

Index

- Adams, John Quincy (Secretary of State 1817–1824; President 1824–1828)—
 furious at *Romp* verdict (1817), 97
 rejects international policing (1818), 126
 rejects international tribunal (1823), 126, 156
- admiralty tribunals—
 established in England in fourteenth century, 33
 apply “universal” substantive law, 33, 90
 and Richard Zouche, 52
 and Sir Leoline Jenkins, 55
 and Cornelisz van Bynkershoek, 59–60
 apply *jus gentium*, not *jus inter gentes*, 61, 63–65, 66, 90, 104
 define “piracy” as political offense (1693), 62–63
 in Blackstone, 64
 in American Articles of Confederation (1777), 71–72
 in American Constitution (1787), 72
 jurisdiction over “piracy” in England, 84
 jurisdiction over “piracy” in America, 86
 retain *jus gentium* language, 97, 150
 Story as judge (*La Jeune Eugénie*), 102–104, 110
 British precedent persuasive in America, 106
 British restrict authority (*Le Louis*), 110–115
 British deny Haitian authority, 129–130
- Aldrich, George H., 179 note 16
 “alien tort claims,” *see* Judicature Act of 1789
- Alvarez, José E., 145 note 23
- ambassadors—
 responsibility of sending state, 66–67
 responsibility of receiving state, 67–68
 subject to receiving state law, 53–54, 67–68
- Aquinas, St. Thomas—
 definition of “law,” 16–17, 187–188
 definition questioned, 17–18
 “*lex*” and “*jus*,” 29–31, 49
 notion of “just war,” 30–31
 apparently influenced Sir William Scott, 112
- Arend, Anthony C., 149 note 26
- Aristotle—
 and “logic,” 5 note 8
 and “natural” law, 7, 16, 57, 62, 185
 and “positive” law, 7–8, 62, 83
 and “sociological” law, 7–8, 57, 132, 178
 and “justice,” 7–8, 12, 83, 185
Rhetoric, 5 note 8, 22
 influence on Pufendorf, 41
 influence on Suarez, 49–50
 rejects universality of *jus gentium*, 7, 12, 16, 83, 112, 151
 influence on Philip Jessup, 144
- Austin, John—
 founder of modern “positivism,” 138–139
 difficulties describing constitutional law and international law, 200
- Austria, Austro-Hungarian Empire—
 at London Conference (1817), 115
 at Aix-la-Chappelle (1818), 118
 at Verona (1822)—
 agrees to Convention subject to French consent, 120
 Mediterranean power, but not in tropics, 120–121
 Metternich not a moralist, 121
 and Hans Kelsen, 139
 and Kurt Waldheim, 175–176
- Balladore Pallieri, Giorgio, 170 note 1
- Barak, Aharon, 20 note 35
- Bassiouni, M. Cherif, 177 note 11
- Belgium—
 legislation extending jurisdiction to adjudicate criminal activities by foreigners, 182

216 INDEX

- Bentham, Jeremy—
 replaces “law of nations” with
 “international law,” 68
- Berlin, Sir Isaiah, 205 note 51
- Berman, Harold, 16 note 30, 18 note 33
- Best, Geoffrey, 171 note 5
- Blackstone, Sir William—
 supports universal “law of nations,”
 64–65
 and “offences against the law of
 nations,” 66–67
 and foreign ambassadors, 67
 confusions noted by Bentham, 68
 categories ignored in Articles of
 Confederation, 70–71
 influence on James Madison, 74–75
 categories adopted in American
 Constitution, 72–73
 resulting confusion in America, 73,
 74–75
 reflected by Hamilton, 78–79
 categories adopted by Story in *La Jeune
 Eugénie*, 103
 categories re-examined by Story and
 others, 190–191
- Blakesley, Christopher, 168 note 59
- Bok, Sisela, 11 note 21
- Bork, Robert, 200 note 50
- Bosch, William J., xiv
- Bosnia—
 Serbs not represented in UN, 147
 war either internal or international, 167
see also Yugoslavia
- Buergenthal, Thomas, 196 note 40
- Burley, Ann-Marie, 66 note 66
- Bynkershoek, Cornelisz van—
 defines “piracy,” 59–60
 impliedly denies “universal”
 jurisdiction, 60
 and “universal” jurisdiction over
 “pirates,” 60
 and Scots privateers, 60
- “Calvo clause,” 159–160, 161
- Cançado Trindade, A. A., 161 note 49
- Canning, George (British Foreign Secretary
 1822–1827)—
 instructs Wellington before Verona
 (1822), 118
 upset by French adamancy, 119
 proposes slave trade be analogized to
 “piracy,” 119–120
- Castlereagh, Lord (British Foreign Secretary
 1812–1822)—
 seeks treaties to abolish slave trade, 115
 at London Conference (1817), 115
 at Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), 116ff.
- responds to Russian “positivism,” 118
 moral fervor derided by Metternich, 121
 proposes treaty with United States (1818),
 125
- Casto, William R., 66 note 66
- Cavers, David F., 34 note 56, 135 note 160
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius—
 and “logic,” 5
 defines “true law” as morality, 8–9, 30
 and “reason,” 10, 30
 influence on St. Thomas Aquinas, 17
 asserts “true law” to be universal, 8–9,
 33–34
 influence on Pufendorf, 41
 civil law, *see* Roman law
- Coke, Sir Edward, 33 note 55, 53 note 47,
 67–68
- Coll, Alberto, 149 note 26
- “comity”—
 as used by Lord Mansfield, 131–133
 compared to constitutional law, 133–134
 in private international law, 134
 mis-defined by Story, 135
 makes lawyers and judges into
 legislators, 147
 requires a coming together, *cp.* music,
 204–205
 international community as comity of
 nations, 162, 206
- common law crimes—
 abolished in American federal law by
 1816, 87, 168
- conflict of laws, choice-of-law—
 inconsistent with dominant “naturalist”
 theories, 34
 inherent in American slave-trade
 decisions, 107
 discussed, 131ff.
 roots in ancient conceptions of
 authority, 130–131, 136
 applied by Lord Mansfield in 1760, 131
 and “comity,” 132–134
 systematized by Joseph Story, 134–135
 part of “positivist” orientation, 136–137
 inconsistent with “incorporation”
 theory, 152
 inconsistent with *jus gentium* theory, 191
 impact on models of the international
 legal order ignored by modern
 theorists, 199–200
 provides simple, unifying conception,
 205
- Crawford, James, 180 note 18
- crime, “universal”—
 asserted about 1,000 BC, 1
 “piracy” as, 84, 88–89, 91–92
 international traffic in slaves as, 105–107

