IDENTIFICATION OF CUSTOMARY INTERNATIONAL LAW

[Agenda item 6]

DOCUMENT A/CN.4/695 and Add.1

Fourth report on identification of customary international law, by Sir Michael Wood, Special Rapporteur*

[*Original: English*]
[*8 March 2016*]

CONTENTS

Multilateral instruments cited in the present report

	Source
Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or Between International Organizations (Vienna, 21 March 1986)	A/CONF.129/15.

Works cited in the present report

Akehurst, Michael

"Custom as a source of international law", BYBIL 1974–1975, vol. 47 (1977), pp. 1–53.

Allott, Philip

"Language, method and the nature of international law", BYBIL, vol. 45 (1971), pp. 79–136.

Baxter, R. R.

"Treaties and custom", *Collected Courses of The Hague Academy of International Law, 1970-I*, vol. 129, pp. 25–105.

Bos, Maarten

"The identification of custom in international law", GYBIL. Berlin, Duncker and Humblot, vol. 25 (1982), pp. 9–53.

* The Special Rapporteur thanks Mr. Omri Sender for his invaluable assistance with the preparation of the present report. The Special Rapporteur would also like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Jean-Baptiste Merlin for his work on the topic as French-speaking contact point proposed by the Société Française pour le Droit International (French Society of International Law).

Briggs, Herbet W.

"Official interest in the work of the International Law Commission: Replies of Governments to requests for information or comment", AJIL, vol. 48 (1954), pp. 603

The International Law Commission. Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1965.

Caflisch, Lucius

"The CAHDI model plan for the classification of documents concerning State practice in the field of public international law", *in* Council of Europe, ed., *The CAHDI Contribution to the Development of Public International Law: Achievements and Future Challenges.* Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2016, pp. 12–18.

Danilenko, Gennady M.

*Law-making in the Internatio*nal Community. Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1993.

Ferrari Bravo, Luigi

"Méthodes de recherche de la coutume internationale dans la pratique des Etats", *Collected Courses of The Hague Academy of International Law, 1985-III*, vol. 192 (1986), pp. 233–330.

Gaebler, Ralph F., and Alison A. Shea, eds.

Sources of State Practice in International Law, 2nd rev. ed. Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2014.

Graefrath, B.

"The International Law Commission tomorrow: Improving its organization and methods of work", AJIL, vol. 85 (1991), pp. 595–612.

Green, James A.

The Persistent Objector Rule in International Law. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.

Jennings, Sir Robert

"The identification of international law", *in* Bin Cheng, ed., *International Law: Teaching and Practice.* London, Stevens and Sons, 1982, pp. 3–9.

"Universal international law in a multicultural world", *in* Maarten Bos and Ian Brownlie, eds., *Liber Amicorum for Lord Wilberforce.* Oxford, Clarendon, 1987, pp. 39–52.

Jiménez de Aréchaga, Eduardo

"International law in the past third of a century", *Collected Courses of The Hague Academy of International Law, 1978-I*, vol. 159 (1979), pp. 2–343.

Liang, Yuen-Li

"Notes on legal questions concerning the United Nations—The second session of the International Law Commission: Review of its work by the General Assembly", AJIL, vol. 45 (1951), pp. 509–525.

MacGibbon, Iain

"The scope of acquiescence in international law", BYBIL 1954, vol. 31 (1956), pp. 143–186.

Meron, Theodor

"The continuing role of custom in the formation of international humanitarian law", AJIL, vol. 90 (1996), p. 238–249.

Mersky, Roy M., and Jonathan Pratter

"A comment on the ways and means of researching customary international law a half-century after the International Law Commission's work", *International Journal of Legal Information*, vol. 24 (1996), pp. 302–309.

Parry, C.

"[Review:] Ways and means of making the evidence of customary international law more readily available: Preparatory work within the purview of article 24 of the Statute of the International Law Commission (Memorandum submitted by the Secretary-General)", *International Law Quarterly* (1950), vol. 3, pp. 462–464.

Preuss, Lawrence

"[Review:] Ways and means of making the evidence of customary international law more readily available. Memorandum submitted by the Secretary-General (A/CN.4/6)", AJIL, vol. 43 (1949), pp. 834–835.

Pulkowski, Dirk

"Theoretical premises of 'regionalism and the unity of international law'", *in* Mariano J. Aznar and Mary E. Footer, eds., *Select Proceedings of the European Society of International Law,* vol. IV: *Regionalism and International Law. Valencia, 13–15 September 2012*. Oxford, Hart, 2015, pp. 77–86.

Rosenne, Shabtai

Practice and Methods of International Law. London, Oceana Publications, 1984.

Schwarzenberger, Georg

"The inductive approach to international law", *Harvard Law Review*, vol. 60 (1947), pp. 539–570.

Sepúlveda-Amor, Bernardo

"Comments on Fawcett and Obregón", *in* Mariano J. Aznar and Mary E. Footer, eds., *Select Proceedings of the European Society of International Law,* vol. IV: *Regionalism and International Law. Valencia, 13–15 September 2012*. Oxford, Hart, 2015, pp. 39–44.

Sur, Serge

"Sources du droit international—La coutume", *Juris Classeur du Droit international*, vol. 118 (1989) (fasc. 13).

Tomka, Peter

"Custom and the International Court of Justice", *The Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals*, vol. 12 (2013), pp. 195–216.

Treves, Tullio

"Customary international law", *in* Rüdiger Wolfrum, ed., *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, vol. 9. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 937–957.

Waldock, Sir Humphrey

"General course on public international law", *Collected Courses of The Hague Academy of International Law, 1962-II*, vol. 106, pp. 1–251.

Watts, Arthur

The International Law Commission 1949–1998, vol. III. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.

Wolfke, Karol

Custom in present international law, 2nd ed. Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1993.

Wood, Michael, and Omri Sender

"State practice", Rüdiger Wolfrum, ed., *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law.* 2017, available from https://opil.ouplaw.com/home/mpil.

Yee, Sienho

"Report on the ILC project on 'Identification of customary international law'", *Chinese Journal of International Law*, vol. 14 (2015), pp. 375–398

Introduction

1. In 2012, the International Law Commission placed the topic "Formation and evidence of customary international law" in its current programme of work,[1] and held an initial debate on the basis of a preliminary note by the Special Rapporteur.[2]

2. In 2013, the Commission held a general debate[3] on the basis of the Special Rapporteur's first report[4] and a memorandum by the Secretariat.[5] The Commission changed the title of the topic to "Identification of customary international law".[6]

3. In 2014, the Commission considered the Special Rapporteur's second report,[7] and confirmed its support for the "two-element" approach to the identification of customary international law. Following the debate, the 11 draft conclusions proposed in the second report were referred to the Drafting Committee, which provisionally adopted eight draft conclusions.[8]

4. A third report by the Special Rapporteur,[9] prepared for the Commission's sixty-seventh session in 2015, sought to complete the set of draft conclusions. In doing so, it addressed certain matters not covered in the second report, and others to which it was agreed the Commission would return in 2015. In particular, it analysed further the issue of the relationship between the two constituent elements; contained more detailed enquiries into inaction as a form of practice and/or evidence of acceptance as law (*opinio juris*), and the relevance of practice of international organizations; examined the role of treaties and resolutions, judicial decisions and teachings; and explored particular customary international law and the persistent objector rule.

5. The Commission debated the Special Rapporteur's third report from 13 to 21 May 2015.[10] The members of the Commission reiterated their support for the "two-element" approach; and there was general agreement that the outcome of the topic should be a set of practical conclusions with commentaries, aiming at assisting practitioners and others in the identification of rules of customary international law. It was suggested, moreover, that the draft conclusions proposed in the report would benefit from further specification, and many particular proposals were voiced in this regard.

6. Following the debate, the draft conclusions proposed in the third report were referred to the Drafting Committee, which provisionally adopted eight additional draft conclusions as well as additional paragraphs for two of the draft conclusions adopted at the previous session. On 29 July 2015, the Chair of the Drafting Committee presented to the plenary a report on the work of the Committee on the topic at the sixty-seventh session, which contained the full set of 16 draft conclusions provisionally adopted by the Committee at the sixty-sixth and sixty seventh sessions.[11]

7. On 6 August 2015, the Commission took note of draft conclusions 1 to 16 as provisionally adopted by the Drafting Committee.[12] It was anticipated that the Commission would, at its next session, consider the adoption on first reading of the draft conclusions as well as the commentaries thereto.

8. In addition, the Commission requested the Secretariat to prepare a memorandum on the role of decisions of national courts in the case law of international courts and tribunals of a universal character for the purpose of identification of customary international law. The memorandum considers the *travaux préparatoires* of Article 38, paragraph 1, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice before proceeding to analyse the case law of various international courts and tribunals in order to deduce some general observations. These are consistent with the Commission's treatment of national court decisions in the present topic as both a form of State practice or evidence of acceptance as law (*opinio juris*), and as a subsidiary means for determining the existence or content of customary international law.[13]

9. In the debate in the Sixth Committee in 2015, delegations generally commended the Commission for the work accomplished on this topic thus far and for the pragmatic approach taken. In particular, delegations reiterated their support for the general approach followed in the draft conclusions provisionally adopted by the Drafting Committee and looked forward to a first reading of the draft conclusions by the Commission during the sixty-eighth session. Valuable comments and suggestions were made with respect to matters addressed in the draft conclusions.[14] In addition, following information from other States received previously, a detailed written statement was received from Switzerland in response to the Commission's request to States for information related to the topic.

10. The present report seeks to address, in chapter I, some of the main comments and suggestions that have been made by States and others in relation to the 16 draft conclusions

[1] *Yearbook … 2012*, vol. II (Part Two), para. 19.

[2] *Ibid*., vol. II (Part One), document A/CN.4/653.

[3] *Yearbook … 2013*, vol. I, 3181st–3186th meetings; see also *ibid.*, vol. II (Part Two), pp. 64 *et seq.*, paras. 66−107.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. II (Part One), document A/CN.4/663.

[5] *Ibid*., document A/CN.4/659.

[6] *Ibid.*, vol. I, 3186th meeting.

[7] *Yearbook … 2014*, vol. II (Part One), document A/CN.4/672.

[8] *Ibid.*, vol. I, 3242nd meeting; the full text of the Chair's interim report of 7 August 2014 may be found at https://legal.un.org/ilc, *Annual Sessions*, under the information on the sixty-sixth session of the Commission. The Drafting Committee was unable to consider two draft conclusions because of a lack of time, and one draft conclusion was omitted.

[9] *Yearbook … 2015*, vol. II (Part One), document A/CN.4/682.

[10] *Ibid.*, vol. I, 3250th to 3254th meetings; *ibid*., vol II (Part Two), pp. 28 *et seq.*, paras. 62–107.

[11] Identification of customary international law: Text of the draft conclusions provisionally adopted by the Drafting Committee (A/CN.4/L.869). See also the Chair's statement of 29 July 2015, at https://legal.un.org/ilc, *Annual Sessions*, under the information on the sixty-seventh session of the Commission.

[12] *Yearbook … 2015*, vol. II (Part Two), pp. 27–28, para. 60.

[13] Document A/CN.4/691, reproduced in the present volume.

[14] The Sixth Committee discussed the report of the Commission at its 17th to 26th meetings, on 2, 3, 4, 6, 9 to 11 November 2015 (A/C.6/70/SR.17–26). See also topical summary prepared by the Secretariat of the discussion held in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly during its seventieth session (A/CN.4/689; available from the website of the Commission), paras. 15–27.

provisionally adopted by the Drafting Committee in 2014 and 2015. It is suggested that the Commission review the draft conclusions (and accompanying commentaries) in the light of such comments before adopting the draft conclusions on first reading. In chapter II, the Special Rapporteur proposes some minor modifications to the texts provisionally adopted by the Drafting Committee, which could be made at the present stage if the Commission so decides.[15] Chapter III then concerns ways and means to make the evidence of customary international law more readily available, a matter that the Commission had of course dealt with some sixty-five years ago. The chapter recalls the background of that prior work, as a basis for further consideration of the matter within the Commission at present. Finally, chapter IV contains suggestions concerning the future programme of work on the topic.

[15] A similar procedure was proposed by the Special Rapporteur on responsibility of international organizations in his seventh report (*Yearbook … 2009,* vol. II (Part One), A/CN.4/610, para. 4 *et seq*.) and taken up by the Commission.

