representatives	374
Section C. The Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal did not afford an opportunity to negotiate	376
Chapter III. Developments after the filing of the Application	378
Chapter IV. The limitations to the legal requirement of prior negotiations	379
Section A. The emergence in modern international arbitration of the prior negotiations requirement and its ratio	381
Section B. The case law of the Permanent Court	382
Section C. The debates at the Institut de droit international in 1956 for the suppression of the requirement of prior negotiations	387
Section D. The case law of the present Court confirms the interpretation of the Permanent Court	388
Section E. Concluding observations	394