

has she invoked any basis of jurisdiction vis-à-vis France in her request to intervene.

The Court should have decided upon this request itself as required by Article 62 of the Statute of the Court and should, in my view, have rejected it on the ground that the condition of reciprocity of an obligation to accept the Court's jurisdiction was wholly absent between Fiji and France.

Judges DILLARD and Sir Humphrey WALDOCK make the following joint declaration:

The Order states that, the Court having found that the claim of New Zealand no longer has any object, the Court is not called upon to give a decision thereon and consequently there will no longer be any proceedings to which intervention can relate. The Application of the Government of Fiji has, according to the Order, therefore lapsed.

The conclusion flows logically from the premise. As Members of the Court, bound by its decision in the *Nuclear Tests* case, we are therefore impelled to vote in favour of the Order. It is clearly not possible for the Government of Fiji to intervene in proceedings, when, by the Judgment of the Court, no proceedings exist.

Having said this we feel it incumbent on us to state that we do not agree with the premise which furnishes the ground on which the Court's conclusion rests. As indicated in detail in the dissenting opinion of ourselves and some of our colleagues, we do not agree that the Court should have decided that no further action is called for on the claim of New Zealand against France.

If, in the case of *New Zealand v. France*, the views of the minority had prevailed, the issue of Fiji's intervention would have required examination in order to determine whether or not there existed a sufficient jurisdictional link between Fiji and France to justify the former's intervention under Article 62 of the Court's Statute. Furthermore, in our view an opportunity should have been given to Fiji to be heard on the issue before this determination was made.

It follows from what we have said above that, while we feel impelled to vote for the Order of the Court, our reasons for doing so differ in certain respects from those advanced by the Court.

Judge JIMÉNEZ DE ARÉCHAGA makes the following declaration:

I have concurred in voting for the dismissal of Fiji's application to intervene under Article 62 of the Statute for a reason other than that on

which the Order is based: because Fiji, which is not a party to the 1928 Act and to the optional clause system, has failed to invoke in its application any title of jurisdiction in relation to France.

In my view, in order to be entitled to intervene under Article 62 of the Statute for the purpose of asserting a right as against the respondent a State must be in a position in which it could itself bring the respondent before the Court.

When Article 62 of the Statute was drafted, its authors were proceeding on the assumption that the intervening State would have its own title of jurisdiction in relation to the respondent, since the draft Statute then provided for general compulsory jurisdiction. When that system was replaced by the optional clause, Article 62 remained untouched, but it must be interpreted and applied as still subject to that condition. Otherwise, unreasonable consequences would result, in conflict with basic principles such as those of the equality of parties before the Court and the strict reciprocity of rights and obligations among the States which accept its jurisdiction. A State which cannot be brought before the Court as a respondent by another State can neither become an applicant vis-à-vis that State nor an intervener against that same State, entitled to make independent submissions in support of an interest of its own. In my view the provision in Article 69, paragraph 2, of the Rules of Court requiring "a statement of law and of fact justifying intervention" must in circumstances like those in the present case be interpreted as including the requirement of establishing an independent jurisdictional link between intervener and respondent.

Judge *ad hoc* Sir Garfield BARWICK makes the following declaration:

I have voted in favour of the Order made in respect of the Application by Fiji to intervene in these proceedings not because of the Order made by the Court in the cases *Australia v. France* and *New Zealand v. France* but solely for the reasons expressed by Judge Jiménez de Aréchaga and Judge Onyeama in their declarations concerning the Fiji Order, with which I entirely agree.

(Initialled) M.L.

(Initialled) S.A.