Chapter I

Suggestions by States and others on the draft conclusions provisionally adopted

11. The Special Rapporteur has consulted widely on the draft conclusions provisionally adopted by the Drafting Committee, and participated in various meetings at which they were discussed, including a meeting of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization (AALCO) informal expert group on customary international law held in Bangi, Malaysia in August 2015.[16] In particular, representatives in the debate in the Sixth Committee provided a wealth of valuable suggestions, for which the Special Rapporteur is very grateful. As indicated below, some of the points raised may be addressed in the commentaries. Others could be considered this year, at the first reading stage, and yet others may be more appropriate for consideration on second reading. The Special Rapporteur would welcome the views of members of the Commission on the following points; his own views, provided below, are for the most part tentative and, of course, subject to the debate in the Commission.

12. A question was raised with respect to the use of the term "conclusions" to describe the Commission's output on the present topic; some asked whether the term "guidelines" would not be more appropriate, given the objective of providing practical guidance on the way in which the existence or otherwise of rules of customary international law, and their content, are to be determined. The Special Rapporteur suggests that this be considered at second reading, in the light of the nature of the texts then adopted.

13. It was also suggested that draft conclusion 1 ("Scope") is not, *stricto sensu*, a conclusion on the identification of customary international law, and that its content, which is of an introductory nature, could be taken up in the general commentary that the Special Rapporteur will propose to the Commission. The Special Rapporteur tends to agree with this suggestion, which is along the same lines as the Drafting Committee's 2015 decision under the topic "Protection of the environment in relation to armed conflict".[17] Such a change could be made either this year or on second reading.

14. One delegation in the Sixth Committee suggested that the draft conclusions should be more detailed. As the Special Rapporteur has indicated in the past, and as the ensuing discussions in the Commission have shown, the need to achieve a balance between making the draft conclusions clear and concise on the one hand, and comprehensive on the other, needs constantly to be borne in mind. Several draft conclusions proposed in the second and third reports were indeed expanded following the debates in plenary and in the Drafting Committee. Other important nuances, it is hoped, will be brought out in the draft commentaries. It is the aim of the Special Rapporteur that the latter will provide the necessary additional depth and detail, and that they will be read together with the draft conclusions as an indissoluble whole. Any further specific suggestions in this respect would be welcome.

15. A concern was voiced in the Sixth Committee that the reference in the draft conclusions to a wide array of potential types of evidence of customary international law might be taken to suggest that customary international law was easily created or inferred. While this concern is understandable, the reference to multiple forms of State practice and various manifestations of State behaviour through which acceptance as law (*opinio juris*) may be made known simply reflects the fact that States exercise their powers in various ways and do not confine themselves only to some types of acts. This does not imply that the existence of rules of customary international law is lightly to be assumed, particularly when in principle "those who participate in the formation of a custom are sovereign States who are the decision-makers, the law-makers within the community. Their recognition of the practice as law is in a very direct way the essential basis of customary law".[18] It is the intention of the Special Rapporteur that, in line with the draft conclusions provisionally adopted, the draft commentaries make it clear that establishing the existence and content of a rule of customary international law entails a search for a practice that has gained such acceptance among States that it may be considered to be the expression of a legal right or obligation. The test must always be: is there a general practice that is accepted as law?

[16] Some of the contributions to the meeting in Bangi are to be published in *Chinese Journal of International Law*, vol. 15 (2016). See also Yee, "Report on the ILC project on 'Identification of customary international law'".

[17] The proposal of the Special Rapporteur on the topic "Protection of the environment in relation to armed conflict" to this effect was adopted by the Drafting Committee in 2015. See the statement of the Chair of the Drafting Committee of 30 July 2015 at https://legal.un.org/ilc, under the information on the sixty-seventh session of the Commission, p. 2.

[18] Waldock, "General course on public international law", p. 49.

16. Several delegations suggested that the formation of customary international law should not be overlooked in the draft conclusions and commentaries, recalling that the topic was originally entitled "Formation and evidence of customary international law". The Special Rapporteur would concur, in particular as the identification of the existence and content of a rule of customary international law may well involve consideration of the processes by which it has developed. The draft conclusions indeed refer in places, explicitly or otherwise, to the formation of rules of customary international law, and it is intended that the draft commentaries will also do so. At the same time, the aim of the topic is to assist in the determination of the existence (or not) and content as of a particular time of rules of customary international law. The task that faces counsel, judges or arbitrators concerns identifying the law as it is, or was, at a particular time, as opposed to how the law developed over time or might develop in the future. As has previously been agreed, it is not the aim of the topic to explain the myriad of influences and processes involved in the development of rules of customary international law over time, especially given the desire is to keep such processes flexible, as they inherently are.

17. Closely connected is the reference by some delegations to the difficulty that often arises in identifying the precise moment when a critical mass of practice accompanied by acceptance as law (*opinio juris*) has accumulated, and a rule of customary international law has thus come into being. One delegation mentioned the similar challenge associated with an enquiry into the exact time when treaty parties might acquire a sense of being under a legal obligation extending also to nonparties. These comments reflect the fact that the creation of customary international law is not an event that occurs at a particular moment, but rather "emanates from an 'intensive dialectic process' between different actors of the international society".[19] But again, the draft conclusions seek to provide guidance as to whether, at a given moment, it may be said that such process had occurred.[20] Much depends upon the point in time at which evidence is considered.

18. Several delegations provided very helpful comments on the process of assessment of evidence for the two constituent elements, currently dealt with in draft conclusion 3. It is intended that these will be reflected in the commentary, which would seek to explain the reference in the draft conclusion to "overall context, the nature of the rule, and the particular circumstances in which the evidence in question is to be found". As suggested by some delegations, the commentaries would clarify, moreover, that the requirement for a separate inquiry for each of the two constituent elements of customary international law does not exclude the possibility that, in some cases, the same material may be used to ascertain both practice and acceptance as law (*opinio juris*).

19. A concern was raised that the reference in draft conclusion 4, paragraph 2, to the practice of international organizations as "also" creative or expressive of customary international law puts such practice on the same level as the practice of States, notwithstanding the inclusion of the words "[i]n certain cases". This, it was argued, does not find support in existing international law, where the practice of international organizations (with the exception of the European Union), while it may play an important indirect role, does not contribute directly to the formation, or expression, of customary international law. A suggestion was made in this connection to delete paragraph 2 and either to explain in the commentary the roles that international organizations do play, or deal with the matter in a separate draft conclusion. Others, however, supported the present text of paragraph 2, and some suggested that international organizations should not be treated in isolation (also providing some drafting proposals to that effect). It was also noted that at present the reference to international organizations is not entirely consistent throughout the draft conclusions as a whole, since in places the latter refer explicitly to State practice alone.

20. The Special Rapporteur continues to consider that the practice of international (intergovernmental) organizations as such, in certain cases, may contribute to the creation, or expression, of customary international law. The relevance of such practice is difficult to deny in the case of the European Union or, in fact, in any case where member States may direct an international organization to execute on their behalf actions falling within their own competences. The relevance of practice by international organizations should not be controversial, moreover, if it is accepted that the practice of international organizations in their relations among themselves, at least, could give rise or attest to rules of customary international law binding in such relations.[21] At the same time, as several delegations have also emphasized, given that international organizations are not States, and vary greatly (not just in their powers, but also in their membership and functions), in each case their practice must be appraised with caution. This should be made clear in the commentary to the current paragraph 2. Alternatively, apart from the possible changes mentioned in paragraph 19 above, the language of paragraph 2 may be revisited, either now, or on second reading after States have had a chance to see

[19] James Crawford, "The identification and development of customary international law", keynote speech, Spring Conference of the International Law Association, British Branch, 23 May 2014 (citing Allott, "Language, method and the nature of international law", pp. 103 and 129).

[20] See also Wolfke, *Custom in Present International Law*, p. 54 ("Writers are, in general, in agreement that the moment of formation of a custom—and hence the moment in which a customary rule begins to have binding effect—cannot be ascertained, since it is practically speaking intangible. We can ascertain only whether at a precise moment the custom exists, and at most, upon analysis of practice, make certain anticipations concerning the evolution of a particular custom.").

[21] This notion appears to be accepted in the 1986 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or Between International Organizations, which refers in its preamble to the "codification and progressive development of the rules relating to treaties between States and international organizations or between international organizations", and in which it is affirmed (also in the preamble) that "rules of customary international law will continue to govern questions not regulated by the provisions of the present Convention"; see also art. 38 of the Convention. It may also be noteworthy that the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's current standard terms and conditions for loan, guarantee and other financing agreements recognize that the sources of public international law that may be applicable in the event of dispute between the Bank and a party to a financing agreement include "forms of international custom, including the practice of States *and international financial institutions** of such generality, consistency and duration as to create legal obligations": European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Standard Terms and Conditions (1 December 2012), sect. 8.04 (*b*) (vi) (c)).

the accompanying draft commentary. The Special Rapporteur would welcome the further views of members of the Commission on this.

21. A couple of delegations were concerned that the wording of draft conclusion 4, paragraph 3, dealing with the conduct of actors other than States and international organizations, was too strict, in that it does not adequately recognize the important contribution that such actors may make to international practice related to their work and the possible development of customary international law. Reference was made in this context to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in particular. The Special Rapporteur would like to draw attention to the words "but may be relevant when assessing the practice [of States and international organizations]", found in paragraph 3, which acknowledge that, although the conduct of "other actors" is not directly creative, or expressive, of customary international law, it may very well have an important (albeit indirect) role in the development and identification of customary international law. In fact, it was the work of ICRC and its significant contribution to the development of customary international humanitarian law (by stimulating or recording practice and acceptance as law (*opinio juris*) by States)[22] that to a large extent inspired the text of paragraph 3.

22. The revised references in the draft conclusions to inaction as a form of practice and/or evidence of acceptance as law (*opinio juris*), following the closer examination of the issue by the Commission in 2015, were widely supported. A large number of delegations underlined again that the relevance of inaction as evidence of acceptance as law (*opinio juris*) had to be assessed with caution: States are not to be expected to react to everything, and attributing legal significance to their inaction depended on the particular circumstances of each situation. Support was expressed in this connection for the development of draft conclusion 10, paragraph 3, by the Drafting Committee in 2015, and it was suggested that the accompanying commentary further clarify the requirements for attributing probative value to inaction. The Special Rapporteur agrees, and will seek to make clear in the draft commentary not only that it is essential that a reaction to the relevant practice would have been called for, but also that where a State does not or cannot have been expected to know of a certain practice, or has not yet had a reasonable time to respond, its inaction cannot to be attributed to a belief on its part that such practice is mandated (or permitted) under customary international law.

23. One delegation was concerned that draft conclusion 7, paragraph 2 (which in its current form provides that where the practice of a particular State varies, the weight to be given to that practice may be reduced), might disadvantage States where the independence of the judiciary and the juxtaposition of Government and parliament might lead to different views, or at least to different nuances being expressed. The Special Rapporteur would note in this connection that States do generally attempt to speak with one voice on matters of international affairs, and that the draft conclusion does not seek to take any position with respect to the internal order of any State. More specifically, and as the draft commentary would seek to make clear, the word "may" in the draft conclusion indicates that an assessment of a State's practice as a whole needs to be approached with care. One example where such an approach is evident may be found in the *Fisheries Case*, where the International Court of Justice held with respect to the relevant practice that "too much importance need not be attached to the few uncertainties or contradictions, real or apparent … They may be easily understood in the light of the variety of facts and conditions prevailing in the long period".[23] In any event, such assessment should take account of the constitutional position of the relevant State organs, including the question which of them has the final say in the relevant matter.[24]

24. An observation was made that, while draft conclusion 12 stated correctly that resolutions cannot, in and of themselves, constitute customary international law, the same was true of treaties, yet the draft conclusion dealing with the latter (draft conclusion 11) did not contain such an express statement. The drafting of draft conclusion 11 reflects an understanding that the basic rule according to which a treaty cannot in principle create obligations for third parties is well understood; the guidance felt necessary to be provided in draft conclusion 11 rather has to do with how treaties may shed light on the existence and content of rules of customary international law.[25] The com-

[22] See also *Prosecutor v. Duško Tadić a/k/a "Dule"*, Case No. IT-94-1, Decision on the Defence Motion for Interlocutory Appeal on Jurisdiction, Appeals Chamber, International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, 2 October 1995, *Judicial Reports 1994–1995*, para. 109 ("As is well known, the ICRC has been very active in promoting the development, implementation and dissemination of international humanitarian law. From the angle that is of relevance to us, namely the emergence of customary rules on internal armed conflict, the ICRC has made a remarkable contribution by appealing to the parties to armed conflicts to respect international humanitarian law. It is notable that, when confronted with non-international armed conflicts, the ICRC has promoted the application by the contending parties of the basic principles of humanitarian law. In addition, whenever possible, it has endeavoured to persuade the conflicting parties to abide by the Geneva Conventions of 1949 or at least by their principal provisions. When the parties, or one of them, have refused to comply with the bulk of international humanitarian law, the ICRC has stated that they should respect, as a minimum, common article 3. This shows that the ICRC has promoted and facilitated the extension of general principles of humanitarian law to internal armed conflict. The practical results the ICRC has thus achieved in inducing compliance with international humanitarian law ought therefore to be regarded as an element of actual international practice; this is an element that has been conspicuously instrumental in the emergence or crystallization of customary rules"); Meron, "The continuing role of custom in the formation of international humanitarian law", pp. 245 and 247 ("The ICRC is of course neither a State nor an intergovernmental organization, but an association under Swiss civil law. Thus, it is not a direct participant in the making of international law, which under the prevailing theory of sources is still reserved to States, with some allowance for the role of intergovernmental organizations … [however, it] influences State practice and thus, indirectly, the development of customary law").