- distinguished from jurisdiction, 23, 92, 116
 and "jurisdiction to adjudicate," 23, 116, 156
 and choice-of-law, 177ff.
 "custom"—
 as "law," 13
- D'Amato, Anthony A., 141 note 15
- divine law—
 assertedly universal, 3
 a branch of "natural law," 7, 13
 defined, 13, 187
 in the model posed by St. Thomas Aquinas, 16–18, 48–49
 rejected in Europe as relevant to secular authority by 1648, 18, 35
 rests on "human" interpretation, 25, 57
 accepted within its own sphere by statesmen, 27
 divides into "moral" naturalism and "amoral" positivism in sixteenth century, 35
 reflected by Pufendorf, 38
 in laws of inheritance, 117, 188
 asserted to require British to stop international traffic in slaves, 128
 mentioned by John Austin, 138
 treated ambiguously by Prince of Dor and Zakar-Baal, 13, 163
 in *fatwa* against Salman Rushdie, 181
 used to justify "*apartheid*," 202
- Doctors' Commons, *see* Law Officers of the Crown
- Dor, Prince of—
 maintains secular authority, 2
 territorial conception of jurisdiction, 163
 and conflict of laws, 131
 accepts divinity of Amon-Re but denies authority of Wen-Amon, 3–4
- "dualism," "dualist"—
 defined, 64
 assumed by Gouverneur Morris, 73–74
 adopted by Constitutional Convention, 77, 83
 assumed by American Supreme Court, 96, 105
 ignored by American Executive Branch, 78–79, 96–97
 American legal model since 1825, 107–108
 in French approach to slave trade, 123
 in Wheaton's approach to slave trade, 125, 130
 slowly entered American tradition, 135
versus "monism" and "incorporation," 150ff.
- and exhaustion of local remedies rule in international claims, 158ff.
 in PCIJ, 161–162
 rejected in current approaches to an international criminal court, 167–169
 ignored in current approaches to human rights crises, 168
 implicit in 1949 Geneva Conventions, 171–172
 should limit effectiveness of German "universal jurisdiction" legislation, 178–180
 would help anti-"terrorist" efforts, 180–181
 implicit in current legal order, 190–191, 205–206
- Dupuy, René-Jean, 170 note 1
- Eco, Umberto, 5 note 6
- enforcement—
 cooperation envisaged, 3–4, 119–120
 "natural" law not directly enforceable by "positive" means, 19–20, 27–28, 53, 187, 194
 and "*forum non conveniens*" in civil cases, 23
 and "human rights" of criminal defendant, 23–24, 172
 inherent in conception of "positive law," 32, 200
 in Pufendorf's notion of "law," 38–42
 in Wolff's notion of "law," 45
 in Coke, 53, 65, 68
 and *mala in se* (universal crimes to Coke), 53
 in Bynkershoek, 60
 in Wooddeson, 61
 requires positive legislation in Britain, 62, 63
 in Blackstone, 64–65, 66–67
 and laws of war, 70–71, 182, 201
 of foreign penal law refused by United States, 105, 106, 176
 cooperation rejected by European states, 115–124, 127–128
 cooperation rejected by United States, 125–127, 166
 cooperation rejected by British, 126, 165–166
 of foreign civil law rationalized, 131–132, 152
 by political and moral pressures ("comity"), 132
 in Lauterpacht, 142–143
 offenses in former Yugoslavia, 147
 International Criminal Court proposal criticized, 147–149, 166, 167–169

218 INDEX

- enforcement (*cont.*)—
 by “truth” commissions, 173–175
 of foreign penal law by Germany,
 177–178
 German approach limited, 178–180
 Belgian approach traditionally correct,
 182
 responsibilities of states in the current
 order, 198
see also jurisdiction to enforce
- equity—
 judicial discretion, 16
 defined, 26–28
 in Wooddeson (*Luke Ryan case*), 60–61,
 74
 Wooddeson view criticized, 61–62
 Law Officers include in “law of nations,”
 63
 Law Officers exclude from *jus inter gentes*,
 63–64
 in PCIJ and ICJ statute, 140–141
- Falk, Richard A., 175 note 9
Federalist Papers, 75–76, 78–80
 Ferrand, Max, 72 note 7, 99 note 79
 Fitzmaurice, Sir Gerald, 199 note 46
 Forsyth, Murray, 11 note 23
- France—
 and definition of “law,” 29
 language of Vattel and Burlamaqui,
 45–46, 48
 immigration law cited by Vitoria as *jus*
gentium, 49
 treaty with Britain 1713, 58
 alliance with United States (1778), 70, 81
 alliance “repealed” by United States
 (1798), 77
 defends *de Longchamps* (1784), 79–80
 authorized to license privateers in
 America, 81
 commissions *Henfield* (1793), 81
 licenses Danish privateer (*Charming Betsy*),
 93–94
 slave trader released (*La Jeune Eugénie*),
 102–103, 107, 110
 has exclusive jurisdiction over vessel
 flying its flag in time of peace (*Le Louis*,
Darnaud), 106, 108–109, 111, 114–115
 at London Conference (1817), 115–116
 at Aix-la-Chappelle (1818), 116
 refuses to join anti-slave-trade alliance,
 119–120, 122–123
 Canning dismayed at refusals, 119
 at Verona (1822), slanged by Wellington,
 120
 considers Britain hypocritical, 122–123
 takes “positivist” position, 123–124
- yields “visitation” rights to Britain
 (1831), 124, 127 note 143
 nuclear tests in the Pacific (1974, 1995),
 194–195
 withdraws submission to ICJ, 195
- Franck, Thomas M., 114 note 114
 Friedmann, Wolfgang, 154 note 35
 Frowein, Jochen Abr., 171 note 2
- Gaius, Roman jurist c. 165 AD—
 defines *ius (jus) civile* and *ius (jus) gentium*,
 12
 great influence, 151
 justifies “Enlightenment” naturalism,
 164
- genocide—
 Convention of 1948, 156
 universal “jurisdiction to adjudicate”
 rejected by states, 156
- Gentili, Alberico (seventeenth century
 Italo-English jurist)—
 early “positivist”-“dualist,” 51
 ignored by Zouche, 52
- Germany—
 language and “law,” 29
 Samuel von Pufendorf’s jurisprudence,
 36
 Christian Wolff’s “Supreme State,”
 43–44
 “Divine law” of race and inheritance, 18,
 117, 149, 188
 asserts “jurisdiction to adjudicate” all
 “universal” offenses, 177–182
see also Prussia
- Glenn, Elias (District Attorney, Baltimore,
 1818), 96
- Glennon, Michael, 114 note 114
- Gottlieb, Gidon, 184 note 26, 200 note 48
- grace, *see* equity
- Green, Leslie C., 133 note 155, 198 note 44
- Gross, Leo, 18 note 33, 141 note 15, 192
 note 32, 195 note 39
- Grotius, Hugo—
 defines “*bellum justum*,” 30
 describes legal order, 30
- Haiti (Hayti)—
 Britain denies universal jurisdiction,
 129–130
- Hamadei case*, 93 note 57, 177 note 13, 181
- Hamilton, Alexander—
 concerned about states entangling
 federation in legal disputes with
 foreigners, 78–79
 concerned about state jury biases, 79
 concerned about “neutrality,” 81
 helps prosecution in *Henfield case*, 81

