

AJIL Unbound

VOL. 108

March 2014-July 2015

CONTENTS

PAGE

Symposium: Nico Krisch, “The Decay of Consent: International Law in an Age of Global Public Goods”		
<u>Comment on Nico Krisch, “The Decay of Consent: International Law in an Age of Global Public Goods”</u>	<i>Eyal Benvenisti & George W. Downs</i>	1
<u>From Contract to Status: A Comment on Nico Krisch’s The Decay of Consent</u>	<i>Tom Ginsburg</i>	8
Symposium: The Sixty-Fifth Session of the International Law Commission		
<u>The Changing Form of the International Law Commission’s Work</u>	<i>Jacob Katz Cogan</i>	4
<u>The International Law Commission Reinvents Itself?</u>	<i>Kristina Daugirdas</i>	79
Symposium: Remedies For Harm Caused By UN Peacekeepers		
<u>Remedies for Harm Caused by UN Peacekeepers</u>	<i>Bruce Rashkow</i>	10
<u>UN Accountability for Haiti’s Cholera Epidemic</u>	<i>Ira Kurzban, Beatrice Lindstrom, & Shannon Jonsson</i>	17
<u>The United Nations in the Time of Cholera</u>	<i>José Alvarez</i>	22
Symposium: The End of Treaties?		
<u>Collective Decision-making in International Governance</u>	<i>Timothy Meyer</i>	30
<u>Reports of the Death of Treaty Are Premature, but Customary International Law May Have Outlived Its Usefulness</u>	<i>Joel P. Trachtman</i>	36
<u>Custom and Treaties as Interchangeable Instruments of National Policy</u>	<i>Bart M. J. Szewczyk</i>	41
<u>The Fall and Rise of Peace Treaties</u>	<i>Tanisha M. Fazal</i>	46
<u>Increasing Relevance of Treaties: The Case of the Arctic</u>	<i>Timo Koivurova</i>	52
<u>An Empirical Look at U.S. Treaty Practice: Some Preliminary Conclusions</u>	<i>Cindy Galway Buys</i>	57

<u>Treaty Stasis</u>	<i>Brian Israel</i>	63
<u>The Expansion of International Law Beyond Treaties</u>	<i>Humberto Cantú-Rivera</i>	70
<u>The Successes and Challenges for the European Court, Seen from the Outside</u>	<i>Laurence R. Helfer</i>	74
Agora: <i>Bond v. United States</i>		
<u><i>Bond</i>, Clear Statement Requirements, and Political Process</u>	<i>Curtis A. Bradley</i>	83
<u><i>Bond v. United States</i> and Congress’s Role in Implementing Treaties</u>	<i>William S. Dodge</i>	86
<u>The <i>Bond</i> Court’s Institutional Truce</u>	<i>Monica Hakimi</i>	89
Symposium: “The Idea of Effective International Law”		
<u>The Idea of Effective International Law: Continuing the Discussion</u>	<i>Vijay Padmanabhan</i>	91
<u>How Compliance Understates Effectiveness</u>	<i>Timothy Meyer</i>	93
<u>Varieties of Effectiveness: What Matters?</u>	<i>Liam Murphy</i>	99
<u>“Effectivity” in International Law: Self-Empowerment Against Epistemological Claustrophobia</u>	<i>Jean d’Aspremont</i>	103
Symposium on the Uniting for Peace Resolution		
<u>“Uniting for Peace”: Does it Still Serve Any Useful Purpose?</u>	<i>Larry D. Johnson</i>	106
<u>He Got It Almost Right</u>	<i>Frederic L. Kirgis</i>	116
<u>What Does the Uniting for Peace Resolution Mean for the Role of the UN Security Council?</u>	<i>Ieva Miluna</i>	118
<u>The Legalizing and Legitimizing Function of UN General Assembly Resolutions</u>	<i>Stefan Talmon</i>	123
<u>Uniting for “Peace” in the Second Cold War: A Response to Larry Johnson</u>	<i>Boris N. Mamlyuk</i>	129
<u>Comment on Larry Johnson, “Uniting for Peace”</u>	<i>Henry Richardson</i>	135
Symposium: The True Meaning of Force		
<u>The True Meaning of Force</u>	<i>Mary Ellen O’Connell</i>	141
<u>The True Meaning of Force – A Reply to Mary Ellen O’Connell</u>	<i>Tom Ruys</i>	148
<u>The True Meaning of Force: A Further Response to Tom Ruys in the Interest of Peace</u>	<i>Mary Ellen O’Connell</i>	153