[23] *Fisheries Case*, Judgment of December 18th, 1951, *I.C.J. Reports 1951*, p. 116, at p. 138.

[24] See, for example, *Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy: Greece intervening)*, Judgment, *I.C.J. Reports 2012*, p. 99, at p. 136, para. 83 (where the Court noted that "under Greek law" the view expressed by the Greek Special Supreme Court prevailed over that of the Hellenic Supreme Court).

[25] It should also be noted that the International Court of Justice remarked in the *North Sea Continental Shelf* cases that, if "a very widespread and representative participation in the convention …, provided it included that of States whose interests were specially affected", is registered, that "might" suffice of itself to transform a conventional rule into a rule of customary international law (*North Sea Continental Shelf*, Judgment, *I.C.J. Reports 1969*, p. 3, at p. 42, para. 73). In other words, a

mentary would explain, however, that the words "if it is established that" make it clear that ascertaining whether a conventional formulation does in fact correspond to an alleged rule of customary international law cannot be done just by looking at the text of the treaty; in each case the existence of the rule must be confirmed by practice (and acceptance as law (*opinio juris*)).

25. Several delegations stressed that great caution should be used when assessing the relevance and significance of resolutions of international organizations and intergovernmental conferences in the identification of customary international law. It was agreed that, as noted in the third report, only some resolutions may be evidence of existing or emerging law, depending on various factors which must be carefully assessed in each case. The Special Rapporteur intends that the commentary will explain further the cautious language of draft conclusion 12, and specify what factors are to be taken into account. It is also intended that, as suggested in the Sixth Committee, the particular relevance of the General Assembly as a forum of near universal participation would be highlighted in this context.

26. Some delegations suggested that a separate conclusion, or at least a specific reference in the commentary accompanying draft conclusion 14 ("Teachings"), should be devoted to the role of the Commission's output in the identification of customary international law. Such output, it was said, did not seem to equate to scholarly work given the Commission's status and relationship with States as a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly. The Special Rapporteur agrees that the Commission does hold a special place in the present context and recalls that this was also highlighted by members of the Commission in the debate in 2015. It is intended that the draft commentary would recognize the particular value that may attach to a determination by the Commission affirming the existence and content of a rule of customary international law (or a conclusion by the Commission that no rule exists), and explain why this is so. Furthermore, the importance of the Commission's work as a catalyst for State practice and expressions of legal opinion is alluded to in other draft conclusions, in particular those dealing with forms of practice, forms of evidence of acceptance as law (*opinio juris*), and the potential relevance of treaties. As noted by one delegation, the Commission's work may also feed into resolutions of the General Assembly. The commentaries to the relevant draft conclusions would seek to capture these points.

27. The inclusion of a draft conclusion on the persistent objector rule was supported by almost all delegations that addressed the matter in the Sixth Committee, indicating widespread agreement that the rule does form part of the corpus of international law.[26] Some delegations, however, expressed concern that recognizing the rule in the draft conclusions may destabilize customary international law or be invoked as a means to avoid customary international law obligations. The Special Rapporteur intends, in this connection, that the commentary, like draft conclusion 15 itself, would emphasize the stringent requirements associated with the rule and, in particular, that once a rule of customary international law has come into being, an objection not voiced earlier will not avail a State wishing to exempt itself from its binding force. Several delegations suggested that the draft commentary should refer to the question of persistent objection *vis-à-vis* rules of *jus cogens*. However, the Commission decided at an early stage not to deal with *jus cogens* as part of the present topic and has now taken it up as a separate topic.

28. One delegation questioned the need for an objection to an emerging rule of customary international law to be repeated and maintained (including after the rule has come into being) in order to secure persistent objector status. It was suggested, instead, that once a State had made it clear that it did not wish to be bound by an emerging rule, it had no obligation to reiterate that stance time and again; the State would lose its status of persistent objector only when its subsequent practice or legal views explicitly expressed support for the new rule and deviated from its earlier position. While this approach does have its appeal, it seems to disregard the legal force that may sometimes attach to silence (when it amounts to acquiescence), and to downplay the importance of inaction in both the development and the identification of rules of customary international law. Nevertheless, there is no requirement that States constantly object: it is intended that the commentary will make clear that objection should be expected only as and when the circumstances are such that a restatement of the objection is to be expected (i.e. where silence or inaction may lead to the conclusion that the State has given up its objection).[27] As

multilateral treaty might, in certain circumstances, "because of its own impact" (*ibid*., para. 70), give rise to a rule of customary international law. As has recently been written, however, "the Court was careful not to determine definitely whether the method was even a possible one … In any event, widespread participation in a codification convention has never, in the jurisprudence of the Court, been sufficient on its own for the confirmation of a customary rule", Tomka, "Custom and the International Court of Justice", p. 207.

[26] For illustration in State practice and the case law of international courts and tribunals, see *Yearbook … 2015*, vol. II (Part One), document A/CN.4/682, paras. 86–87 and accompanying footnotes; Green, *The Persistent Objector Rule in International Law*, in general, but particularly chapter two (p. 55: "[T]here is … more than enough evidence to support the existence of the persistent objector rule today. The State acceptance and usage of the rule, especially when taken alongside the increasingly notable judicial endorsement of it and its ubiquity in scholarship, confirms that the rule is indeed a secondary rule of the international legal system"). See also Wolfke, *Custom in Present International Law*, pp. 66–67 ("The argument that, in practice, such objections [by a persistent objector] are rarely upheld and the objectors finally join the general practice and the arising custom does not undermine the principle of persistent objector. On the contrary, it confirms the consensual basis of customary international law. It shows merely that for extra-legal reasons, the so-called 'societal context', it is in practice difficult, if not impossible, for individual States to abstain *à la longue* from the general evolution of international law"); Danilenko, *Law-Making in the International Community*, p. 112 ("Experience shows that community pressure often results in situations where objecting States are compelled to recognize new rules which have won broad support in the framework of the international community. However, the possibility of effective preservation of the persistent objector status should not be confused with the legally recognized right not to agree with new customary rules.").

[27] See also *Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary in the Gulf of Maine Area*, Judgment, *I.C.J. Reports 1984*, p. 246, at p. 305, para. 130; Bos, "The identification of custom in international law", p. 37 ("it should be emphasized that silence may not always be taken to mean acquiescence: for States cannot be deemed to live under an obligation of permanent protest against anything not pleasing them. For legal consequences to ensue, there must be good reason to require some form

(*Continued on next page.*)

was also suggested, this requirement should be approached in a balanced and pragmatic manner.

29. Some delegations expressed concern that referring to rules of particular customary international law, which by definition apply only among a limited number of States, might be taken to encourage fragmentation of international law. While such concerns are understandable, it is undisputed that rules of particular customary international law exist (as is confirmed, *inter alia*, in the case law of the International Court of Justice).[28] Even if they are not all that frequently encountered in practice, rules of particular customary international law sometimes play a significant role in inter-State relations, accommodating differing interests and values peculiar to some States only. Guidance as to how such rules are to be identified (including the clarification that stricter criteria apply) may thus prove useful. The Special Rapporteur would like the commentaries to make clear, however, that it is not to be excluded that rules of particular customary international law may evolve over time into rules of general customary international law.[29]

(*Footnote 27 continued.*)

of action"); MacGibbon, "The scope of acquiescence in international law", p. 143 ("Acquiescence thus takes the form of silence or absence of protest in circumstances which generally call for a positive reaction signifying an objection"). This is consistent with the approach adopted in draft conclusion 10, paragraph 3, dealing with inaction as a form of evidence of acceptance as law (*opinio juris*).

[28] See *Yearbook … 2015*, vol. II (Part One), document A/CN.4/682, para. 80.

[29] See also "Fragmentation of international law: difficulties arising from the diversification and expansion of international law", report of the Study Group of the International Law Commission finalized by Martti Koskenniemi (A/CN.4/L.682 and Corr. 1 and Add.1) (available from the website of the Commission, documents of the fifty-eighth session; the final text will be published as an addendum to *Yearbook … 2006*, vol. II (Part One)), para. 201 ("these regional influences appear significant precisely because they have lost their originally geographically limited character and have come to contribute to the development of universal international law"); Jennings, "Universal international law in a multicultural world", p. 41 ("[The universality of international law] is not to say, of course, that there is no room for regional variations, perhaps even in matters of principle … Every law, including the law within the sovereign State, readily accommodates such variations. Universality does not mean uniformity. It does mean, however, that such a regional international law, however variant, is a part of the system as a whole and not a separate system, and it ultimately derives its validity from the system as a whole."); Sepúlveda-Amor, "Comments on Fawcett and Obregón", p. 39 ("Remarkably, some of the doctrines and rules that originated in this region [of Latin America] in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were regarded in many quarters, at first, as extravagant and contrary to the laws of civilised nations. Ultimately, however, some of them came to be embraced as part and parcel of general international law. The *uti possidetis juris* principle is a paradigmatic example."); Pulkowski, "Theoretical premises of 'regionalism and the unity of international law'", pp. 84–85 ("regionalism does not affect legal unity in ways that are qualitatively different from other phenomena of modern international lawmaking. Regional law is a sub-variant of particular international law [ranging from plurilateral treaties with limited adherence, to quasi-universal multilateral conventions], and as such is neither more nor less prone to creating disorder in the international system than other forms of particularism.").

Chapter II

Proposed amendments to the draft conclusions in the light of comments received

30. In the light of suggestions made since the sixty-seventh session, the Special Rapporteur proposes that a limited number of minor modifications be made to the text of the draft conclusions provisionally adopted by the Drafting Committee in 2014 and 2015. As noted above, other possible changes may well be considered, either this year or upon second reading. For convenience, the suggested amendments to the draft conclusions are set out (and marked-up) in the annex to the present report.

31. In draft conclusion 3 ("Assessment of evidence for the two elements"), paragraph 2, it is suggested that the text be clarified and its context be emphasized by replacing the words "Each element is to be separately ascertained", which refer to the two constituent elements of customary international law, with "Each of the two elements is to be separately ascertained".

32. In draft conclusion 4 ("Requirement of practice"), paragraph 1, it is suggested that small amendments be made in order to indicate better not only whose practice is primarily relevant for the identification of customary international law, but also the role of such practice. This would provide clearer guidance and better correspond to the title of the draft conclusion. Among the amendments suggested, replacing the words "formation, or expression" with the words "expressive, or creative" draws inspiration from the language of the International Court of Justice in the *Continental Shelf (Tunisia/Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)* case, where the actual practice of States was referred to as "expressive, or creative, of customary rules".[30] It would also serve to focus the paragraph on the task of identification of a rule. The paragraph could thus read: "The requirement, as a constituent element of customary international law, of a general practice refers primarily to the practice of States as expressive, or creative, of rules of customary international law."

33. If draft conclusion 4, paragraph 1, is amended in this way, corresponding changes would be made to draft conclusion 4, paragraph 2, and draft conclusion 4, paragraph 3.