- Hart, H. L. A., 32 note 53
- Henfield, Gideon (American privateer 1793)—
 accepts letters of marque from France, 81
 tried in United States for common law crimes under *jus gentium*, 81
 acquitted by jury, 82
- Herodotus, 14 note 27
- Hobbes, Thomas, 42 note 16, 186 note 29
- Hohfeld, Wesley—
 invents useful vocabulary, 31, 32
 value-free “positivist,” 32
- Holland, *see* Netherlands
- Holmes, Oliver Wendell, Jr., 25, 55
- Holt, J. C., 129 note 148
- “Holy Alliance”—
 supports “legitimacy” of governments, 96, 117
 viewed as hypocritical regarding slavery, 116–117
- UN Security Council compared, 146
 authority rejected by Great Britain, United States and American colonies of Spain, 146
- Huff, Toby E., 16 note 30
- human rights—
 assertedly “natural” and “universal,” 14
 undifferentiated sources of “law,” 14, 20
 in US Constitution’s “fair trial” provisions and “due process,” 23–24
 assumed “universal” value, 149
 “rights” in the “legal” order, or “moral” order?, 156–157
 violated in former Yugoslavia, 166, 172
 of accused in international tribunals, 167, 168–169, 172
 in Council of Europe Conventions, 170
 in regional conventions, 171
 of accused under German law, 178
 of accused under 1949 Geneva Conventions, 179–180
 of accused foreigners before municipal courts, 179, 190
 advanced using positive law, 196, 205
- imperial law—
 Egyptian, 3, 35
 Spain and Portugal, 35
 and piracy, 108–109
- individuals’ acts violating “neutrality” made statutory crime in United States (1794), 82 note 32
- International Court of Justice (ICJ)—
 Statute (1920, 1945), Article 38, 140
 “equity” distinguished from “law,” 140–141
- adopts “positivist” model of the legal order, 161–162
 abandons “positivist” model of the legal order, 192–194
 costs paid for ICJ abandoning positivist model, 194–195
- International Law Association, 179 note 15
- International Law Commission (ILC), *see* United Nations
- Janis, Mark, 136 note 161, 141 note 13, 176 note 10
- Jay, John (American statesman)—
 “monist” view, 76–77
 monist views rejected by American Congress, 77
 rejected by jury in *Henfield* case, 82
- Jefferson, Thomas—
 neutral in *Henfield* case, 82
- Jenkins, Sir Leoline (Privy Counsellor to Charles II)—
 opinion regarding Scots privateers, 56
 focuses on authority, 56–57, 165
 legal disputes between sovereigns frequently left unresolved, 56, 58
 ignores *jus gentium* theory, 65, 165
- Jessup, Philip Caryl, 143–145
- Judicature Act of 1789 (United States), 66
- jurisdiction to adjudicate—
 in the *Restatement of the Foreign Relations Law of the United States*, 23
 not considered by Coke, 53–54
 and seventeenth-century privateering, 56, 58, 60
 in Bynkershoek, 59–60
 lacking over foreign ambassadors, 68, 80
 derived through “natural law” reasoning, 57, 68
 issue in *de Longchamps* case, 79–80
 restricted by United States Supreme Court, 90–91, 93
 limits American jurisdiction over “piracy” cases despite “universal” prescription, 87–89, 90–92, 164–165
 limits British jurisdiction over foreign “slave trader,” 105–106, 111*ff.*
 and *jus standi*, 109, 116, 180–181, 193
 limits American jurisdiction over foreign “slave trader,” 106, 108–109
 limitations of British enforcement frustrate Castlereagh, 115–116, 118
 limitations force major shift in Wheaton’s theories of law, 125
 limited in Genocide Conventions of 1948, 156
 and “human rights” of a defendant, 168, 172

