

## The International Court of Justice

Nuredin Lutfiu<sup>1</sup> and Naser Pajaziti<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

*In this scientific paper my main focus of research is based on the composition, structure and main function of judges of the International Court of Justice according to countries and geographical regions where they come from, as according to Article 9 members of the court represent the main forms of civilization and the main system legal of the world. This means customary law, civil law and socialist law (now post-communist law). Then the task and function of international judges of law is to resolve disputes between states in accordance with international law and to give advisory opinions on international legal matters. The ICJ is the only international court that adjudicates general disputes between countries, with its decisions and opinions serving as primary sources of international law. Then, we have the creation of the first permanent institution created for the purpose of resolving international disputes was the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA), which included all the major world powers as well as some smaller states, and resulted in the first multilateral treaties dealing with the conduct of war. Among them was the Convention for the Settlement of International Disputes in the Pacific, which defined the institutional and procedural framework for arbitration proceedings to be conducted in The Hague, the Netherlands. Although the proceedings would be supported by a permanent bureau - whose functions would be equivalent to that of a secretariat or court register - arbitrators would be appointed by opposing states from a larger group provided by each member of the convention.*

**Keywords:** Court, Arbitration, International, Judge, Convention

### INTRODUCTION



Seat of the Court in The Hague

### Establishment of similar International Court

The International Court of Justice, otherwise known as the General Court, is a permanent UN Court with headquarters in The Hague. <sup>1</sup> It started in 1946, when it replaced the permanent international Court of Justice that had been functioning since 1922.

The function of the International Court of Justice differs from other courts.

Judges from (15) fifteen eleven, of different nationalities, who are elected for a (9) nine-year term by the General Assembly and the Security Council. Foreign members of the Judiciary do not manage to make the government from, but are independent.

all internationals can lead only internationally recognized states, and can be presented to, namely the UN member state. The court can hear a case before it only if the states involved in it have accepted its jurisdiction. A case starts with a written statement argued by the parties, and then in several hearings. Are the various

---

<sup>1</sup> UBT College – Higher Education Institution, Kosovo, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9232-0823>, E-mail: [nuredin.lutfiu@ubt-uni.net](mailto:nuredin.lutfiu@ubt-uni.net)

<sup>2</sup> UBT College – Higher Education Institution, Kosovo. (corresponding author)

international decisions of the Justice binding after the hearing, the members of the court and the decision of the decision of a final decision the decision of the public decision.

The decision is final and cannot be appealed. If one of the states involved does not implement it, then the other side can take the matter to the UNSC. This means that a dispute can all remain impure if one of the five members involved in the SC who have the right to vote decide to block it. Since 1946, the Court has given another 93 decisions in case of border disputes and territorial sovereignty, non-use of forces, non-interference in the internal affairs of states, in case of hostage-taking, right to political asylum.

The various international Councils of Justice have consultations, they are not binding on the parties involved. Since the formation of all internationals of Justice, 25 such advices have been given, in different cases.<sup>1</sup>

**1 [http://www.bbc.co.uk/albanian/news/2009/04/090417\\_gjnd\\_qanda.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/albanian/news/2009/04/090417_gjnd_qanda.shtml).**

Courts of duties are completed at the end, but nine judges are enough for a quorum (Article 25). The court can have a lot of judicial advice, for solving a certain type of work that refers to transit and communication, etc. which decides with abbreviated conclusion when it is the party's (Article 26 29) The decisions of these bodies have the value as if they had been taken by the Courts themselves (Article 27).

Article 31 of the Information Status provides that the members who are members of the dispute enjoy the right to participate in the resolution of the cases that are before the court. However, if the other party does not have a citizen of his own as a judge, to ensure the equality of the parties, he may decide that the decision is such that he does not participate in the decision of that case, or the parties who are named are given the opportunity . an AD HOC council which will participate in the resolution of the whole case.

According to the proposal of the court, it would be established and work in accordance with the statute that would be part of the Charter of the United Nations. In agreement with me, the Conference in San-Francisco decided to establish the court as one of the main judicial bodies of the Organization of the United Nations and which are part of the Charter (Articles 7 and 92 of the Charter).

