Adams, John Quincy (Secretary of State 1817–1824; President 1824–1828)—furious at Rump 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 Zouch, 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

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
categorization 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
Bosc, 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, Cornelis van—
defines “piracy,” 59–60
impliedly denies “universal” jurisdiction, 60
and “universal” jurisdiction over “pirates,” 60
and Scots privateers, 60
“The 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
Casteraugh, Lord (British Foreign Secretary 1812–1822)—
sseeks 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
Casio, William R., 66 note 66
Cavers, David F., 34 note 56, 135 note 160
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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
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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, 159–200
provides simple, unifying conception, 205
Crawford, James, 180 note 18
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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
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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
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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 jutus against Salaman Rushdie, 181
used to justify “apartheid,” 202
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territorial conception of jurisdiction, 163
and conflict of laws, 131
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Eco, Umberto, 5 note 6
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“natural” law not directly enforceable by “positive” means, 19–20, 27–28, 53, 187, 194
and “forum non convenient” 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
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in Coke, 53, 65, 68
and mala in se (universal crimes to Coke), 53
in Bykenshoeck, 60
in Wooddeson, 61
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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
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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
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 Woodeson (Lake Ryan case), 60–61, 74
Woodeson view criticized, 61–62
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alliance with United States (1778), 70, 81
alliance “repealed” by United States (1798), 77
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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 Alexia-Chappelle (1818), 116
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Canning dismayed at refusals, 119
at Verona (1822), slandered by Wellington, 120
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yields “visitation” rights to Britain (1831), 124, 127 note 143
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Franck, Thomas M., 114 note 114
Friedmann, Wolfgang, 154 note 35
Frowein, Jochen Abr., 171 note 2
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defines ius (just) civil and ius (just) gentium, 12
great influence, 151
justifies “Enlightenment” naturalism, 164
genocide—
Convention of 1948, 156
universal “jurisdiction to adjudicate” rejected by states, 156
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Italo-English jurist)—
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ignored by Zouche, 52
Germany—
language and “law,” 29
Samuel von Punfredor’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
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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
Grotilius, Hugo—
defines “belium justum,” 30
describes legal order, 30

Haiti (Hayti)—
Britain denies universal jurisdiction, 129–130
Hamaleti 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 “neutralitv,” 81
helps prosecution in Henley case, 81
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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
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Holland, see Netherlands
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, Jr., 25, 55
Holt, J. C., 129 note 148
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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—
asserted “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
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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
Jans, 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 Leonle (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 privatizing, 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,” 106, 108–109
and jur standi, 109, 116, 180–181, 193
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
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
in Woodeson, 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, 110ff.
in Lauterpacht, 143 offenses in former Yugoslavia, 147
international criminal court proposal criticized, 147–149, 166–168, 168ff.
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
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and distinguished from jus inter gentes by Zouche, 52, 77
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61–74
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century statesmen, 67–68
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basis for federal “fort” jurisdiction in
American Judicature Act of 1789, 78
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statesmen of the founding generation,
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70–71
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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 Ilenfield 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 Wilberger case, 1820, 87–88
supported by Wheaton despite Wilberger
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 Darnand 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
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international tribunals and
substantive law, 124–129
rejected by Britain as basis for universal
judicature authority, 120–130
superseded by choice-of-law theory,
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fluence of Lord Mansfield, 131–133
fluence of Joseph Story, 134–135
and John Austin, 138–139
in the Statute of the Permanent Court of
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International Court of Justice, 140,
141–142, 199
revived by Sir Hersch Lauterpacht.
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found inapplicable in real case by Jessup,
144–145
basis for current initiatives, 146–147
current initiatives likely to fail, 147–149
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Suarez and Pufendorf, 151
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standards, 151–152
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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
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64–65, 66–68
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and Lauterpacht, 141–143
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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 deployed by Joseph Story, 135
influences “objective” natural law theories,
13, 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
Kintstock (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
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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
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Convention, 72
notion of “felon,” 72–73
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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 prohibitae, 67
irrelevant to Ambassadors Immunities,
68

Manufield, 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 (Kintstock), 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
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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, Theodore, 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, 136–157

reflected in some arbitral opinions, 157–161

in PCIJ, 161–162
inconsistent with current distribution of legal authority in the world, 166–169
adopted by German legislation, 178
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, 10, 187–188

as “divine law,” 13

as custom, 13

assessed universally, 13–14, 33–34, 48

and overlapping normative orders, 14–15

dominates theory (1648–1834), 35–36, 190–191

in Pulendorf, 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
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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 Castleragh, 115–116
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underlies “comity” to Lord Mansfield, 132
underlies conflict of laws to Story, 134
defined by Austin, 138
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and “property,” 164

and “piracy,” 164–165

“violations” subject to positive “pardon,” 174
“natural law” (cont.)—
inconsistent with criminal law
enforcement, 177ff.
not applied by International Court in the
South West Africa case, 192–193
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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,
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O’Brian, Patrick, 15 note 28
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applied to naive naturalism, 25
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obeys “monist” model of
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supports municipal criminal law,
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Ogilvie, R. M., 67 note 68
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Perry, Clive, 153 note 36
Permanent Court of International Justice,
see International Court of Justice
Petrie, Donald A., 61 note 57
Piekert, Wolfgang, 171 note 2
Pfeffer, Leo, 77 note 17
pragmacy—
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 Woodadsen, 61
in case of Luke Ryan, 61
Irish privateers of 1693 considered not
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