220 INDEX

- jurisdiction to adjudicate (*cont.*)—
 could be extended if “monist”
 pretensions were abandoned, 178,
 179–181
 extensions limited by “dualist” system,
 182
 ignored in two recent cases, 181
 asserted by Belgium, 182
 not fully analyzed by jurists yet, 197
 and the laws of war, 198–199
 limitations inherent in choice-of-law
 theory, 205
- Jurisdiction to enforce—
 ancient concept, 2
 at least territorial, 3, 67, 163
 cooperation envisaged, 3, 118, 119–120
 distinguished from jurisdiction to
 adjudicate, 22–23
 and “*forum non conveniens*” in civil cases,
 23
 and “human rights” of criminal
 defendant, 23–24, 172
 in Pufendorf’s notion of “law,” 39–40,
 41–42, 45
 in Wolff’s notion of “law,” 45
 in Coke, 53, 65, 67–68
 and *mala in se* (universal crimes to Coke),
 53, 65
 positive obligations to exercise, 57–58
 in Bynkershoek, 59–60
 in Wooddeson, 61
 requires positive legislation in Britain,
 62, 64–65
 in Blackstone, 64–65, 66–67
 distinguished in England from
 substantive prescriptions by 1710, 68
 and laws of war, 71, 198
 considered universal for violations of *jus*
gentium, 84, 88–89
 assumed in American “piracy”
 legislation, 85–87, 91, 92
 Wheaton denies universality except for
 “piracy,” 89–90
 universality denied by Supreme Court in
 all criminal cases except where
 defendant has no nationality, 88, 90
jus gentium/mala in se universality rejected
 in United States, 108–110
 denied by Britain in “piracy” cases,
 114–115
 denied by Britain in slave-trading case,
 110*ff.*
 in Lauterpacht, 143
 offenses in former Yugoslavia, 147
 international criminal court proposal
 criticized, 147–149, 166–168, 168*ff.*
 not universal in Genocide Convention, 156
 restricted in “Calvo” clause, 158–161
 foreign penal law in Germany, 178,
 181–182
 German approach limited, 178–179
 Belgian approach traditionally correct,
 182
see also enforcement
- jurisdiction to prescribe—
 in earliest records, 1–2, 163
 categories, 23, 24
 limited, 24
 limits acknowledged in 1713, 57–58
 distinguished from jurisdiction to
 adjudicate, 68, 87
 unclear limits in United States
 Constitution, 83
 held limited by the United States
 Supreme Court in “piracy” cases,
 87–89, 90–92, 110, 164–165
 believed unlimited in “piracy” cases,
 89–90, 91
 limits held in British case cited by United
 States Supreme Court, 106
 held limited by the United States
 Supreme Court in “slave trade” case,
 106–107
 held limited in British law, 110–114
 British limits asserted against Haiti,
 129–130
 and conflict-of-laws theory, 134–135
 primarily territorial, 164–165
 and “truth” commissions, 173–174
 over acts of nationals abroad, 177–178
 over acts of foreigners with “effects”
 within the prescribing state, 177–178
 over “universal” crimes, 178–180
 German approach inconsistent with legal
 order, 178–179, 181–182
- Belgian limits, 182
- jus gentium*—
 defined by Gaius, 12
 Gaius’s definition adopted by Justinian,
 13
 model rejected by Suarez, 36, 50–51
 applied narrowly by Pufendorf, 39–41
 adopted broadly in eighteenth-century
 Europe, 42
 applied broadly by Wolff, 43–44
 identified with *jus inter gentes* by Vattel, 46
 in Burlamaqui, 48
 applied by Vitoria to justify Spanish
 conquests in America, 49
 basic premises rejected by Suarez, 50–51,
 77
 ignored by Gentili, 51
 distinguished from *jus inter gentes* by
 Zouche, 52, 77

- applied by Coke, 53, 65, 67
 rejected in practice by Jenkins, 56–57
 rejected in eighteenth-century European treaty practice, 57–58
 impliedly rejected by Bynkershoek, 59–60
 assumed fundamental by Wooddeson, 61–74
 denied in practice by seventeenth-century statesmen, 67–68
 denied by Law Officers of the Crown in middle of eighteenth century, 63–64
 applied restrictively by Blackstone, 64, 66–67, 78
 basis for federal “tort” jurisdiction in American Judicature Act of 1789, 78 note 20
 distinguished from “international law” by Bentham, 68, 97
 assumed fundamental by American statesmen of the founding generation, 70–71, 72, 82–84
 in American Articles of Confederation, 70–71
 debated at American Constitutional Convention, 70ff.
 views of James Madison, 72–73, 74–76
 views of Gouverneur Morris, 73–74, 85
 views of James Wilson, 73–74, 84, 115
 views of John Jay, 76–77
 views of Alexander Hamilton, 77–79, 81
 in *de Longchamps* case, 79–80
 in *Henfield* case, 81–82
 and “comparative law,” 82–83
 irrelevant to British “Piracy” Act of 1700, 84–85
 assumed in American Piracy Act of 1790, 85–86
 rejected as basis for federal jurisdiction in *Wiltberger* case, 1820, 87–88
 supported by Wheaton despite *Wiltberger* case, 88–90
 in substantive “prize” law, 90
 in American Piracy Act of 1819, 91, 92
 unworkable in American piracy cases, 92–93
 background to American municipal legislation (*The Charming Betsy*), 93–95
 eroded beyond repair by John Marshall, 94, 95–96
 and revolution, 95–96
 not addressed in American Neutrality Act of 1794, 96
 restricted to “piracy” cases, 97
 asserted to make traffic in slaves universally criminal, 103
 applied by Joseph Story in *La Jeune Eugénie*, 103–104
 rejected by John Marshall in *The Antelope*, 104–106
 rejected in *Darnaud* case, 108–110
 applied narrowly in *Le Louis*, 111, 112
 interpreted to allow slave trade in *Le Louis*, 112–114
 interpreted to forbid revolution, 117
 rejected by statesmen as a source of substantive law, 118–124
 rejected by Wheaton as a source of substantive law, 125
 rejected by the United States as a basis for international tribunals, 125–127
 asserted by Britain as basis for both international tribunals and substantive law, 124–129
 rejected by Britain as basis for universal adjudicatory authority, 128–130
 superseded by choice-of-law theory, 131ff.
 influence of Lord Mansfield, 131–133
 influence of Joseph Story, 134–135
 and John Austin, 138–139
 in the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and the International Court of Justice, 140, 141–142, 199
 revived by Sir Hersch Lauterpacht, 142–143, 200
 revived by Philip C. Jessup, 143–144
 found inapplicable in real case by Jessup, 144–145
 basis for current initiatives, 146–147
 current initiatives likely to fail, 147–149
 persists in language of admiralty and prize, 150
 persists in language of some pre-1834 cases, 150–151
 weaknesses pointed out by Aristotle, Suarez and Pufendorf, 151
 persists in scholars’ yearning for objective evidence of universal standards, 151–152
 persists in minds of people seeking authority at the expense of statesmen, 152–154
 “*jus*” distinguished from “*lex*,” 29–30
jus inter gentes—
 defined in French by Vattel, 46
 defined by Burlamaqui, 48
 defined by Zouche, 52
 distinguished from *jus gentium*, 77
 analyzed by Law Officers to forbid “denial of justice”; not to forbid injustice, 63
 Blackstone confuses with *jus gentium*, 64–65, 66–68