### **The External International Court - Has Two Functions**

Make decisions in cases of disputes, when a state requests such a thing.

Gives opinions when requested by UN agency bodies - such as the request of the General Assembly in 2003 on the legality of the barrier that Israel has changed in the West Bank.

Members of various countries of Justice do not manage to make English-language governments, but are independent judges.

The Court can hear a case before it, only if the states involved in it have accepted its jurisdiction.

A case begins with an appearance and written exchange of arguments by the parties, followed by several hearings.

How binding are the decisions of the International Court of Justice

After the hearings, the members of the court take into account the case and the decision of the publication decision.

The decision is final and cannot be appealed.

If one of the states involved does not implement it, then the other side can take the matter to the UNSC.

This, in a way, means that a particular dispute can remain unresolved if one of the SC's five veto-wielding permanent members decides to block further action.

Since 1946, the court has handed down at least 93 decisions in disputes ranging from border disputes and territorial sovereignty, to the non-use of force, non-interference in the internal affairs of states, hostage-taking cases, political asylum and nationality.

The advice of the International Court of Justice has a consultative character, it is not binding on the parties involved.

Since its formation, the Court has given at least 25 such advices, on matters such as UN membership and reparations for injuries sustained by persons working for the UN, to the status of UN rapporteurs on human rights or legality. of the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

How does the success of the International Court of Justice stand out?

The International Court of Justice, regardless of the decisions taken, has not managed to become the organization that its founders wanted to establish in the days full of optimism after the Second World War, for it to serve as a forum for the resolution of disputes with international in nature.

This has happened mainly because the governments have not left the decision-making in the hands of it in cases of disputes related to them.

The International Criminal Tribunals in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda try the cases of individuals for crimes against humanity, but only those committed in these territories for a certain period of time.

The International Court of Justice has given many decisions, but we are only mentioning the advisory decision on the Kosovo issue.

The International Court of Justice in The Hague has announced the advisory decision, according to which the declaration of Kosovo's independence did not violate international law.

With 10 votes in favor and 4 against, the members of the International Court of The Hague had decided in favor of Kosovo, thus rejecting Serbia's request for violation of the right

The decision was read by the President of the International Court of Justice at the time, Hiasashio Ovada.

Kosovo declared independence on February 17, 2008.

On July 22, 2010, the International Court of Justice concluded that the adoption of Kosovo's Declaration of Independence on February 17, 2008 "did not violate general international law, nor Security Council resolution 1244, nor the Constitutional Framework."

Therefore, the adoption of this declaration has not violated any applicable rule of international law", it was further emphasized in the advisory decision of the International Court of Justice.

**LITERATURE REVIEW:** Nations, United. "International Court of Justice". United Nations. Retrieved 29 August (2020), Koh, Steven Arrigg (27 August 2014), "Things You Should Know About The Hague". HuffPost. Retrieved 17 March (2017), "The Court". www.icj-cij.org. Archived from the original on 10 January 2018. Retrieved 10 January (2018) "Cases". www.icj-cij.org. Retrieved 29 August (2020), Scott, James Brown. "The Hague peace conferences of 1899 and 1907; a series of lectures delivered before the Johns Hopkins University in the year 1908". Avalon.law.yale.edu. Retrieved 2 May 2019.

## **METHODOLOGY**

In this scientific work I have used the method of comparison referring to the origin of judges from which country they come, since two judges can not be from the same country, according to Article 9 members of the court represent the main forms of civilization and the main legal system of world. This means customary law, civil law, and socialist law (now post-communist law). While during the scientific work we have made comparisons for the years 1993, 1940, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1947 and the challenges for changing different international conditions. From its first session in 1922 to 1940, the PCIJ handled 29 interstate disputes and issued 27 advisory opinions. The wide acceptance of the court was reflected in the fact that several hundred international treaties and agreements gave it jurisdiction over certain categories of disputes. In addition to helping to resolve some serious international disputes, the PCIJ helped clarify some ambiguities in international law that contributed to its development. The United States played a major role in setting up the World Court, but never joined. Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover and Roosevelt all supported membership, but

it was impossible to get a 2/3 majority in the Senate for a treaty. After a peak of activity in 1933, the PCIJ began to decline in its activities due to the growing international tension and isolationism that characterized the era. World War II actually ended the tribunal, which held its last public hearing in December 1939 and issued its final orders in February 1940. In 1942 the United States and the United Kingdom jointly declared their support for the creation or re-establishment of an international court. after the war, and in 1943, the UK chaired a panel of lawyers from around the world, the "Inter-Allied Committee", to discuss the issue. His 1944 report recommended that:

The statute of each new international court should be based on that of the PCIJ; The new court should retain an advisory jurisdiction; Acceptance of the jurisdiction of the new court must be voluntary; The court should deal only with judicial matters and not political ones

A few months later, a conference of the major Allied Powers - China, the USSR, the UK and the US - issued a joint statement recognizing the need to "establish as soon as possible a comprehensive international organization, based on the principle of sovereign equality of the to all peace-loving states and open to membership by all these states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security ”.

The following Allied Conference in Dumbarton Oaks, USA, published a proposal in October 1944 calling for the establishment of an intergovernmental organization that would include an international tribunal. A meeting was then convened in Washington, DC, in April 1945, involving 44 lawyers from around the world to draft a statute for the proposed court. The draft statute was essentially similar to that of the PCIJ and questioned whether a new court should be established. During the San Francisco Conference, which took place from April 25 to June 26, 1945 and included 50 seats, it was decided that a completely new court should be established as the main body of the new United Nations. The statute of this court would form an integral part of the Charter of the United Nations, which, to maintain continuity, explicitly stated that the Statute of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) was based on that of the PCIJ.

Consequently, the PCIJ met for the last time in October 1945 and decided to transfer its archives to a successor, who would take his place in the Peace Palace. All PCIJ judges resigned on January 31, 1946, with the election of the first ICJ members to take place the following February at the First Session of the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council. In April 1946, the PCIJ was officially dissolved and the ICJ, at its first meeting, was elected President José Gustavo Guerrero of El Salvador, who had served as the last president of the PCIJ. The court also appointed members of its Registry, derived mainly from that of the PCIJ, and held a inaugural public hearing later that month. The first case was brought in May 1947 by the United Kingdom against Albania in connection with the incidents in the Corfu Channel.

The ICJ is composed of fifteen judges elected for a nine-year term by the UN General Assembly and the UN Security Council from a list of persons nominated by national groups to the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The electoral process is set out in Articles 4–19 of the ICJ Statute. Elections are scalable, with five judges elected every three years to ensure continuity within the court. If a judge dies in office, the practice has generally been to elect a judge in a special election to complete the term. Judges of the International Court of Justice are entitled in the style of His Excellency.



**Figure 2.** The Peace Palace in The Hague, Netherlands, seat of the ICJ

We then used the comparative method of countries scattered by geographical regions, so that there are five countries for Western countries, three for African countries (including one Francophone civil law judge, one English-speaking ordinary law judge, and one Arab), two for eastern countries. European countries, three for Asian countries and two for Latin American and Caribbean countries. For most of the court's history, the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council (France, USSR, China, the United Kingdom and the United States) have always had one judge in office, thus occupying three of the western countries, one of the Asian countries and one of the countries of Eastern Europe.

Exceptions have been China not having a judge on the court from 1967 to 1985, during which time it did not put forward a candidate, and British judge Sir Christopher Greenwood being withdrawn as a candidate for election for a second nine-year term on the bench in 2017, leaving no judges from the United Kingdom on the court. Greenwood had been supported by the UN Security Council but failed to get a majority in the UN General Assembly.

Indian judge Dalveer Bhandari took the seat instead. Article 6 of the Statute provides that all judges should be "elected regardless of their nationality among persons of high moral character" who are either qualified for the highest judicial office in their home states or known as lawyers with sufficient competence in international law. Judicial independence is dealt with specifically in Articles 16–18. Judges of the ICJ are not able to hold any other post or act as counsel. In practice, members of the court have their own interpretation of these rules and allow them to be involved in outside arbitration and hold professional posts as long as there is no conflict of interest. A judge can be dismissed only by a unanimous vote of the other members of the court. Despite these provisions, the independence of ICJ judges has been questioned. For example, during the *Nicaragua case*, the United States issued a communiqué suggesting that it could not present sensitive material to the court because of the presence of judges from the Soviet bloc.
