34. In draft conclusion 6 ("Forms of practice"), paragraph 2, it is suggested that the words "conduct in connection with resolutions adopted by an international organization or at an intergovernmental conference" be deleted. While such conduct may sometimes be relevant as State practice, in practice it is more often useful as evidence of acceptance as law (*opinio juris*) or lack thereof, and draft conclusion 6, paragraph 2, in any case does not give an exhaustive list of forms of practice. The reference to "conduct in connection with resolutions" would of course remain in

[30] *Continental Shelf (Tunisia/Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)*, Judgment, *I.C.J. Reports 1982*, p. 18, at p. 46, para. 43 ("it should be borne in mind that, as the Court itself made clear in that [1969] Judgment, it was engaged in an analysis of the concepts and principles which in its view underlay the actual practice of States which is expressive, or creative, of customary rules").

draft conclusion 10, paragraph 2, which lists possible forms of evidence of acceptance as law (*opinio juris*).

35. In draft conclusion 9 ("Requirement of acceptance as law (*opinio juris*)"), paragraph 1, it is suggested that the words "undertaken with" be replaced by the words "accompanied by". The words "undertaken with" could more easily be read to encompass the legal opinion both of States carrying out the relevant practice and those in a position to react to it; they were also employed recently by the International Court of Justice, in its 2012 judgment in the *Jurisdictional Immunities of the State* case.[31]

[31] See *Jurisdictional Immunities of the State* (footnote 24 above), para. 55 ("the point is that the grant of immunity in such a case is not accompanied by the requisite *opinio juris* and therefore sheds no light upon the issue currently under consideration by the Court"), and para. 77 ("[t]hat practice is accompanied by *opinio juris*, as demonstrated by the positions taken by States and the jurisprudence of a number of national courts which have made clear that they considered that customary international law required immunity").

36. In draft conclusion 12 ("Resolutions of international organizations and intergovernmental conferences"), paragraph 1, it is suggested to replace the word "cannot" by the words "does not", since this would better reflect the factual rather than normative nature of the statement, and is better drafting.

37. In draft conclusion 12, paragraph 2, it is suggested, first, that the word "establishing" be replaced with the word "determining", for greater consistency within the draft conclusions as a whole (the word "determine" is used in draft conclusions 1, 2, 13, 14, and 16 in connection with rules of customary international law). It is also suggested that the words "or contribute to its development", be deleted to better focus the draft conclusion on the identification of customary international law; the potential contribution of resolutions of international organizations and intergovernmental conferences to the development of the law could be covered in the commentary.

Chapter III

Making the evidence of customary international law more readily available

38. The practical challenges of access to evidence in order to ascertain the practice of States and their *opinio juris* have long been recognized. Such difficulties, which of course are closely linked to the nature of customary international law as *lex non scripta*,[32] were also acknowledged by the Committee on the Progressive Development of International Law and its Codification (the Committee of Seventeen) in 1947.[33] The Committee therefore recommended in its report to the General Assembly that the Commission "consider ways and means for making the evidences of customary international law more readily available",[34] and this led to the inclusion of article 24 in the Statute of the Commission (1947), within the section entitled "Codification of international law". Article 24 stipulates that:

> The Commission shall consider ways and means for making the evidence of customary international law more readily available, such as the collection and publication of documents concerning State practice and of the decisions of national and international courts on questions of international law, and shall make a report to the General Assembly on this matter.[35]

39. The question of the implementation of article 24 was among the first items on the Commission's agenda.[36] In this connection, the Commission had before it at its first session a memorandum submitted by the Secretary-General entitled "Ways and means of making the evidence of customary international law more readily available: Preparatory work within the purview of article 24 of the Statute of the International Law Commission".[37] The

[32] See also Rosenne, *Practice and Methods of International Law*, p. 56 ("[t]he evidence of customary law [given that it is essentially based on practice] is therefore scattered, elusive, and on the whole unsystematic"); Mersky and Pratter, "A comment on the ways and means of researching customary international law …", p. 304.

[33] Sir Dalip Singh, Chair of the Committee, explained that "the evidence of customary international law was not easily available in contradistinction to the evidence of scientific international law which was always laid down in books" (A/AC.10/SR.27, p. 11). It was observed at about that time, in connection with the identification of customary international law, that "[n]othing could be worse than the current repetition of quotations from the very limited repertoire of diplomatic notes which are taken over from one textbook into another and only rarely supplemented by casual personal excursions of writers into the unknown wilderness of State papers": Schwarzenberger, "The inductive approach to international law", p. 564.

[34] Report of the Committee on the Progressive Development of International Law and its Codification, A/331, para. 18 ("In connection with the development of customary international law, as well as with the development of the law through the judicial process, the Committee desired to recommend that the [Commission] consider ways and means for making the evidences of customary international law more readily available by the compilation of digests of State practice, and by the collection and publication of the decisions of national and international courts on international law questions."). A memorandum on the methods for encouraging the progressive development of international law and its eventual codification submitted to the Committee by its secretariat suggested that, "[w]hile customary international law develops as a result of State practice and its growth is not dependent upon conscious international efforts, the United Nations can stimulate its development through taking steps to render more accessible the evidence of the practice of States in the form of digests of international law … [a useful approach for ascertaining and compiling such digests] might be the consideration of methods whereby the materials containing such evidences can be made more readily available" (A/AC.10/7 and Corr.1–2, pp. 5–6).

[35] The task assigned to the Commission under article 24 of its Statute was "distinct from the other functions of the Commission, namely, the progressive development and the codification of international law … [it] relates exclusively to evidence of customary international law, yet it is concerned not merely with any particular topic but with the whole range of customary international law. The task, specifically stated, is to explore ways and means of remedying the present unsatisfactory state of documentation. This is made clearer by the French text, which speaks of 'documentation', than by the English text, which employs the word 'evidence'": Ways and means of making the evidence of customary international law more readily available: Preparatory work within the purview of article 24 of the Statute of the International Law Commission, Memorandum submitted by the Secretary-General (A/CN.4/6 and Corr.1; United Nations publication, Sales No. 1949.V.6), p. 5.

[36] *Yearbook … 1949*, Report to the General Assembly (document A/925), p. 277, at pp. 283–284, paras. 35–37. See also, more generally, Briggs, *The International Law Commission*, pp. 203–206.

[37] A/CN.4/6 and Corr.1 (see footnote 35 above). The Commission also had before it a working paper prepared by the Secretariat based on the memorandum (Working Paper based on Part III of the preparatory work done by the Secretariat upon ways and means of making the evidence of customary international law more readily available (A/CN.4/6), A/CN.4/W.9; incorporated in *Yearbook … 1949*, 31st meeting, footnote 10).

memorandum comprised three parts: (*a*) a short introduction on "The problem of making the evidence of customary international law more readily available"; (b) an extensive survey of "The existing state of the evidence of customary international law and suggestions hitherto made for its improvement"; and (c) an evaluation of the state of the evidence of customary international law at that time and possible "ways and means" to improve it.[38] Following a debate on the memorandum and the topic more broadly, the Commission invited one of its members, Mr. Manley O. Hudson, to prepare a working paper on the subject for consideration during the Commission's second session.[39]

40. On the basis of Hudson's working paper,[40] the Commission observed in its 1950 report to the General Assembly that "[e]vidence of the practice of States is to be sought in a variety of materials", but considered it impractical to enumerate "all the numerous types of materials which reveal State practice on each of the many problems of international relations".[41] Instead it found it useful to list and survey "[w]ithout any intended exclusion, certain rubrics", or types, of evidence of customary international law: texts of international instruments; decisions of international courts; decisions of national courts; national legislation; diplomatic correspondence; opinions of national legal advisers; and practice of international organizations.[42]

41. As for the availability of such evidence, the Commission suggested that this

> may be considered in three aspects. First, availability for meeting the needs of particular groups of persons [these being private individuals engaged in the exploration of international law, government and international officials]. Second, the extent to which materials already published are available throughout the world. Third, the extent to which materials not yet published may be made available throughout the world.[43]

In this connection, it was noted, *inter alia*, that extensive collections of published materials "are to be found only in great libraries of international law" that "[u]nfortunately … are few and far between"; and that, while

> it is extremely difficult to estimate the present availability of many of the principal collections of evidence of customary international law, which have been published … [i]n many instances, stocks probably do not exist to be drawn upon for meeting present or future demands.[44]

42. Against this background, the Commission then suggested "specific ways and means" for making the evidence of customary international law more readily available. These included: (*a*) distribution, as wide as possible and for a price as low as possible, of publications relating to international law issued by organs of the United Nations, and prompt publication of the texts of international instruments registered with, or filed and recorded by the Secretariat; (*b*) authorization of the Secretariat, insofar as has not yet been done, to prepare and distribute widely various publications containing legal materials from the various States and covering their practice (and that of the United Nations), reporting international arbitral awards and outlining significant developments; (*c*) publication of occasional digests of the reports of the International Court of Justice; (*d*) the General Assembly calling to the attention of Governments the desirability of their publishing digests of their diplomatic correspondence and other materials relating to international law; and (*e*) consideration by the General Assembly to the desirability of an international convention concerning the general exchange of official publications relating to international law and international relations.[45]

43. Most of these recommendations have been acted upon,[46] giving rise to some important documentation frequently consulted by international lawyers. Publication of State practice (and of other evidence of such practice, as may be found in scholarly writings, documents stemming from international organizations, and decisions of international courts and tribunals) has greatly expanded, in part also thanks to "manifestations of zeal" of private national or international institutes.[47] The growing intensity of international relations has also made the practice and positions of States better known; and powerful new means to collect, preserve and disseminate data have mitigated in the digital era many of the difficulties of accessing and collating published information that were foreseen in 1949–1950.[48]

---

[38] The memorandum was said to be "the most complete and usable biographical manual which has appeared in this field … admirably accomplishes its immediate purpose in providing full data and a sound and progressive program[me] for the work of the International Law Commission and the General Assembly": Preuss, "[Review:] Ways and means of making the evidence of customary international law more readily available. Memorandum submitted by the Secretary-General (A/CN.4/6)", p. 835. See also Mersky and Pratter, "A comment on the ways and means of researching customary international law …", p. 308 ("This is an impressive survey of the documentation of international law relevant to custom. There is not room here to go into the details of its content. It is enough to say that this document can still today be fully recommended as a resource for law librarians and other researchers.").

[39] Commission members, with one exception, were very appreciative of the memorandum: see *Yearbook … 1949*, 31st and 32nd meetings, pp. 228–235. The decision by the Commission reads: "It was decided that no Rapporteur should be appointed to deal with the question of ways and means for making customary international law more readily available, but that a member of the Commission should prepare a working paper on that subject to be submitted to the second session of the International Law Commission" (p. 235, para. 54).

[40] *Yearbook … 1950*, vol. II, document A/CN.4/16 and Add.1.

[41] *Ibid.*, document A/1316, p. 368, para. 31.

[42] *Ibid.*, pp. 368–372, paras. 32–78.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 372, para. 80.

[44] *Ibid.*, paras. 82–83.

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 373–374, paras. 90–94.

[46] See also General Assembly resolution 487 (V) of 12 December 1950, inviting the Secretary-General to consider and report upon some of the Commission's recommendations; Liang, "Notes on legal questions concerning the United Nations", pp. 510–514.

[47] The Commission had observed in 1950 that "[r]esults of the fruitful activities of non-official scientific bodies have appeared in the numerous reviews, and recent years have seen the launching of yearbooks or journals of international law in a number of countries. Despite these manifestations of zeal, it seems doubtful that many national or international institutes exist which may be relied upon for the sustained effort involved in the publication of useful compendiums of the evidence of customary international law. Few of them can undertake and continue a long-range programme of solid work; their personnel changes rapidly, their interest is easily deflected, and their funds are seldom adequate": *Yearbook … 1950*, vol. II, document A/1316, p. 373, para. 89. But the position is very different today.