222 INDEX

- jus inter gentes* (cont.)—
 protects foreign ambassadors, 67–68
 Bentham suggests: “international law,” 68–69
 makes treaties binding, 70–71
 and American Constitutionalists, 70ff.
 and James Madison, 72–73, 74–76
 and John Jay, 76–77
 and *de Longchamps* case, 79–80
 source of “neutrality” obligations (*Henfield*), 8
 source of American Neutrality Act of 1794, 82 note 32
 part of “law of nations,” 83, 85
 and Wheaton, 89
 and American “prize” adjudications, 90
 and American separation of functions, 95–96, 109
 replaced by “international law,” 97
 analyzed by Sir William Scott (*Le Louis*), 111, 112
 distinguishes from *jus gentium*, 112, 114–115
 Castlereagh tries to incorporate *jus gentium*, 115–116
 Castlereagh abandons incorporation, 120
 Wheaton abandons incorporation, 125–126, 130
 and “comity,” 137–134
 and Austin, 138–139
 and Lauterpacht, 141–143
 survives as “international law” today, 189–190
- jus standi*—
 and “jurisdiction to adjudicate,” 114–115, 156–157
 “just war”—
 to St. Thomas Aquinas, 30–31
 to Hugo Grotius, 30
- Justinian’s *Institutes* and *Digest*, c.533 AD—
 great influence, 135, 151
 influence deplored by Joseph Story, 135
 inspires “objective” natural law theories, 83, 151
 incorporates Gaius’s definitions of *jus gentium* and *jus civile*, 12
- Kelsen, Hans—
 “law” as “authority,” 31
 international law as “monist” system, 139
 and “recognition,” 21 note 326
- Klintock* (foreigner convicted of “piracy” for fraudulent capture of a Danish vessel in 1820), 88
 precedent for jurisdiction in “terrorism” cases, 181
- Latham, R. T. E., 96 note 72
- Lauterpacht, Sir Hersch—
 analyzes “general principles of law,” 141–143, 200
 “law” defined etymologically, 29–30
 “law of nations,” see *jus gentium*, *jus inter gentes*
- Law Officers of the Crown—
 reject *jus gentium* logic, 62–63
 adopt “non-discrimination” as basis for substantive law of international claims, 63–64, 78
- “legitimacy”—
 defensible “political” principle, 117
- Lewis, Walker, 97 note 68
 “lex” distinguished from “jus,” 29–30
- Luard, Evan, 148 note 25
- Madison, James—
 records of the Constitutional Convention, 72
 notion of “felony,” 72–73
 views criticized, 73
 confused by “law of nations” category, 74–76
 impliedly adopts “dualist” view, 75, 76
- Maier, Harold, 135 note 160, 196 note 40
- mala in se*—
 ambassadors not immune from jurisdiction to adjudicate, 53, 65, 67–68
 notion inconsistent with Bynkershoek’s approach to “piracy,” 59–60
 distinguished from *mala prohibita*, 67
 irrelevant to Ambassadorial immunities, 68
- Mansfield, Lord (William Murray, 1705–1793)—
 decides “slavery” cannot legally exist in England (*Somerset’s* case), 98
 applies “foreign” law as “law of England,” 131, 132–133
 distinguishes *jus gentium* from “comity,” 133
 Story adopts conclusions, 134
- Marshall, John (1755–1835, Chief Justice of the United States 1801–1835)—
 denies American jurisdiction in absence of legislated directive (*Palmer*), 88, 90
 asserts American jurisdiction over stateless defendant (*Klintock*), 88
 holds “law of nations” informs municipal legislation (*Charming Betsy*), 93–95
 denies lawfulness of acts of “unrecognized” rebels (*Romp*), 95–96
 dualist model disputed by political leaders, 96–97
 applies dualist-positivist model to

- international slave trade (*Antelope*), 105ff.
- construed to deny “incorporation” of “international law” into municipal law, 92–95, 150
- reasoning overwhelms contemporaries, 150, 151, 153
- denies enforcement to “foreign” penal law, 105, 176
- Meron, Theodor, 179 note 16
- “monism,” “monist”—
- defined, 76–77
 - assumed by John Jay, 76–77
 - rejected by United States (1798), 77
 - adopted by Wheaton, 88–89
 - restricted by Wheaton, 89
 - not revived in America by later prize cases, 89–90
 - adopted in American piracy cases, 91–92
 - Kelsen’s “monism,” 139, 166 note 56
 - in the international legal order, 151–152
 - adopted by United Nations for Bosnia, 156–157
 - reflected in some arbitral opinions, 157–161
 - in PCIJ, 161–162
 - inconsistent with current distribution of legal authority in the world, 166–169
 - misleads human rights activists, 168–169, 172–173
 - adopted by German legislation, 178
 - adopted in anti-“terrorist” legislation, 180–182
- Moore, George Edward, 11 note 23
- moral reasoning—
- “golden mean,” 10
 - single value, 10
 - value weighing, 11
 - definitional, 11
- Morison, Samuel Eliot, 86 note 36
- Morris, Gouverneur (American Constitutionalist)—
- criticizes Constitution draft regarding “offenses against the law of nations,” 73–74
 - urges “dualist” model of society, 73–74, 85
 - dualist view misunderstood by Madison, 75
 - dualist view impliedly adopted by Madison, 76
 - dualist views adopted by American Congress, 77
- music, as expression of culture, 204–205
- Namibia (South West Africa)—
- South African Mandate, 192–194
 - Mandate held “illegal,” 193
 - ICJ actions, 192–194
- Nanda, Ved, 177 note 11
- “natural law”—
- as a single concept, 14
 - in Aristotle, 7–8, 10, 16, 48, 57
 - as “justice,” 7–8, 9
 - as sociology, 8, 11, 48, 132, 178, 187
 - as physical “laws,” 6–7, 8, 16, 48, 187
 - as morality or ethics, “true law,” 8–9, 30, 187–188
 - as “divine law,” 13
 - as custom, 13
 - assertedly universal, 13–14, 33–34, 48
 - and overlapping normative orders, 14–15
 - dominates theory (1648–1834), 35–36, 190–191
 - in Pufendorf, 36ff.
 - inherent in “positivism,” 15
 - St. Thomas Aquinas’s conception, 16–17, 49
 - impliedly rejected by statesmen, 19, 27–28, 189–190
 - inherent in legal writing, 19
 - in Wolff, 43–45
 - in Vattel, 46–48
 - in Burlamaqui, 48
 - considered to be “objective,” 48, 83, 132, 191
 - denied by Suarez, 50–51
 - ignored by Gentili, 51
 - in Zouche, 52–53
 - applied to criminal law by Coke, 53, 65, 68
 - ignored by Jenkins, 56–57, 65
 - basis for “jurisdiction to adjudicate,” 57
 - as evidenced by history, 57, 189
 - irrelevant to constitutional authority, 57
 - in Wooddeson, 61
 - ignored by Law Officers of the Crown, 63, 65
 - in Blackstone, 64–65, 67
 - and slavery—
 - views of Joseph Story, 103, 107
 - views of Sir William Scott, 111ff.
 - views of Lord Castlereagh, 115–116
 - views of the Bishop of London, 128 - underlies “comity” to Lord Mansfield, 132
 - underlies conflict of laws to Story, 134
 - defined by Austin, 138
 - supposedly applied by “objective” lawyers in contemporary tribunals, 157ff.
 - and “property,” 164
 - and “piracy,” 164–165
 - “violations” subject to positive “pardon,” 174