Judges may deliver joint judgments or give their own separate opinions. Decisions and advisory opinions are by majority, and, in the event of an equal division, the president's vote becomes decisive, which occurred in the *Legality of the Use by a State of Nuclear Weapons in Armed Conflict* (Opinion requested by WHO), [1996] ICJ Reports 66. Judges may also deliver separate dissenting opinions. Article 31 of the statute sets out a procedure whereby ad hoc judges sit on contentious cases before the court. The system allows any party to a contentious case (if it otherwise does not have one of that party's nationals sitting on the court) to select one additional person to sit as a judge on that case only. It is thus possible that as many as seventeen judges may sit on one case. The system may seem strange when compared with domestic court processes, but its purpose is to encourage states to submit cases. For example, if a state knows that it will have a judicial officer who can participate in deliberation and offer other judges local knowledge and an understanding of the state's perspective, it may be more willing to submit to the jurisdiction of the court. Although this system does not sit well with the judicial nature of the body, it is usually of little practical consequence. *Ad hoc* judges usually (but not always) vote in favour of the state that appointed them and thus cancel each other out. Generally, the court sits as full bench, but in the last fifteen years, it has on occasion sat as a chamber. Articles 26–29 of the statute allow the court to form smaller chambers, usually 3 or 5 judges, to hear cases. Two types of chambers are contemplated by Article 26: firstly, chambers for special categories of cases, and second, the formation of *ad hoc* chambers to hear particular disputes. In 1993, a special chamber was established, under Article 26(1) of the ICJ statute, to deal specifically with environmental matters (although it has never been used).

*Ad hoc* chambers are more frequently convened. For example, chambers were used to hear the *Gulf of Maine Case* (Canada/US). In that case, the parties made clear they would withdraw the case unless the court appointed judges to the chamber acceptable to the parties. Judgments of chambers may have either less authority than full Court judgments or diminish the proper interpretation of universal international law informed by a variety of cultural and legal perspectives. On the other hand, the use of chambers might encourage greater recourse to the court and thus enhance international dispute resolution.

## The Current Composition Of Judges And The Comparison By Geographical Locations Of November 6, 2021, Is As Follows













### Current Composition



As of 6 November 2021, the composition of the court is as follows:

Name	Nationality	Position	Term began	Term ends
Abdulqawi Yusuf	 Somalia	Member	2009	2027
Xue Hanqin	 China	Member	2010	2030
Peter Tomka	 Slovakia	Member	2003	2030
Ronny Abraham	 France	Member	2005	2027
Mohamed Bennouna	 Morocco	Member	2006	2024
Vacant ( <i>Replaced Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade</i> [23])			2022	2027
Joan Donoghue	 United States	President <sup>a</sup>	2010	2024
Julia Sebutinde	 Uganda	Member	2012	2030
Dalveer Bhandari	 India	Member	2012	2027
Patrick Lipton Robinson	 Jamaica	Member	2015	2024
Hilary Charlesworth[24] ( <i>Replaced James Crawford</i> [25])	 Australia	Member	2021	2024
Kirill Gevorgian	 Russia	Vice-president <sup>a</sup>	2015	2024
Nawaf Salam	 Lebanon	Member	2018	2027
Yuji Iwasawa	 Japan	Member	2018	2030
Georg Nolte	 Germany	Member	2021	2030
Philippe Gautier	 Belgium	Registrar	2019	2026

<sup>a</sup> For the 2021–2024 term

### Presidents

#	President	Start	End	Country
1	José Gustavo Guerrero	1946	1949	 El Salvador
2	Jules Basdevant	1949	1952	 France
3	Arnold McNair	1952	1955	 United Kingdom
4	Green Hackworth	1955	1958	 United States
5	Helge Klæstad	1958	1961	 Norway
6	Bohdan Winiarski	1961	1964	 Poland
7	Percy Spender	1964	1967	 Australia
8	José Bustamante y Rivero	1967	1970	 Peru
9	Muhammad Zafarullah Khan	1970	1973	 Pakistan
10	Manfred Lachs	1973	1976	 Poland
11	Eduardo Jiménez de Aréchaga	1976	1979	 Uruguay
12	Humphrey Waldock	1979	1981	 United Kingdom