[48] See also Treves, "Customary international law", para. 80 ("Important changes in the availability of manifestations of international practice have been brought about in recent times by electronic means of knowledge now widely available. Such means have made it possible for a very high number of States to make their practice accessible, remedying, at least as far as recent practice is concerned, the lack of balance of printed collections. They have also, admittedly only

44. The work of the Commission has itself made, and continues to make, the evidence of customary international law more readily available. As has been observed,

> [t]oday, the process of codification furnishes an easy and convenient way of discovering the actual practice of States

given that

> [t]he observations of governments on drafts elaborated by the International Law Commission, the discussions in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly, the statements of representatives of States in plenipotentiary codification conferences constitute a sort of public enquiry about the practice of States and about their views as to the rules which are followed or ought to be followed on a certain subject; this is an evidence "free of the ambiguities and inconsistencies characteristic of the patchwork of evidence of State practice".[49]

The regular publication by the United Nations of information supplied by Governments in response to requests by the Commission is important.[50]

45. At the same time, the expanded number of States (and international organizations), the far greater volume of international intercourse, and the multiple formats of evidence now in existence, pose significant challenges to a thorough enquiry into the practice and *opinio juris* of States. The sheer quantity of available material is daunting: even thirty years ago, one author was of the view that "one difficulty now is the embarrassingly rich and varied range of evidences, in these days of digests and national practices, and almost daily spat of resolutions, recommendations, and assertions from some more or less authoritative body or other".[51] Such challenges are compounded by the absence of a common classification system to compare and contrast the practice of States and others.[52]

46. In addition, despite the great mass of materials that is now at hand, coverage of State practice remains limited given that many official documents and other indications of governmental action are still unpublished and thus unavailable.[53] This may sometimes reflect a political choice,[54] but more often derives from the simple fact that publishing State practice systematically "requires considerable resources, and relatively few States have succeeded in sustaining publication of comprehensive material over an extended period".[55]

47. As has been written,

> For a legal system so heavily dependent on customary international law, and thus on State practice as evidence of that law, improvements in ways and means of making that practice more widely available are necessary if the rule of law in international affairs is to prosper. The International Law Commission fully recognized the importance of State practice being widely available, and its report [in 1950] did much to prompt action towards that end. Two developments, however, now threaten the full attainment of the objectives set in 1950 by the Commission: first, the enormous proliferation in the available material on the many aspects of international law and relations, and second the rising costs associated with its accumulation, storage, and distribution.

---

in part, made less acute the unfavourable position of those (government officials or scholars) who do not have access to the relatively few large and well organized libraries where the printed materials can be accessed. Lastly, electronic means have made practice available almost at the time the manifestations concerned come into being, thus eliminating the information gap existing between those States that have at their disposal well organized foreign services and other States, as well as most scholars.").

[49] Jiménez de Aréchaga, "International law in the past third of a century", p. 26 (quoting Baxter, "Treaties and custom", p. 36). See also Preuss, "Ways and means …", p. 835 (suggesting at the time that given the lack of adequate documentation of much State practice, "[t]he development of a veritable *corpus juris gentium* is possible only under the guidance and direction of some such central agency as the International Law Commission, acting with the full cooperation of governments").

[50] See also Briggs, "Official interest in the work of the International Law Commission …", pp. 605 and 612 (referring to a document submitted by the United States of America in response to the Commission's work on the law of treaties when remarking that "[i]t seems unfortunate that the document has not yet been published by the United States or issued as a United Nations document", and adding more generally with respect to replies from Governments to the Commission's requests for information that "[i]t is unfortunate for the professional student of international law that these materials are mostly issued only in impermanent mimeographed form and are of limited availability. These factors underline the pressing need for a *United Nations Juridical Yearbook* in which these and comparable materials might be printed so as to form a readily available and permanent record of contemporary developments in international law"). Comments by Governments on the Commission's draft texts have sometimes been published by individual Governments or privately (for example, "Comments by certain Governments on the provisional articles concerning the régime of the high seas and the draft articles on the régime of the territorial sea adopted by the United Nations International Law Commission at its seventh session in 1955", AJIL, vol. 50 (1956), pp. 992–1049), but this has not been done comprehensively or consistently. The Secretariat has now begun publishing on the website of the Commission, for each topic under consideration, not only comments and observations received on first-reading products of the Commission, but also other responses from Governments received following requests from the Commission during the deliberations on the topic.

[51] Jennings, "The identification of international law", p. 5 (referring in particular to the ascertainment of *opinio juris*). See also Graefrath, "The International Law Commission tomorrow …", p. 606 ("[t]oday, State practice and legal activities have become so extensive and technical, and information is so voluminous and scattered"); Mersky and Pratter, "A comment on the ways and means of researching customary international law …", p. 304 ("[t]he reality is that the recorded evidence of a State practice is scattered throughout a literature as vast as international law itself"); Gaebler and Shea, *Sources of State Practice in International Law*, p. 4 ("comprehensiveness of coverage seems to be an ever more elusive goal").

[52] The exception of the model plan for the classification of documents concerning State practice in the field of public international law, adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in 1968 (Resolution (68) 17 of 28 June 1968) and amended in 1997 (Recommendation No. R (97) 11 of 12 June 1997), bears mention in this context: See Caflisch, "The CAHDI Model Plan for the Classification of Documents Concerning State Practice in the Field of Public International Law".

[53] See also Akehurst, "Custom as a source of international law", p. 13 ("Much of the evidence of State practice is hidden in unpublished archives. Consequently one can never prove a rule of customary law in an absolute manner but only in a relative manner – one can only prove that the majority of the evidence *available* supports the alleged rule.").

[54] See also Treves, "Customary international law", para. 79 ("[r]eluctance to make available manifestations of practice by a number of secretive States, both large and small, and selectivity as to the documents made available, reflect a political choice between the desire to avoid criticism and to make it easier to contradict previous practice, on the one hand, and the desire to exercise leadership and influence the customary process, on the other").

[55] Wood and Sender, "State practice", para. 30. See also Ferrari Bravo, "Méthodes de recherche de la coutume internationale dans la pratique des Etats", p. 310; Sur, "Sources du droit international – La coutume", para. 57. But see Treves, "Customary international law", para. 78 ("It has been observed that the collections of State practice give an unbalanced view, as they concern the practice of the relatively small group of the main powers. While there is some truth in this observation, it must also be stressed that the main powers engage in relations with most other States, so that the practice of almost all States is, at least in part, reflected in these collections. Moreover, in recent times a number of collections and reviews of practice of smaller and third world States have begun to appear.").

With the added impact in recent years of revolutionary developments in global information technology, the subject covered in the Commission's 1950 report might repay renewed attention.[56]

48. For the Commission to consider once more ways and means for making the evidence of customary international law more readily available, after over sixty-five years and taking into account the significant changes that have occurred in this context since 1949–1950, may indeed prove useful; it could well assist those attempting to identify the existence and content of rules of customary international law. Several States speaking at the Sixth Committee in 2015 have already voiced their support for such an undertaking.

49. The Special Rapporteur would welcome the thoughts of members of the Commission on whether, and if so how, the matter should be revisited. In any event, as an initial step, the Special Rapporteur suggests that the Secretariat be requested to provide an account of the evidence currently available by updating the "General survey of compilations and digests of evidence of customary international law" that formed part of its 1949 memorandum, including, if appropriate, its recommendations.[57]

[56] Watts, *The International Law Commission 1949–1998*, p. 2106. Briggs, too, has suggested that "[a]s the French version of Article 24 indicates, the International Law Commission is not limited to making a single report in this field": Briggs, *The International Law Commission*, p. 206.

[57] It probably remains true, that, as in 1950 "[t]he part of the Commission must … inevitably be limited to direction. The actual work [of making the evidence of customary international law more readily available] must be carried out by Governments, the Secretariat and individuals, either independently or in combination. And, without the co-operation of Governments, at least to the extent of opening their archives, relatively little can be achieved": Parry, "[Review:] Ways and means of making the evidence of customary international law more readily available …", p. 463.

Chapter IV

Future programme of work

50. It is proposed that the Commission's final outcome on the present topic could consist of three components: a set of conclusions, with commentaries; a further review of ways and means for making the evidence of customary international law more readily available; and a bibliography.

51. If the Commission is able to complete the first reading of the draft conclusions, with commentaries, at its sixty-eighth session in 2016, a second reading could take place in 2018. Following the sixty-eighth session, States (and others, including international organizations) would have adequate time to consider and comment on the draft adopted on first reading. States and international organizations should be invited to send to the Commission written comments on the draft conclusions and commentaries by 31 January 2018, at the latest. It is hoped that States will also offer initial observations during the Sixth Committee debate in 2016.

52. The question of ways and means for making the evidence of customary international law more readily available could continue to be considered in the period between the end of the Commission's sixty-eighth session and its session in 2018, with a view to refining the output on this matter. This could be done in the light of a Secretariat memorandum as proposed at paragraph 49 above, as well as suggestions from States, interested international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and academic institutions.

53. The Special Rapporteur is preparing a draft bibliography on the topic, which will initially be circulated to Commission members informally at the sixty-eighth session. It is proposed that, amended in the light of any suggestions that members may make, the draft bibliography will be circulated as an annex to the present report. It will then be revised by 2018 to ensure that it is up-to-date, representative, and user-friendly. This will be done in the light of suggestions from members of the Commission, States, international organizations, and academic and other institutions.

ANNEX I

Proposed amendments to the draft conclusions

Words suggested for deletion are struck through; suggested additions are in bold.

Draft conclusion 3. Assessment of evidence for the two elements

[…]

2. Each **of the two** element**s** is to be separately ascertained. This requires an assessment of evidence for each element.

Draft conclusion 4. Requirement of practice

1. The requirement, as a constituent element of customary international law, of a general practice **refers** ~~means that it is~~ primarily **to** the practice of States **as expressive, or creative,** ~~that contributes to the formation, or expression,~~ of rules of customary international law.

2. In certain cases, the practice of international organizations also contributes to the ~~formation, or~~ expression, **or creation**, of rules of customary international law.

3. Conduct of other actors is not practice that contributes to the ~~formation, or~~ expression, **or creation**, of rules of customary international law, but may be relevant when assessing the practice referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2.

Draft conclusion 6. Forms of practice

[…]

2. Forms of State practice include, but are not limited to: diplomatic acts and correspondence; ~~conduct in connection with resolutions adopted by an international organization or at an intergovernmental conference~~; conduct in connection with treaties; executive conduct, including operational conduct "on the ground"; legislative and administrative acts; and decisions of national courts.

~~[…]~~

Draft conclusion 9. Requirement of acceptance as law (opinio juris)

1. The requirement, as a constituent element of customary international law, that the general practice be accepted as law (*opinio juris*) means that the practice in question must be ~~undertaken with~~ **accompanied by** a sense of legal right or obligation.

~~[…]~~

Draft conclusion 12. Resolutions of international organizations and intergovernmental conferences

1. A resolution adopted by an international organization or at an intergovernmental conference ~~cannot~~ **does not**, of itself, create a rule of customary international law.

2. A resolution adopted by an international organization or at an intergovernmental conference may provide evidence for ~~establishing~~ **determining** the existence and content of a rule of customary international law~~, or contribute to its development~~.

Annex II

Identification of customary international law: bibliography

The subject of identification of customary international law is one on which a great deal has been written, and the present bibliography does not seek to be exhaustive.

Part A lists writings dealing with identification of customary international law in general, including textbooks. Part B contains studies on particular aspects of the identification of customary international law, which correspond in part to issues dealt with by some of the draft conclusions on the identification of customary international law. Part C is dedicated to studies relevant to the identification of customary international law in different fields.

A. General studies on customary international law

1. Documents

International Law Association, London Statement of Principles Applicable to the Formation of General Customary International Law, with commentary, resolution 16/2000 on formation of general customary international law, adopted at the Sixty-ninth Conference of the International Law Association, in London, on 29 July 2000.

International Law Commission, Article 24 of the Statute of the International Law Commission, Working Paper by Manley O. Hudson, Special Rapporteur, *Yearbook … 1950*, vol. II, document A/CN.4/16.

———, Formation and evidence of customary international law: Elements in the previous work of the International Law Commission that could be particularly relevant to the topic, Memorandum by the Secretariat, *Yearbook … 2013*, vol. II (Part One), document A/CN.4/659.

———, First report on formation and evidence of customary international law, by Sir Michael Wood, Special Rapporteur, *ibid.*, document A/CN.4/663.

———, Second report on identification of customary international law, by Sir Michael Wood, Special Rapporteur, *Yearbook … 2014*, vol. II (Part One), document A/CN.4/672.

———, Third report on identification of customary international law by Michael Wood, Special Rapporteur, *Yearbook … 2015*, vol. II (Part One), document A/CN.4/682.

———, Fourth report on identification of customary international law, by Sir Michael Wood, Special Rapporteur, document A/CN.4/695 reproduced in the present volume.

———, The role of decisions of national courts in the case-law of international courts and tribunals of a universal character for the purpose of the determination of customary international law, Memorandum by the Secretariat, document A/CN.4/691 reproduced in the present volume.