224 INDEX

- “natural law” (*cont.*)—
 inconsistent with criminal law enforcement, 177ff.
 not applied by International Court in the *South West Africa* case, 192–193
- Netherlands—
 and Hugo Grotius, 30
 and Scots privateers, 56
 and Cornelisz van Bynkershoek, 59–60
 issue letters of marque to Luke Ryan, 61
 treaty with United States upheld, 81–82
 win independence from Spain (1648), 136, 188–189
- normative orders and sub-orders—
 natural law, 6ff., 13–15
 positive Law, 15ff.
- Nussbaum, Arthur, 45 note 25, 52 note 43, 53 note 46
- O’Brian, Patrick, 15 note 28
- Occam’s Razor—
 defined, 5
 applied to naïve positivism, 22
 applied to naïve naturalism, 25
 compels “dualism,” 152
 supports the authority of a state to reject arbitral awards, 158
 obstructs “monist” model of international adjudication, 171–173
 supports municipal criminal law, obstructs international criminal law model, 176ff., 181–182
- Occam, William of, 5–6
- Ogilvie, R. M., 67 note 68
- Onuma, Yasuaki, 9 note 17
- Palmer* case (“piratical” taking of a foreign vessel held outside American jurisdiction in 1818), 88, 90, 91–92
- Palmerston, Lord (Henry John Temple, British Foreign Secretary 1830–1834, 1835–1841, 1846–1851)—
 denies authority of Hayti to arrest British ships accused of slave trade, 129–130
- Parry, Clive, 155 note 36
- Permanent Court of International Justice, *see* International Court of Justice
- Petrie, Donald A., 61 note 57
- Peukert, Wolfgang, 171 note 2
- Pfeffer, Leo, 77 note 17
- piracy—
 viewed differently by “naturalists” and “positivists” in Europe, 19
 example of “universal offense,” 24
 assumed to violate natural law, 28
 Scottish privateers in 1674–1675, 55–56
 and jurisdiction to adjudicate, 57, 89–90
 treated as municipal offense by Bynkershoek, 59–60
 cannot be *malum in se* to positivists, 60
 considered universal offense by Bynkershoek, 60
 views of Wooddeson, 61
 in case of Luke Ryan, 61
 Irish privateers of 1693 considered not pirates by Law Officers of the Crown, 62–63
 defined by British legislation, 1700, 63, 84
 Blackstone categorizes as “offence against the law of nations,” 65
 in American Articles of Confederation, 72
 in American Constitution of 1787, 73–74
 discussed at American Constitutional Convention, 73–74
 views of James Madison, 75
 and mutiny, 84
 defined by American legislation of 1790, 85
 American legislation criticized, 86–87
 and John Paul Jones, 86
 and Latin American “rebels,” 86, 95–97
 as “common law crime” in America, 87–88, 91
 and American killers (*Wiltberger*), 87–88, 110
 not “universal” offense in United States Supreme Court (*Palmer*), 88, 90
 “universal” offense in United States Supreme Court (*Klintock*), 88, 110
 Wheaton considers sole “common law” offense, 89–90, 91
 purportedly defined by American legislation in 1819, 91, 92, 107–108
 American legislation of 1819 upheld (*Smith*), 91–92
 American legislation of 1819 considered doubtful (1982), 92
 probably undefinable today, 92–93
 British analogize slave trade (1824), 98
 analogy to slave trade denied in America (*Darnaud*), 108–110
 assumed to be “universal offense,” 110
 analogy to slave trade by foreigners denied by British (*Le Louis*), 111–113
 analogy to slave trade urged by Castlereagh, 116
 analogy to slave trade urged by Canning, 119
 analogy to slave trade rejected by European powers, 120–124
 analogy to slave trade disputed by Wheaton, 125, 130