13	Taslim Elias	1982 1985		Nigeria
14	Nagendra Singh	1985 1988		India
15	José Ruda	1988 1991		Argentina
16	Robert Jennings	1991 1994		United Kingdom
17	Mohammed Bedjaoui	1994 1997		Algeria
18	Stephen Schwebel	1997 2000		United States
19	Gilbert Guillaume	2000 2003		France
20	Shi Jiuyong	2003 2006		China
21	Rosalyn Higgins	2006 2009		United Kingdom
22	Hisashi Owada	2009 2012		Japan
23	Peter Tomka	2012 2015		Slovakia
24	Ronny Abraham	2015 2018		France
25	Abdulqawi Yusuf	2018 2021		Somalia
26	Joan Donoghue	2021 current		United States

Jurisdiction; As stated in Article 93 of the UN Charter, all 193 UN members are automatically parties to the court's statute. Non-UN members may also become parties to the court's statute under the Article 93(2) procedure, which was used by Switzerland in 1948 and Nauru in 1988, prior to either joining the UN. Once a state is a party to the court's statute, it is entitled to participate in cases before the court. However, being a party to the statute does not automatically give the court jurisdiction over disputes involving those parties. The issue of jurisdiction is considered in the three types of ICJ cases: contentious issues, incidental jurisdiction, and advisory opinions.



Figure 3. Parties upon becoming a UN member  
Parties prior to joining the UN under Article 93  
UN observer states that are not parties

**Contentious issues;** In contentious cases (adversarial proceedings seeking to settle a dispute), the ICJ produces a binding ruling between states that agree to submit to the ruling of the court. Only states may be parties in contentious cases; individuals, corporations, component parts of a federal state, NGOs, UN organs, and self-determination groups are excluded from direct participation, although the court may receive information from public international organizations. However, this does not preclude non-state interests from being the subject of proceedings; for example, a state may bring a case on behalf of one of its nationals or corporations, such as in matters concerning diplomatic protection.

Jurisdiction is often a crucial question for the court in contentious cases. The key principle is that the ICJ has jurisdiction only on the basis of consent. Under Article 36, there are four foundations for jurisdiction:

*Compromis* or "special agreement", in which parties provide explicit consent to the court's jurisdiction by referring cases to it. While not true compulsory jurisdiction, this is perhaps the most effective jurisdictional basis, because the parties concerned have a desire for the dispute to be resolved by the court, and are thus more likely to comply with the court's judgment.

Compromissory clauses in a binding treaty. Most modern treaties contain such clauses to provide or dispute resolution by the ICJ. Cases founded on compromissory clauses have not been as effective as cases founded on special agreement, since a state may have no interest in having the matter examined by the court and may refuse to comply with a judgment. For example, during the Iran hostage crisis, Iran refused to participate in a case brought by the US based on a compromissory clause contained in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and did not comply with the judgment. Since the 1970s, the use of such clauses has declined; many modern treaties set out their own dispute resolution regime, often based on forms of arbitration.

Optional clause declarations accepting the court's jurisdiction. Also known as Article 36(2) jurisdiction, it is sometimes misleadingly labeled "compulsory", though such declarations are voluntary. Many such declarations contain reservations that exclude from jurisdiction certain types of disputes (*ratione materiae*). The principle of reciprocity may further limit jurisdiction, as Article 36(2) holds that such declaration may be made "in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation...". As of January 2018, seventy-four states had a declaration in force, up from sixty-six in February 2011; of the permanent Security Council members, only the United Kingdom has a declaration. In the court's early years, most declarations were made by industrialized countries. Since the 1986 *Nicaragua* case, declarations made by developing countries have increased, reflecting a growing confidence in the court. However, even those industrialized countries that have invoked optional declarations have sometimes increased exclusions or rescinded them altogether. Notable examples include the United States in the *Nicaragua* case, and Australia, which modified its declaration in 2002 to exclude disputes on maritime boundaries, most likely to prevent an impending challenge from East Timor, which gained independence two months later.