2. Books

Bederman, D. J., *Custom as a Source of Law*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Bradley, C. A., ed., *Custom's Future: International Law in a Changing World*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Byers, M., *Custom, Power and the Power of Rules: International Relations and Customary International Law*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Chigara, B., *Legitimacy Deficit in Custom: A Deconstructionist Critique*. Aldershot/Burlington, Ashgate Dartmouth, 2001.

D'Amato, A. A., *The Concept of Custom in International Law.* London/Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1971.

Danilenko, G. M., *Обычай в современном международном праве* [*Obychay v sovremennom mezhdunarodnom prave*]. Moscow, Nauka, 1988.

Deumier, P., *Le droit spontané*. Paris, Economica, 2002.

Elias, O. A., and C. L. Lim, *The Paradox of Consensualism in International Law*. The Hague, Kluwer Law International, 1998.

Lepard, B., *Customary International Law: A New Theory with Practical Applications*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010.

———, ed., *Reexamining Customary International Law*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Lijnzaad, L., and Council of Europe, eds., *The Judge and International Custom*. Leiden, Brill/Nijhoff, 2016.

Mateesco, N., *La coutume dans les cycles juridiques internationaux*. Paris, Pedone, 1947.

Mendelson, M. H., "The formation of customary international law", *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law*, 1998, vol. 272, pp. 155–410.

Peñaranda, A., *La costumbre en el derecho internacional*. Madrid, Editorial de la Universidad Complutense, 1988.

Simma, B., *Das Reziprozitätselement in der Entstehung des Völkergewohnheitsrechts*. Munich, Fink Verlag, 1970.

Sur, S., *La coutume internationale* (excerpt from *Juris-Classeur Droit international*). Paris, Librairies techniques, 1990.

Suy, E., *La coutume comme fait de production juridique*, Paris, LGDJ, 1965.

Thirlway, H. W. A., *International Customary Law and Codification: An Examination of the Continuing Role of Custom in the Present Period of Codification of International Law*. Leiden, Sijthoff, 1972.

Unger, R. F., *Völkergewohnheitsrecht—objektives Recht oder Geflecht bilateraler Beziehungen*. Munich, Tuduv Verlagsgesellschaft, 1978.

Villiger, M. E., *Customary International Law and Treaties: A Manual on the Theory and Practice of the Interrelation of Sources*, 2nd ed. The Hague, Kluwer Law International, 1997.

Wolfke, K., *Custom in Present International Law*, 2nd rev. ed. Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1993.

3. Sections in Textbooks

Arangio-Ruiz, G., "Consuetudine (consuetudine internazionale)", *in* P. Spirito, ed., *Enciclopedia Giuridica*, Rome, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana Roma, 1988, pp. 1–2.

Boas, G., *Public International Law: Contemporary Principles and Perspectives*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2012, pp. 73–105.

Chen, L.-C., *An Introduction to Contemporary International Law: A Policy-Oriented Perspective*, 3rd ed. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015, pp. 426–430.

Clapham, A., *Brierly's Law of Nations: An Introduction to the Role of International Law in International Relations*, 7th ed. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 57–63.

Corten, O., *Méthodologie du droit international public*. Brussels, Université de Bruxelles, 2009, pp. 149–178.

Crawford, J., *Brownlie's Principles of Public International Law*, 8th ed. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 23–34.

———, "Chance, order, change: The course of international law", *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law*, vol. 365 (2013), pp. 48–69.

Daillier, P., M. Forteau and A. Pellet, *Droit international public (Nguyen Quoc Dinh)*, 8th ed. Paris, LGDJ, 2009, pp. 353–379.

Danilenko, G. M., *Law-Making in the International Community*. Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1993, pp. 75–129.

Degan, V. D., *Sources of International Law*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1997, pp. 142–252.

Diez de Velasco Vallejo, M. (C. Escobar Hernández, ed.), *Instituciones de derecho internacional público*, 18th ed. Madrid, Tecnos, 2012, pp. 136–149.

Dugard, J., *International Law: A South African Perspective*, 4th ed. Cape Town, Juta, 2011, pp. 26–34.

Jennings, R., and A. Watts, eds., *Oppenheim's International Law*, vol. I, *Peace*, 9th ed. Harlow, Longmans, 1991, pp. 25–31.

Klabbers, J., *International Law*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 26–34.

Koskenniemi, M., *From Apology to Utopia: The Structure of International Legal Argument*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 388–473.

Lowe, V., *International Law*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 36–63.

Lukashuk, I. I., *Международное право*, vol. 1, 3rd ed. Moscow, Wolters Kluwer Russia, 2008, pp. 105–113.

Menzhinskiy V. I., and G. M. Danilenko, "Процесс образования и действия международного обычного права", *in* N. A. Ushakov, ed., *Международное право и международный правопорядок*, Moscow, Institute of State and Law, 1981, pp. 53–54.

Monroy Cabra, M. G., *Derecho Internacional Público*, 4th ed. Santa Fe de Bogotá, Temis, 1998, pp. 73–76.

Mulamba Mbuyi, B., "La coutume internationale", in *Introduction à l'étude des sources modernes du droit international public*. Québec, Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1999, pp. 25–49.

Murase, S., *International Lawmaking: Sources of International Law*, Tokyo, Toshindo, 2002 (in Japanese), translated by Yihe Qin, Chinese People's Public Safety University Press, 2012 (in Chinese).

Murphy, S. D., *Principles of International Law*, 2nd ed. Saint Paul, Minnesota, West, 2012, pp. 92–101.

Parry, C., *The Sources and Evidences of International Law*. Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1965, pp. 56–82.

Pastor, J., *Curso de Derecho Internacional Público y Organizaciones Internacionales*. Madrid, Tecnos, 2003, pp. 69–82.

Pellet, A., "Article 38", *in* A. Zimmermann *et al*., eds., *The Statute of the International Court of Justice: A Commentary*, 2nd ed., Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 748–764.

Remiro Brotóns, A., *et al*., *Derecho Internacional*. Valencia, Tirant Lo Blanch, 2010, pp. 205–236.

Shaw, M. N., *International Law*, 7th ed. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2014, pp. 51–69.

Thirlway, H., *The Sources of International Law*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 53–91.

———, "The sources of international law", *in* M. Evans, ed., *International Law*, 4th ed., Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 97–103.

Tunkin, G. I., “Особенности создания обычных норм международного права”, *in* V. N. Kudryavtsev *et al.*, *Курс международного права*, Moscow, Nauka, 1989, vol. I, pp. 189–197.

——— (L. N. Shestakov, ed., W. E. Butler, ed., trans.), *Theory of International Law*. London, Wildy, Simmonds and Hill, 2003, pp. 121–159.

van Hoof, G. J. H., *Rethinking the Sources of International Law*. Antwerp, Kluwer Law International, 1983, pp. 85–116.

4. Articles and book chapters

Abi-Saab, G., “La coutume dans tous ses états ou le dilemme du développement du droit international général dans un monde éclaté”, in *International Law at the Time of its Codification: Essays in Honour of Roberto Ago*, vol. I, Milan, Giuffrè, 1987, pp. 53−65.

Akehurst, M., “Custom as a source of international law”, BYBIL *1974–1975*, vol. 47 (1977), pp. 1−53.

Baker, R. B., “Customary international law in the 21st century: Old challenges and new debates”, EJIL, vol. 21 (2010), pp. 173–204.

Barberis, J. A, “Es la costumbre una fuente de derecho internacional?”, *Anuario Argentino de Derecho Internacional*, vol. 3 (1987–1989), pp. 11–22.

———, “Réflexions sur la coutume internationale”, AFDI, vol. 36 (1990), pp. 9−46.

———, “La coutume est-elle une source de droit international?”, in *Le droit international au service de la paix, de la justice et du développement: mélanges Michel Virally*, Paris, Pedone, 1991, pp. 43–52.

Barboza, J., “The customary rule: From chrysalis to butterfly”, *in* C.A. Armas Barea *et al.*, eds., Liber Amicorum ‘In Memoriam*’ of Judge José María Ruda*, The Hague, Kluwer Law International, 2000, pp. 1–14.

Bernhardt, R., “Ungeschriebenes Völkerrecht”, *Heidelberg Journal of International Law*, vol. 36 (1976), pp. 50–76.

———, “Customary international law: New and old problems”, *Thesaurus Acroasium: Sources of International Law*, vol. 19 (1992), pp. 199–221.

Bleckmann, A., “Zur Feststellung und Auslegung von Völkergewohnheitsrecht”, *Heidelberg Journal of International Law*, vol. 37 (1977), pp. 504–529.

Blutman, L., “Conceptual confusion and methodological deficiencies: Some ways that theories on customary international law fail”, EJIL, vol. 25 (2014) 529–552.

Bodansky, D., “Prologue to a theory of non-treaty norms”, *in* M. H. Arsanjani *et al.*, eds., *Looking to the Future: Essays on International Law in Honor of W. Michael Reisman*, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2011, pp. 119–134.

Bokor-Szegö, H., “Le rôle du droit coutumier dans le droit international contemporain”, *Acta Juridica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, vol. 15 (1973), pp. 299–318.

Bos, M., “The identification of custom in international law”, GYBIL, vol. 25 (1982), pp. 9–53.

Bühler, T., “La coutume en droit international”, in *Transactions of the Jean Bodin Society for Comparative Institutional History*, vol. LIV: *Custom*, Brussels, De Boeck-Wesmael, 1989, pp. 13–42.

Byers, M., “Custom, power, and the power of rules: Customary international law from an interdisciplinary perspective”, *Michigan Journal of International Law*, vol. 17 (1995), pp. 109–180.

———, “Power, obligation, and customary international law”, *Duke Journal of Comparative & International Law*, vol. 11 (2001), pp. 81–88.

Cançado Trindade. A. A., “Some thoughts on contemporary international law-making and customary international law”, *in* J. Pérez de Cuéllar *et al.*, *Desarrollo Progresivo del Derecho Internacional: Aportaciones de organizaciones, tribunales y parlamentos internacionales*, Buenos Aires, Consejo de Estudios Internacionales Avanzados, 1991, pp. 219–230.

Charpentier, J., “Tendances de l’élaboration du droit international public coutumier”, *in* Société française pour le droit international, *Colloque de Toulouse: l’élaboration du droit international public*, Paris, Pedone, 1975, pp. 105–131.

Charlesworth, H., “The unbearable lightness of customary international law”, *ASIL Proceedings*, vol. 92 (1998), pp. 44–47.

Charney, J. I., “Universal international law”, AJIL, vol. 87 (1993), pp. 529–551.

Charney, J., “Remarks on the contemporary role of customary international law”, *in* W. P. Heere, ed., *Contemporary International Law Issues: Conflicts and Convergence—Proceedings of the Third Joint Conference in The Hague, the Netherlands, July 13–15, 1995*. American Society of International Law and Netherlands Society of International Law, The Hague, TMC Asser Instituut, 1996, pp. 20–24.

Chaumont, C., “Méthode d’analyse du droit international”, *Belgian Review of International Law*, vol. 11 (1975), pp. 32–37.

Cheng, B., “Custom: The future of general State practice in a divided world”, *in* R. St.J. Macdonald and D. M. Johnston, eds., *The Structure and Process of International Law: Essays in Legal Philosophy Doctrine and Theory*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1983, pp. 513–554.

———, "Some remarks on the constituent element(s) of general (or so-called customary) international law", *in* A. Anghie and G. Sturgess, eds., *Legal Visions of the 21st Century: Essays in Honour of Judge Christopher Weeramantry*, The Hague, Kluwer Law International, 1998, pp. 377–390.

Chodosh, H. E., "Neither treaty nor custom: The emergence of declarative international law", *Texas International Law Journal*, vol. 26 (1991), pp. 87–124.

Chung, J. J., "Customary international law as explained by status instead of contract", *North Carolina Journal of International Law and Commercial Regulation*, vol. 37 (2012), pp. 609–664.

Condorelli, L., "Consuetudine internazionale", *Digesto delle discipline pubblicistiche*, vol. 4, Turin, UTET, 1989, pp. 1–48.

———, "La coutume", *in* M. Bedjaoui, ed., *Droit international: bilan et perspectives*, Paris, Pedone. 1991, pp. 187–221.

Crawford, J. R., "The identification and development of customary international law", keynote speech, Spring Conference of the International Law Association, British Branch, 23 May 2014.

Crootof, R., "Constitutional convergence and customary international law", *Harvard International Law Journal Online*, vol. 54 (2013), pp. 195–203.