- to Enlightenment jurists, 163–164
- Enlightenment approach fails in America, 164–165
- Enlightenment approach rejected in England, 165–166
- Plato—
 - and “reality,” 5 note 6
 - and “logic,” 5 note 7
 - ideal *Republic* controlled by “guardians,” 118, 154
 - and official authority, 57, 153, 185–186
 - Crito*, 9 note 16
 - Gorgias*, 186
 - Laws*, 5 note 7
 - Phaedrus*, 5 note 7
 - Protagoras*, 9 note 16
- Portugal—
 - bypasses Papal authority in sixteenth century, 35
 - anti-slave trade treaty with Britain (1817), 116
 - objects to multilateral convention (1817), 116, 120
 - not represented at Verona (1822), 123
 - refuses to abandon slave trade (1839), 122, 127–128
- “positive law”—
 - defined, 15
 - illogical “natural” basis, 15
 - in St. Thomas Aquinas, 16–18
 - “equality” as a “positive law” concept, 18–19
 - dominant in statecraft since 1648, 19, 53, 65–66, 190–191
 - search for “legislator,” 20
 - relationship to reality, 21
 - and “equity,” 27–28
 - to Grotius, 30
 - reduces all “law” to “authority,” 31–32
 - element in “divine law,” 13, 35
 - dismissed by Pufendorf, 38
 - in Zouche, 53
 - descriptive rather than normative, 54
 - in Jenkins’s analyses, 56–57
 - in the settlement of Utrecht (1713), 58
 - in Bynkershoek, 59–60
 - moderated by “equity” in England, 61
 - fundamental to Law Officers of the Crown, 62, 63
 - ignored by Blackstone, 64–67
 - to James Madison, 72–73
 - and “law of nations,” 83–84
 - ignored by American Congress in “piracy” legislation of 1819, 91
 - to John Marshall, 105, 106–107
 - fundamental to United States Supreme Court, 106–108
 - and “dualism,” 107
 - French approach to slave trade, 122–123
 - in Wheaton, 130
 - and conflict-of-laws theory, 134, 136, 152
 - in Austin, 138–139
 - in Kelsen, 139
 - in the Statute of the PCIJ and ICJ, 139–141
 - in Jessup, 143–144
 - denigrated in twentieth-century writings, 145
 - defended, 146, 149
 - inherent in the Genocide Convention of 1948, 156
 - and “rule” regarding exhaustion of domestic remedies in international law, 158–161
 - in cases before the PCIJ, 161–162
 - capable of grappling with current issues, 170ff.
 - and the laws of war, 171–173
 - in recent German legislation, 177–178
 - applicable to “terrorism,” 180–181
 - abandoned by ICJ, 192–195
 - costs paid by ICJ for abandoning a positivist approach to the legal order, 195
 - re-adoption of fundamental positivism recommended, 196–198, 205–206
- prize (maritime law of war)—
 - as universal private law (*jus gentium*), 64, 90, 129
 - in Blackstone, 64
 - as *jus inter gentes*, 67–68
 - in American Articles of Confederation (1777), 71
 - in American Constitution (1787), 72
 - Hamilton concerned about national biases, 77–78
 - cannot hear “criminal” case (*Coolidge*), 87
 - French decision pertinent to American law (*Charming Betsy*), 94 note 60
 - reflects *jus gentium* language, 97, 150
 - value of vessel a perquisite of arrestor if criminal law so decrees, 102
 - value of vessel a perquisite of captor only if capture was correct (*La Jeune Eugénie*), 103
 - can justify condemnation of vessel (*Antelope*), 104, 105
 - international tribunal rejected (1907),
 - not evidence of “trend” in the law of claims, 159–160
 - ignores “natural” law of property, 164–165

226 INDEX

- Prussia—
 treaty with United States upheld, 81
 at London Conference (1817), 115
 “positivist” at Aix-la-Chappelle (1818),
 116, 118
 “positivist” at Verona (1822), 122
see also Germany
- Pufendorf, Samuel von—
 contributions to legal theory, 35ff., 82
 influence on Wolff, 44
 notion of “imperfect rights,” 37, 44, 47,
 154
 rejects general *jus gentium* theory, 41, 151
- Quine, W. V., 4 note 6
- “reason”—
 different kinds distinguished, 9–12
- “rectification” defined, 180
- revolution—
 could be forbidden by *jus gentium*, 117
 cannot be forbidden by *jus inter gentes*, 117
- “right reason (*recta ratio*)”—
 and morality/ethics, 10–11
 and “objectivity,” 12
 in St. Thomas Aquinas, 17, 187–188
 in Christian Wolff, 44
 in Cicero, 8–10, 11–12, 30, 187
 irrelevant to Westphalian legal order,
 189
- Robertson, David W., 74 note 10
- Roman law—
 distinguishes *jus civile* from *jus gentium*,
 12–13, 63, 164
 in Pufendorf, 39
 in Zouche, 52
 expertise of Law Officers of the Crown,
 62–63
 requires ambassadorial immunities, 67
 cannot forbid revolution, 117
 rejected by Story, 135
 misunderstood by Jessup, 144
 a source of “incorporation” theory, 151
see also Gaius, Cicero
- Romp (vessel of the “Baltimore pirates” in
 1817), 95–97
- Rosenberg, Tina, 174 note 8
- Rushdie, Salman—
 Iranian divine/criminal law applied to,
 181
- Russia—
 cited by Marshall as equal to Geneva in
 law, 107
 at London Conference (1817), 115–116
 at Aix-la-Chappelle (1818), 118
 “positivist” reply to Castlereagh (1818),
 118
 “positivist” reply at Verona (1822),
 121–122
- Scelle, Georges, 152 note 31
- Scharf, Michael, 174 note 7
- Scott, Sir William (British admiralty
 judge)—
 Story disagrees with decision in *Le Louis*,
 103
 decides slave trade does not violate *jus
 gentium* (*Le Louis*), 111–114
 denies *jus gentium* is part of *jus inter
 gentes*, 111, 115
 Wheaton concurs in conclusion of *Le
 Louis*, 125
 reasoning adopted by Palmerston,
 129–130
 arguments unanswerable in nineteenth
 century, 151, 153
- Sheehan, Jeffrey, 180 note 17
- Silesian Loan Crisis—
 Law Officers’ Opinion, 63
- slavery, slave trade—
 Aristotle defends as “natural,” 8, 48
 Wheaton considers immoral, not illegal,
 89
 efforts to criminalize international
 traffic, 97ff.
 held inconsistent with English law
 (1772), 97–98
 slave trade made criminal in Britain
 (1807), 98
 in American Constitution, 98–101, 156,
 165–166
 American anti-slave-trade legislation,
 101–102
 America asserts universal jurisdiction to
 adjudicate (*La Jeune Eugénie*), 102–103
 America rejects universal jurisdiction to
 adjudicate (*Antelope, Darnaud*), 104–107,
 108–110
 Britain rejects universal jurisdiction to
 adjudicate (*Le Louis*), 111–115
 Castlereagh’s efforts to end trade,
 115–118
 Canning and Wellington’s efforts,
 118–124
 British attempts to establish an
 international tribunal rejected by
 United States, 124–127
 British attempts to establish an
 international tribunal rejected by
 France, 127
 British attempts to establish an
 international tribunal rejected by
 Portugal, 127
 Haitian attempts to assert universal