Article 36(5) provides for jurisdiction on the basis of declarations made under the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. Article 37 similarly transfers jurisdiction under any compromissory clause in a treaty that gave jurisdiction to the PCIJ.

Additionally, the court may have jurisdiction on the basis of tacit consent (*forum prorogatum*). In the absence of clear jurisdiction under Article 36, jurisdiction is established if the respondent accepts ICJ jurisdiction explicitly or simply pleads on the merits. This arose in the 1949 Corfu Channel Case (U.K. v. Albania), in which the court held that a letter from Albania stating that it submitted to the jurisdiction of the ICJ was sufficient to grant the court jurisdiction.

## CONCLUSION

The International Court of Justice has been criticized for its decisions, procedures and authority. As with criticism of the United Nations, many critics and opponents of the court refer to the general authority assigned to the body by member states through its Charter, rather than to specific problems with the composition of judges or their decisions. Key criticisms include the following: "Mandatory" jurisdiction is limited to cases where both parties have agreed to abide by its decision, and thus cases of aggression tend to escalate automatically and be adjudicated by the Security Council. According to the principle of the sovereignty of international law, no nation is superior or inferior to another. Therefore, I conclude that there is no entity that can force states in the practice of law or punish states in the event of any violation of international law. Therefore, the lack of binding force means that the 193 member states of the ICJ do not necessarily have to accept jurisdiction.

Furthermore, membership in the UN and the ICJ does not give the court automatic jurisdiction over member states, but it is the consent of each state to pursue the jurisdiction that matters.



The International Court of Justice cannot hear cases of organizations, private enterprises and individuals. Moreover, UN agencies are unable to raise a case except in the circumstances of a non-binding advisory opinion. Nation states are the only ones able to raise issues and act as defendants for these individuals. As a result, victims of war crimes, crimes against humanity and minority groups may not have the support of their national state.

Other existing international thematic courts, such as the ICC, are not under the umbrella of the International Court of Justice. Unlike the ICJ, international thematic courts such as the ICC operate independently of the United Nations. Such a dual structure between different international courts sometimes makes it difficult for courts to engage in effective and collective jurisdiction.

The International Court of Justice does not enjoy a full separation of powers, with permanent members of the Security Council vetoing the implementation of cases, even those for which they agreed to comply. Because the jurisdiction itself has no binding force, in many cases, cases of aggression are adjudicated by the Security Council by adopting a resolution, etc. Therefore, there is a possibility that the permanent members of the Security Council will avoid legal liability. set up by the International Court of Justice, as shown in the example of *Nicaragua v. United States*.

The court has been charged with judicial prudence, with its decisions attempting to dismiss the parties' submissions for reasons of jurisdiction and fail to resolve the fundamental dispute between them.