D'Amato, A. A., "Wanted: A comprehensive theory of custom in international law", *Texas International Law Forum*, vol. 4 (1968), pp. 28–41.

———, "Trashing customary international law", AJIL, vol. 81 (1987), pp. 101–105.

———, "Customary international law: a reformulation", *International Legal Theory*, vol. 4 (1998), pp. 1–6.

Danilenko, G. M., "The theory of international customary law", GYBIL, vol. 31 (1988), pp. 9–47.

Degan, V.-D., "Customary process in international law", *Finnish Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 1 (1990), pp. 1–76.

Dodge, W. S., "Customary international law and the question of legitimacy", *Harvard Law Review Forum*, vol. 120 (2007), pp. 19–27.

Dunbar, N. C. H., "The myth of customary international law", *Australian Year Book of International Law*, vol. 8 (1978–1980), pp. 1–19.

Dupuy, R.-J., "Coutume sage et coutume sauvage", in *La communauté internationale: Mélanges offerts à Charles Rousseau*, Paris, Pedone, 1974, pp. 75–87.

———, "Droit déclaratoire et droit programmatoire: de la coutume sauvage à la 'soft law' ", *in* Société française pour le droit international, *Colloque de Toulouse: l'élaboration du droit international public*, Paris, Pedone, 1975, pp. 132–148.

Elias, O., and C. Lim, "Some tentative epistemological claims concerning the basis of customary international law", *Cambrian Law Review*, vol. 25 (1994), pp. 103–125.

Estreicher, S., "Rethinking the binding effect of customary international law", *Virginia Journal of International Law*, vol. 44 (2003), pp. 5–17.

Fidler, D. P., "Challenging the classical concept of custom: Perspectives on the future of customary international law", GYBIL, vol. 39 (1996), pp. 199–248.

Fon, V., and F. Parisi, "International customary law and articulation theories: an economic analysis", *International Law and Management Review*, vol. 2 (2006), pp. 201–232.

Goldsmith, J. L., and E. A. Posner, "Notes toward a theory of customary international law", *ASIL Proceedings*, vol. 92 (1998), pp. 53–57.

———, "A theory of customary international law", *University of Chicago Law Review*, vol. 66 (1999), pp. 1113–1177.

———, "Understanding the resemblance between modern and traditional customary international law", *Virginia Journal of International Law*, vol. 40 (2000), pp. 639–672.

———, "Further thoughts on customary international law", *Michigan Journal of International Law*, vol. 23 (2001), pp. 191–200.

Golove, D. M., "Leaving customary international law where it is: Goldsmith and Posner's The Limits of International Law", *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law*, vol. 34 (2006), pp. 333–377.

Gradoni, L., "Consuetudine internazionale e caso inconsueto", *Rivista di diritto internazionale*, vol. 95 (2012), pp. 704–720.

———, "La Commissione del diritto internazionale riflette sulla rilevazione della consuetudine", *Rivista di diritto internazionale*, vol. 97 (2014), pp. 667–698.

Guggenheim, P., "Les deux éléments de la coutume en droit international", in *La technique et les principes du droit public: études en l'honneur de Georges Scelle*, vol. 1, Paris, LGDJ, 1950, pp. 275–284.

Guzman, A. T., "Saving customary international law", *Michigan Journal of International Law*, vol. 27 (2005), pp. 115–176.

———, and T. L. Meyer, "Customary international law in the 21st century", *in* R. Miller and R. M. Bratspies, eds., *Progress in International Law*, Leiden, Brill, 2008, pp. 197–217.

———, and J. Hsiang, "Some ways that theories on customary international law fail: A reply to László Blutman", EJIL, vol. 25 (2014), pp. 553–559.

Guzmán Brito, A., "El Fundamento de Validez de la Costumbre como Fuente de Derecho", *Revista Chilena de Derecho*, vol. 22 (1995), pp. 623–628.

Heathcote, S., "Est-ce que l'état de nécessité est un principe de droit international coutumier ?", *Revue belge de droit international*, vol. 40 (2007), pp. 53–89.

Hwang, J., "A sense and sensibility of legal obligation: customary international law and game theory", *Temple International and Comparative Law Journal*, vol. 20 (2006), pp. 111–131.

Jiménez de Aréchaga, E., "Custom", *in* A. Cassese and J. H. H. Weiler, eds., *Change and Stability in International Law-Making*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1988, pp. 1–4.

Kammerhofer, J., "Uncertainty in the formal sources of international law: Customary international law and some of its problems", EJIL, vol. 15 (2004), pp. 523–553.

Kelsen, H., "Théorie du droit international coutumier", *Revue internationale de la théorie du droit*, vol. 1 (1939), pp. 253–274.

Kelly, J. P., "The twilight of customary international law", *Virginia Journal of International Law*, vol. 40 (2000), pp. 449–543.

Kirgis, F. L., "Custom on a sliding scale", AJIL, vol. 81 (1987), pp. 146–151.

Klabbers, J., "The curious condition of custom", *International Legal Theory*, vol. 8 (2002), pp. 29–39.

Kolb, R., "Selected problems in the theory of customary international law", *Netherlands International Law Review*, vol. 50 (2003), pp. 119–150.

———, "La *clausula rebus sic stantibus* s'applique-t-elle aussi au droit international coutumier?", RGDIP, vol. 115 (2011), pp. 711–718.

———, "Nullité, inapplicabilité ou inexistence d'une norme coutumière contraire au jus cogens universel?", RGDIP, vol. 117 (2013), pp. 281–298.

———, "Réflexions sur le droit international coutumier: des pratiques et des opiniones juris légitimes plutôt que simplement effectives?", in *Liber Amicorum en l'honneur de Serge Sur*, Paris, Pedone, 2014, pp. 93–108.

Kontorovich, E., "Inefficient customs in international law", *William and Mary Law Review*, vol. 48 (2006), pp. 859–922.

Kopelmanas, L., "Custom as a means of the creation of international law", BYBIL *1937*, vol. 18 (1937), pp. 127–151.

Koskenniemi, M., "The normative force of habit: International custom and social theory", *Finnish Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 1 (1990), pp. 77–153.

Kunz, J. L., "The nature of customary international law", AJIL, vol. 47 (1953), pp. 662–669.

Lazarev, M. I., "International legal custom at a contemporary stage", *Indian Journal of International Law*, vol. 19 (1979), pp. 511–514.

Lobo de Souza, I. M., "The role of State consent in the customary process", *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 44 (1995), pp. 521–539.

Lukashuk, I. I., "Customary norms in contemporary international law", *in* J. Makarczyk, ed., *Theory of International Law at the Threshold of the 21st Century: Essays in Honour of Krzysztof Skubiszewski*, The Hague, Kluwer Law International, 1996, pp. 487–508.

Malenovský, J., "Evolution des opinions doctrinales sur la coutume internationale dans les pays socialistes", *Revue belge de droit international*, vol. 22 (1989), pp. 307–338.

———, "Evolution of opinions on international custom in Czechoslovak theory of international law", *Nordic Journal of International Law*, vol. 59 (1990), pp. 235–246.

———, "Le juge et la coutume internationale: perspective de l'Union européenne et de la Cour de justice", *Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals*, vol. 12 (2013), pp. 217–241.

———, "The judge and international custom: perspective of the European Union and its Court of Justice/Le juge et la coutume internationale : perspective de l'Union européenne et de la Cour de justice", *in* L. Lijnzaad and Council of Europe, eds., *The Judge and International Custom*, Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2016, pp. 46–72.

Maluwa, T., "Custom, authority and law: some jurisprudential perspectives on the theory of customary international law", *African Journal of International and Comparative Law*, vol. 6 (1994), pp. 387–410.

McGinnis, J. O., "The comparative disadvantage of customary international law", *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy*, vol. 30 (2006), pp. 7–14.

Mejía-Lemos, D. G., "Some considerations regarding 'instant' international customary law", fifty years later", *Indian Journal of International Law*, vol. 55 (2015), pp. 85–108.

Meijers, H., "How is international law made?—The stages of growth of international law and the use of its customary rules", *Netherlands Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 9 (1978), pp. 3–26.

———, "On international customary law in the Netherlands", *in* I. F. Dekker and H. H. G. Post, eds., *On the Foundations and Sources of International Law*, The Hague, T.M.C. Asser Press, 2003, pp. 77–128.

Meyer, T., "Codifying custom", *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, vol. 160 (2012), pp. 995–1069.

Milisavljević, B., and B. Čučković, "Identification of custom in international law", *Annals of the Faculty of Law in Belgrade*, vol. 62 (2014), pp. 31–51.

Moca, G., "La notion et l'importance de la coutume internationale dans le processus d'instauration de nouvelles relations entre les Etats", *Revue roumaine d'études internationales*, vol. 9 (1975), pp. 237–246.

Mohamad, R., "Some reflections on the International Law Commission topic 'Identification of customary international law' ", *Chinese Journal of International Law*, vol. 15 (2016), pp. 41–46.

Müller, T., "Customary transnational law: attacking the last resort of State sovereignty—Conference on Democracy and the Transnational Private Sector", *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, vol. 15 (2008), pp. 19–47.

Müllerson, R., "On the nature and scope of customary international law", *Austrian Review of International and European Law*, vol. 2 (1997), pp. 341–360.

———, "The interplay of objective and subjective elements in customary law", *in* K. Wellens, ed., *International Law: Theory and Practice—Essays in Honour of Eric Suy*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1998, pp. 161–178.

Norman, G., and J. P. Trachtman, "The customary international law game", AJIL, vol. 99 (2005), pp. 541–580.

Oeter, S., "The legitimacy of customary international law", *in* T. Eger, S. Oeter and S. Voigt, eds., *Economic Analysis of International Law: Contributions to the XIIIth Travemünde Symposium on the Economic Analysis of Law (March 29–31, 2012)*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2014, pp. 1–22.

Orakhelashvili, A., "Customary law and inherent rules", *in* A. Orakhelashvili, *The Interpretation of Acts and Rules in Public International Law*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 70–101.

Orrego Vicuña, F., "Customary international law in a global community: tailor made?", *Estudios Internacionales*, vol. 148 (2005), pp. 21–38.

Park, P.-K., "Change of customary international law", *Korean Journal of International Law*, vol. 43 (1998), pp. 97–111 (in Korean).

Paulus, A., "The judge and international custom", *Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals*, vol. 12 (2013), pp. 253–265.

Pearce, J., "Customary international law: not merely fiction or myth", *Australian International Law Journal*, vol. 125 (2003), pp. 125–140.

Petersen, N., "Customary law without custom? Rules, principles, and the role of State practice in international norm creation", *American University International Law Review*, vol. 23 (2008), pp. 275–310.

———, "Der Wandel des ungeschriebenen Völkerrechts im Zuge der Konstitutionalisierung", *Archiv des Völkerrechts*, vol. 46 (2008), pp. 502–523.

Posner, E. A., and A. O. Sykes, "Customary international law", *in* L. Bernstein and F. Parisi, eds., *Customary Law and Economics*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2014, pp. 451–464.

Postema, G. J., "Custom in international law: a normative practice account", *in* A. Perreau-Saussine and J. B. Murphy, eds., *The Nature of Customary Law: Legal, Historical and Philosophical Perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 279–306.

———, "Custom, normative practice, and the law", *Duke Law Journal*, vol. 62 (2012), pp. 707–738.

Rama Rao, T. S., "International custom", *Indian Journal of International Law*, vol. 19 (1979), pp. 515–521.

Reisman, W. M. "The cult of custom in the late 20th century", *California Western International Law Journal*, vol. 17 (1987), pp. 133–145.

Roberts, A. E., "Traditional and modern approaches to customary international law: a reconciliation", AJIL, vol. 95 (2001), pp. 757–791.

Roberts, A., "Who killed Article 38 (1) (*b*)? A reply to Bradley and Gulati", *Duke Journal of Comparative and International Law*, vol. 21 (2010), pp. 173–190.

Schachter, O., "New custom: power, *opinio juris* and contrary practice", *in* J. Makarczyk, ed., *Theory of International Law at the Threshold of the 21st Century: Essays in Honour of Krzysztof Skubiszewski*, The Hague, Kluwer Law International, 1996, pp. 531–540.

Schauer, F., "The jurisprudence of custom", *Texas International Law Journal*, vol. 48 (2013), pp. 523–534.

Schweisfurth, T., "Das Völkergewohnheitsrecht—verstärkt im Blickfeld der sowjetischen Völkerrechtslehre", GYBIL, vol. 30 (1987), pp. 36–77.