<u>Response to Richard Stewart, “Remedying Disregarding Global Regulatory Governance”</u>	<i>David Zaring</i>	145
Symposium: Elephant Law		
<u>Introduction to Symposium</u>	<i>Jacqueline Peel</i>	155
<u>Aligning Frames for Elephant Extinction: Towards a New Role for the United Nations</u>	<i>André Nollkaemper</i>	158
<u>Elephant Poaching and Ivory Trafficking as a Threat to the Peace</u>	<i>Anne Peters</i>	162
<u>Delegitimizing Ivory: The Case for an Ivory Trade Ban Treaty</u>	<i>Rachelle Adams</i>	166
Symposium: Reflections on Customary International Law and the International Law Commission’s Project		
<u>Identifying the Rules for Identifying Customary International Law</u>	<i>Sean D. Murphy</i>	169
<u>Identifying International Organizations’ Contributions to Custom</u>	<i>David M. DeBartolo</i>	174
<u>Does Custom Have a Source?</u>	<i>Daniel Bodansky</i>	179
<u>Identifying Customary International Law: First Thoughts on the ILC’s First Steps</u>	<i>Edward T. Swaine</i>	184
<u>The Potential Impact on Investment Arbitration of the ILC’s Work on Customary International Law</u>	<i>Jeremy K. Sharpe</i>	188
<u>Some Observations on the Draft Conclusions on Identification of Customary Law Provisionally Adopted by the ILC’s Drafting Committee at the Sixty-Sixth Session (2014)</u>	<i>Bernard H. Oxman</i>	193
<u>Identifying the Rules for Identifying Customary International Law: Response</u>	<i>Michael Wood & Omri Sender</i>	196
<u>Customary International Law: A Moral Judgment-based Account</u>	<i>John Tasioulas</i>	XXX
Symposium: Recognition of Governments and Customary International Law		
<u>Introduction to Symposium</u>	<i>James Gathii</i>	199
<u>From Free Town to Cairo via Kiev: The Unpredictable Road of Democratic Legitimacy in Governmental Recognition</u>	<i>Erika de Wet</i>	201
<u>Democratic Legitimacy Between Port-au-Prince and Cairo: A Reply to Erika de Wet</u>	<i>Jure Vidmar</i>	208
<u>Whither Democratic Legitimism?: Contextualizing Recent Developments in the Recognition and Non-recognition of Governments</u>	<i>Brad R. Roth</i>	213
<u>The Pipe Dream of Constraining Recognition Through Democracy: International Lawyers’ Regulatory Project Continue</u>	<i>Jean d’Aspremont</i>	219
<u>Democratic Legitimacy and Respect for Human Rights: The New Gold</u>		

<u>Standard</u>	<i>Christina M. Cerna</i>	222
<u>Democratic Legitimacy as a Criterion for the Recognition of Governments: A Response to Professor Erika de Wet</u>	<i>Obiora Chinedu Okafor</i>	228
<u>Democratic Legitimacy as a Criterion for Recognizing a Government: Towards the Emergence of a Regional Customary Rule in the Americas? A Reply to Professor Erika de Wet</u>	<i>Vasiliki Saranti</i>	233
Symposium: Pierre-Hugues Verdier and Erik Voeten, “Precedent, Compliance, and Change in Customary International Law: An Explanatory Theory”		
<u>Introduction to Symposium</u>	<i>Ingrid Wuerth</i>	239
<u>How Different are Treaties and Modern Customary International Law? A Response to Verdier and Voeten</u>	<i>Timothy Meyer</i>	240
<u>Precedent and Custom: A Response to Verdier and Voeten</u>	<i>Jens David Ohlin</i>	246
<u>The Translation of Common Sense: A Response to Verdier and Voeten</u>	<i>Alejandro Lorite Escorihuela</i>	250
<u>A Response to Professors Meyer, Ohlin, and Lorite Escorihuela</u>	<i>Pierre-Hugues Verdier & Erik Voeten</i>	257
Symposium: Janie A. Chuang, “Exploitation Creep and the Unmaking of Human Trafficking Law”		
<u>Introduction to Symposium</u>	<i>The Editors</i>	XXX
<u>Re-Framing Exploitation Creep to Fight Human Trafficking: A Response to Janie Chuang</u>	<i>Clifford Bob</i>	XXX
<u>“Exploitation Creep” and Development: A Response to Janie Chuang</u>	<i>Aziza Ahmed</i>	XXX
<u>A Crossroads in the Fight Against Human Trafficking? Let’s Take the Structural Route: A Response to Janie Chuang</u>	<i>Karen E. Bravo</i>	XXX
<u>Anti-Trafficking Law as a Key to Global Economic Contradictions: A Response to Janie Chuang</u>	<i>Chantal Thomas</i>	XXX
Symposium: WTO EC-Seal Products Case		
<u>Editors’ Introduction</u>	<i>Alexia Herwig & Gregory Shaffer</i>	XXX
<u>The WTO Seal Products Case: Doctrinal and Normative Confusion</u>	<i>Joel Trachtman</i>	XXX
<u>Measures with Multiple Purposes: Puzzles from EC-Seal Products</u>	<i>Donald H. Regan</i>	XXX
<u>Accommodating Divergent Policy Objectives under WTO Law: Reflections on EC-Seal Products</u>	<i>Julia Y. Qin</i>	XXX
<u>Indigenous Interests and the Chapeau of Article XX: Equality of What?</u>	<i>Alexia Herwig</i>	XXX
<u>Consensus Analysis, State Practice, and Majoritarian Activism in the</u>		

<u>WTO</u>	<i>William J. Moon & Alec Stone Sweet</i>	XXX
<u>The WTO, Self-Determination, and Multi-jurisdictional Sovereignty</u>	<i>Michael Fakhri</i>	XXX