## REFERENCES

- Nations, United. "International Court of Justice". United Nations. Retrieved 29 August 2020.
- Koh, Steven Arrigg (27 August 2014). "4 Things You Should Know About The Hague". HuffPost. Retrieved 17 March 2017.
- "The Court". www.icj-cij.org. Archived from the original on 10 January 2018. Retrieved 10 January 2018.
- "Cases". www.icj-cij.org. Retrieved 29 August 2020.
- Scott, James Brown. "The Hague peace conferences of 1899 and 1907; a series of lectures delivered before the Johns Hopkins University in the year 1908". avalon.law.yale.edu. Retrieved 2 May 2019.
- Eyffinger, Arthur (2007). "A Highly Critical Moment: Role and Record of the 1907 Hague Peace Conference". *Netherlands International Law Review*. 54 (2): 197. doi:10.1017/S0165070X07001970. S2CID 144726356.
- "History | International Court of Justice". www.icj-cij.org. Retrieved 3 May 2019.
- Accinelli, Robert D. (1978). "The Roosevelt Administration and the World Court Defeat, 1935". *The Historian*. 40 (3): 463–478. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6563.1978.tb01903.x. JSTOR 24445043.
- Accinelli, R. D. (1972). "Peace Through Law: The United States and the World Court, 1923-1935". *Historical Papers*. 7: 247. doi:10.7202/030751ar.
- "The Moscow Conference, October 1943". avalon.law.yale.edu. Retrieved 3 May 2019.
- Statute of the International Court of Justice Archived 29 June 2011 at the Wayback Machine. Retrieved 31 August 2007.
- Churchill, Ward. *A Little Matter of Genocide*. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1997. Print.
- "United Nations Official Document". www.un.org.
- Harris, D. *Cases and Materials on International Law*, 7th ed. (2012, London) p. 839.
- a b c "International Court of Justice: UK abandons bid for seat on UN bench". BBC. Retrieved 21 November 2017.
- ICJ Statute, Article 18(1)
- a b c Case Concerning Military and Paramilitary Activities in and Against Nicaragua (*Nicaragua v USA*), [1986] ICJ Reports 14, 158–60 (Merits) per Judge Lachs.
- Posner, E. A.; De Figueiredo, M. F. P. (June 2005). "Is the International Court of Justice Biased?" (PDF). *Journal of Legal Studies*. University of Chicago. 34.
- Sarwat, N., Ali, R., & Khan, T. I. (2021). Challenging, hindering job demands and psychological well-being: The mediating role of stress-related presenteeism. *Research Journal of Social Sciences and Economics Review*, 2(1), 135-143.
- Rules of Court of the International Court of Justice 1978 Archived 26 November 2005 at the Wayback Machine (as amended on 5 December 2000). Retrieved 17 December 2005. See also Practice Directions I–XII Archived 27 November 2005 at the Wayback Machine (as at 30 July 2004). Retrieved 17 December 2005.
- a b Schwebel S "Ad Hoc Chambers of the International Court of Justice" (1987) 81 *American Journal of International Law* 831.
- "Current Members | International Court of Justice". www.icj-cij.org. Archived from the original on 29 November 2017. Retrieved 16 April 2021.
- "General Assembly, in Second Secret Ballot Round, Elects Five Judges to Serve Nine-Year-Long Terms on International Court of Justice | Meetings Coverage and Press Releases". www.un.org. UN News Centre. 12 November 2020. Retrieved 16 April 2021.

- "It is with great sadness that the Court announces the passing of H.E. Judge Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade" (PDF). International Court of Justice. 30 May 2022. Retrieved 31 May 2022.
- "Veteran Australian judge Hilary Charlesworth elected to the International Court of Justice". UN News. 5 November 2021. Retrieved 6 November 2021.
- "It is with great sadness that the Court announces the passing of H.E. Judge James Richard Crawford" (PDF). International Court of Justice. 31 May 2021. Retrieved 3 June 2021.
- "Chapter XIV | United Nations". United Nations. Retrieved 21 November 2017.
- "Chapter I – Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice: 3 . Statute of the International Court of Justice". United Nations Treaty Series. 9 July 2013. Retrieved 9 July 2013.
- J. G. Merrills (2011). *International Dispute Settlement*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 116–134. ISBN 978-0521153393.
- See the *Nottebohm Case (Liechtenstein v Guatemala)*, [1955] ICJ Reports 4.
- See List of treaties that confer jurisdiction on the ICJ.
- Case Concerning United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran (*USA v Iran*), [1979] ICJ Reports 7.
- See Charney J "Compromissory Clauses and the Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice" (1987) 81 *American Journal of International Law* 855.
- See Alexandrov S *Reservations in Unilateral Declarations Accepting the Compulsory Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 1995).
- a b "Declarations recognizing the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory | International Court of Justice". [www.icj-cij.org](http://www.icj-cij.org). Retrieved 30 May 2021.
- For a complete list of countries and their stance with the ICJ, see *Declarations Recognizing as Compulsory the Jurisdiction of the Court* Archived 29 June 2011 at the Wayback Machine. Retrieved 21 February 2011.
- Cesare P.R. Romano, *INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (CONTINUED): A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS*, *The Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals* 1: 539–611, 2002. 2002 Kluwer Law International. Printed in the Netherlands., pp. 575–576. "Over the decades, developing countries have significantly changed their attitudes toward the ICJ, to the point that while their participation accounted for 50% of the contentious cases filed in the 1960s, in the 1990s they were the source of 86% of the cases"