- jurisdiction to adjudicate rejected by Britain, 129–130
 analogy to “piracy” rejected by Wheaton, 130
 and German assertions of universal jurisdiction to adjudicate, 181
 and human rights today, 143, 190
- Smith, John (captain of American slave trader), 104
- Smith (convicted of “piracy” *jure gentium* in 1820), 91–92
- South Africa, *see* Namibia
- South-West Africa, *see* Namibia
- Spain, Spanish—
 bypasses Papal authority in sixteenth century, 35
 Vitoria supports “rights” in America by *jus gentium* theory, 49
 Suarez rejects *jus gentium* theory, 49–51
 legal interests defended by Gentili, 51
 and Latin American independence struggles, 86, 95, 146
 vessels taken by United States privateers, 95–97, 104
 merchants claim slaves (*Antelope*), 104, 106–107
 agrees to abolish slave trade (1817), 115
 lax in enforcing slave-trade laws, 118
 loses legal authority in Dutch Republic (1648), 136, 188–189
- Stein, Torsten, 93 note 57, 77 note 13, 181 note 19, 181 note 21
- Story, Joseph—
 systematized “conflict of laws” theory, 34, 134–136, 152
 supports “common law crimes,” 87, 91, 147, 153
 holds “piracy” to be a crime under the “law of nations” (*Smith*), 91–92
 despises slavery and the slave trade, 99–100
 holds slave trade violates “law of nations” (*La Jeune Eugénie*), 102–103, 115
 disagrees with Scott (*Le Louis*), 103, 115, 150 note 28
 avoids appeal of slave-trade case, 103–104
 concurs in holding slave trade does not violate “law of nations” (*Antelope*), 105–106
 denies existence of *jus gentium*, 134, 135
 misunderstands “comity,” 135
 as “incorporationist,” 151, 153
 inspires “choice-of-penal-law,” 176
- Suarez, Francisco—
 influences Pufendorf, 36
 rejects *jus gentium* theory, 36, 50–51, 151, 191
 frequently cited by Gentili, 51
 ignored by Zouche, 52
 ignored by American constitutionalists, 77
 influence on Sir William Scott, 112, 115
 ignored by Story, 134–135
 Szaszy, Istvan, 177 note 11
- “terrorism,” “terrorists”—
 positive legislators, 20
 not bound by treaties to which they are not directly parties, 171, 180–181
 held by some to violate universal “natural” international law, 181–182
 could be suppressed using positive law, 196–197
- Textor, Johann Wolfgang, 62 note 58
- Thucydides—
 quoted on customary law, 13–14
- Trimble, Phillip, 90 note 48
- “truth” commissions, 174–176
- Tuchman, Barbara, 66 note 65
- United Nations (UN)—
 Charter principles, 142, 146–147
 Jessup denigrates lack of universal membership, 144
 Bosnian Serbs not represented, 147
 General Assembly—
 advised by International Law Commission, 180
 and Namibia, 193–194
 Secretary-General (Kurt Waldheim), 175–176
 Security Council—
 and former Yugoslavia, 147, 156–157, 172
 and Namibia, 193
 expands assertions of authority, 147, 156–157, 194, 195
 International Law Commission—
 moves towards “rectification” rationale, 180
see also International Court of Justice
- Vattel, Emerich de—
 publishes in the vernacular, 45–46
 draws no distinction between *jus gentium* and *jus inter gentes*, 46
 considers the state to be a “moral person,” 47
 identifies “law” with “morality,” 47–48
 cited often by American constitutionalists, 45 note 25, 154
 Vitoria, Francisco (sixteenth-century Spanish jurist)—
 defends Spanish conquistadores on the basis of *jus gentium*, 49

228 INDEX

- Waldheim, Kurt—
 ostracism as moral remedy, 175–176
- Wen-Amon (priest)—
 idol stolen in Dor, 1–2
 buys cedar in Lebanon, 2–3
 and “naturalism,” 6, 35
 and conflict of laws, 131
 “universal”-monist model, 151
 illustrates conflicting models of “law,”
 153, 163
- Westphalia, Peace of (1648)—
 and restructuring of the concept of the
 international legal order, 18, 35, 136,
 189
 period between and defeat of Napoleon,
 and sovereign equality under law, 35–36
 implies positivist-dualist constitution,
 115, 136, 168, 189
 universal jurisdiction inconsistent with,
 136–137, 168, 178–179, 197–198
- Wheaton, Henry—
 argues universal jurisdiction to
 adjudicate in “piracy” cases, 88–89,
 130
 considers “piracy” a “common law”
 offense, 89, 130
 denies universal jurisdiction to
 adjudicate in non-piracy common law
 cases, 89, 91
 denies universal jurisdiction to
 adjudicate in slave-trade cases,
 125–127, 130
 regards the international legal order as
 fundamentally dualist-positivist, 130
 despises slavery and the slave trade, 151
 conclusions undercut international
 criminal court proposals today, 156,
 166
- Wilson, James (American
 constitutionalist)—
 urges “monist” model of society, 73–74,
 85
- distinguishes *jus gentium* from *jus inter
 gentes*, 115
- Wiltberger (American acquitted of “piracy”
 1820)—
 conviction for “piracy” reversed for lack
 of prescriptive jurisdiction 1820,
 87–88
 Wheaton interprets case narrowly,
 88–89
 case cited, 91, 92, 110
- Wirt, William (Attorney General,
 1817–1824)—
 prosecutes “Baltimore Pirates,” 96
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 4 note 6
- Wolff, Christian, 43–45
- Wooddeson, Richard—
 defines “law of nations,” 60–61
 confuses universal law with national
 discretion to do “justice,” 61–62, 74,
 203
- Yugoslavia—
 UN Security Council and atrocities in,
 147, 156–157, 172
 international criminal tribunal, 147,
 156–157, 166, 172
 Genocide Convention inapplicable, 156
 and laws of war, 167, 171–172
 tribunal likely to be ineffective, 172, 183
- Zakar-Baal, ruler in Lebanon—
 sells cedar to Wen-Amon, 2, 3
 accepts divinity of Amon-Re but denies
 authority of Wen-Amon, 3
 secular conception of law, 163
- Zouche, Richard (seventeenth-century
 British admiralty judge and scholar)—
 defines *jus gentium* and *jus inter gentes*,
 52
 founder of modern positivism, 53
 ignored by American Constitutionalists,
 77