Séfériadès, S., "Aperçus sur la coutume juridique internationale et notamment sur son fondement", RGDIP, vol. 43 (1936), pp. 129–196.

Seibert-Fohr, A., "Modern concepts of customary international law as a manifestation of a value-based international order", *in* A. Zimmermann and R. Hofmann, eds., *Unity and Diversity in International Law*, Berlin, Duncker & Humblot, 2006, pp. 257–283.

Sender, O., and M. Wood, "The emergence of customary international law: between theory and practice", *in* Y. Radi and C. Brölmann, eds., *Research Handbook on the Theory and Practice of International Law-Making*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2016, pp. 133–159.

Sobrino Heredia, J., and M. Abad Castelos, "Reflexiones sobre la formación del derecho internacional en un escenario mudable", *Anuario Español de Derecho Internacional*, vol. 17 (2001), pp. 195–238.

Stern, B., "Custom at the heart of international law", *Duke Journal of Comparative and International Law*, vol. 11 (2001), pp. 89–108.

Sur, S., "La coutume internationale: sa vie, son œuvre", *Droits: Revue française de théorie juridique*, No. 3 (1986), pp. 111–124.

———, "Sources du droit international: la coutume", *Juris-Classeur Droit international*, Fascicule No. 13 (1989).

Swaine, E. T., "Rational custom", *Duke Law Journal*, vol. 52 (2002), pp. 559–627.

Szurek, S., "L'étude sur le droit international coutumier: 'les voies d'une normativité en action' ", *in* J.-F. Akandji-Kombé, ed., *L'homme dans la société internationale: mélanges en hommage au Professeur Paul Tavernier*, Brussels, Bruylant, 2013, pp. 1447–1464.

Tasioulas, J., "Customary international law and the quest for global justice", *in* A. Perreau-Saussine and J. B. Murphy, eds., *The Nature of Customary Law: Legal, Historical and Philosophical Perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 307–335.

Tesón, F. R., "Falsa costumbre", *Revista Latinoamericana de Derecho Internacional*, vol. 3 (2015), pp. 1–20.

Thévenaz, H., "À propos de la coutume", *in* S. Engel and R. A. Métall, eds., *Law, State and International Legal Order—Essays in Honor of Hans Kelsen*, Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1964, pp. 317–327.

Treves, T., "Customary international law", *in* R. Wolfrum, ed., *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, vol. II, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012. Available from https://opil.ouplaw.com /home/mpil.

Tunkin, G. I., "Remarks on the juridical nature of customary norms of international law", *California Law Review*, vol. 46 (1961), pp. 419–430.

———, "Is general international law customary law only?", EJIL, vol. 4 (1993), pp. 534–541.

Vagts, D. F., "International relations look at customary international law: a traditionalist's defence", EJIL, vol. 15 (2004), pp. 1031–1040.

Venkata Raman, K., "Toward a general theory of international customary law", *in* W. M. Reisman and B. H. Weston, eds., *Toward World Order and Human Dignity: Essays in Honor of Myres S. McDougal*, New York, Free Press, 1976, pp. 365–402.

Vio Grossi, E., "Customary international law in the case law of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights"/"Le droit international coutumier dans la jurisprudence de la Cour interaméricaine des droits humains", *in* L. Lijnzaad and Council of Europe, eds., *The Judge and International Custom*, Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2016, pp. 83–99.

Verdier, P.-H., and E. Voeten, "Precedent, compliance, and change in customary international law: an explanatory theory", AJIL, vol. 108 (2014), pp. 389–434.

Verdross, A., "Entstehungsweisen und Geltungsgrund des universellen völkerrechtlichen Gewohnheitsrechts", *Heidelberg Journal of International Law*, vol. 29 (1969), pp. 635–653.

Voyiakis, E., "Customary international law and the place of normative considerations", *American Journal of Jurisprudence*, vol. 55 (2010), pp. 163–200.

———, "A disaggregative view of customary international law-making", *Leiden Journal of International Law*, vol. 29 (2016), pp. 365–388.

Vylegzhanin, A. N., and R. A. Kalamkarian, "Международный обычай как основной источник международного права", *Государство и право*, vol. 6 (2012), pp. 78–89.

Walden, R. M., "Customary international law: a jurisprudential analysis", *Israel Law Review*, vol. 13 (1978), pp. 86–102.

Weil, P., "Towards relative normativity in international law?" AJIL, vol. 77 (1983), pp. 413–442.

Wolfke, K., "Some persistent controversies regarding customary international law", *Netherlands Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 24 (1993), pp. 1–16.

Wolfrum, R., "Sources of international law", in *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012. Available from https://opil.ouplaw.com/home/mpil.

Wood, M., "The present position within the ILC on the topic 'Identification of customary international law': in partial response to Sienho Yee, Report on the ILC Project on 'Identification of Customary International Law' ", *Chinese Journal of International Law*, vol. 15 (2016), pp. 3–15.

Worster, W. T., "The transformation of quantity into quality: critical mass in the formation of customary international law", *Boston University International Law Journal*, vol. 31 (2013), pp. 1–73.

———, "The inductive and deductive methods in customary international law analysis: traditional and modern approaches", *Georgetown Journal of International Law*, vol. 45 (2014), pp. 445–521.

Yee, S., "Report on the ILC project on 'Identification of Customary International Law'", *Chinese Journal of International Law*, vol. 14 (2015), pp. 375–398.

———, "A reply to Sir Michael Wood's response to AALCOIEG's work and my report on the ILC project on identification of customary international law", *Chinese Journal of International Law*, vol. 15 (2016), pp. 33–40.

5. Audiovisual lectures

Mendelson, M., "Customary international law", United Nations Audiovisual Library of International Law. Available from https://legal.un.org/avl/.

B. Studies on particular aspects of customary international law

1. State practice

Bleckmann, A., "Die Praxis des Völkergewohnheitsrechts als konsekutive Rechtsetzung", *in* R. Bernhardt *et al.*, eds., *Völkerrecht als Rechtsordnung: Internationale Gerichtsbarkeit. Menschenrechte. Festschrift für Hermann Mosler*, Berlin, Springer, 1983, pp. 89–110.

Boisson de Chazournes, L., "Qu'est-ce que la pratique en droit international?", in *La pratique et le droit international: Colloque de Genève*, Paris, Pedone, 2004, pp. 13–47.

Brownlie, I., "Some problems in the evaluation of the practice of States as an element of custom", in *Studi di diritto internazionale in onore di Gaetano Arangio Ruiz*, vol. I, Naples, Editoriale Scientifica, 2004, pp. 313–318.

Carty, A., "Doctrine versus State practice", *in* B. Fassbender, A. Peters, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the History of International Law*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 972–996.

Ferrari Bravo, L., "Méthodes de recherche de la coutume internationale dans la pratique des États", *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law, 1985-III*, vol. 192, pp. 233–330.

Gaebler, R. F., and A. A. Shea, *Sources of State Practice in International Law*, 2nd ed., Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2014.

Mendelson, M., "State acts and omissions as explicit or implicit claims", in *Le droit international au service de la paix, de la justice et du développement : Mélanges Michel Virally*, Paris, Pedone, 1991, pp. 373–382.

Parry, C., "The practice of States", *Transactions of the Grotius Society*, vol. 44 (1958), pp. 145–186.

Prakash Sinha, S., "New nations and the international custom", *William and Mary Law Review*, vol. 9 (1968), pp. 788–803.

Weisburd, A. M., "The International Court of Justice and the concept of State practice", *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law*, vol. 31 (2009), pp. 295–372.

Wood, M., and O. Sender, "State practice", *in* R. Wolfrum, ed., *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017. Available from https://opil.ouplaw.com/home/mpil.

Zemanek, K., "What is 'State practice' and who makes it?", *in* U. Beyerlin *et al.*, eds., *Recht zwischen Umbruch und Bewahrung, Völkerrecht-Europarecht-Staatsrecht: Festschrift für Rudolf Bernhardt*, Berlin, Springer, 1995, pp. 289–306.

2. International organizations and customary international law

Alvarez, J. E., *International Organizations as Lawmakers*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Cahin, G., *La coutume internationale et les organisations internationales: l'incidence de la dimension institutionnelle sur le processus coutumier*, Paris, Pedone, 2001.

DeBartolo, D. M., "Identifying international organizations' contributions to custom", *AJIL Unbound*, 23 December 2014. Available from www.asil.org.

Fry, J. D., "Formation of customary international law through consensus in international organizations", *Austrian Review of International and European Law*, vol. 17 (2012), pp. 49–82.

Hannikainen, L., "The collective factor as a promoter of customary international law", *Baltic Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 6 (2006), pp. 125–141.

Hoffmeister, F., "The contribution of EU practice to international law", *in* M. Cremona, Developments *in EU External Relations Law*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 37–127.

Johnstone, I., "Law-making through the operational activities of international organizations", *George Washington International Law Review*, vol. 40 (2008), pp. 87–122.

Klabbers, J., "International organizations in the formation of customary international law", *in* E. Cannizzaro and P. Palchetti, eds., *Customary International Law on the Use of Force*, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2005, pp. 179–195.

Mathias, S., "The work of the International Law Commission on identification of customary international law: a view from the perspective of the Office of Legal Affairs", *Chinese Journal of International Law*, vol. 15 (2016), pp. 17–31.

Schachter, O., "The development of international law through the legal opinions of the United Nations Secretariat", BYBIL, vol. 25 (1948), pp. 91–132.

Skubiszewski, K., "Forms of participation of international organizations in the law-making processes", *International Organization*, vol. 18 (1964), pp. 790–805.

Vanhamme, J., "Formation and enforcement of customary international law: the European Union's contribution", *Netherlands Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 39 (2008), pp. 127–154.

Vignes, D., "The impact of international organizations on the development and application of public international law", *in* R. St. John Macdonald and D. M. Johnston, eds., *The Structure and Process of International Law: Essays in Legal Philosophy Doctrine and Theory*. Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 1986, pp. 809–855.

Wood, M., "International organizations and customary international law", *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, vol. 48 (2015), pp. 609–620.

Wouters, J., and P. De Man, "International organizations as law-makers", *in* J. Klabbers and A. Wallendahl, eds., *Research Handbook on the Law of International Organizations*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2011, pp. 190–224.

3. Non-State actors and customary international law

Henckaerts, J.-M., and C. Wiesener, "Human rights obligations of non-State armed groups: a possible contribution from customary international law?", *in* R. Kolb and G. Gaggioli, eds., *Research Handbook on Human Rights and Humanitarian Law*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2013, pp. 146–169.

Hobe, S., "The role of non-State actors, in particular of NGOs, in non-contractual law-making and the development of customary international law", *in* R. Wolfrum and V. Röben, eds., *Developments of International Law in Treaty-Making*, Berlin, Springer, 2005, pp. 319–329.

Ochoa, C., "The individual and customary international law formation", *Virginia Journal of International Law*, vol. 48 (2007), pp. 119–186.

Paust, J. J., "Nonstate actor participation in international law and the pretense of exclusion", *Virginia Journal of International Law*, vol. 51 (2011), pp. 977–1004.

Roberts, A., and S. Sivakumaran, "Lawmaking by nonstate actors: engaging armed groups in the creation of international humanitarian law", *Yale Journal of International Law* (2012), pp. 107–152.

4. Duration of practice

Arangio-Ruiz, G., "Customary law: a few more thoughts about the theory of 'spontaneous' international custom", *in* N. Angelet, ed., *Droit du Pouvoir, Pouvoir du Droit: Mélanges offerts à Jean Salmon*, Brussels, Bruylant, 2007, pp. 93–124.

Cheng, B., "United Nations resolutions on outer space: 'instant' international customary law?", in *Studies in International Space Law*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1997, pp. 125–149.

Scharf, M. P., "Seizing the 'Grotian moment': accelerated formation of customary international law in times of fundamental change", *Cornell International Law Journal*, vol. 43 (2010), pp. 439–469.

———, *Customary International Law in Times of Fundamental Change: Recognizing Grotian Moments*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013.

5. Inaction and customary international law

Buzzini, G. P., "Abstention, silence et droit international général", *Rivista di Diritto Internazionale*, vol. 88 (2005), pp. 342–382.

MacGibbon, I. C., "Customary international law and acquiescence", BYBIL *1957*, vol. 33 (1957), pp. 115–145.

Quane, H., "Silence in international law", BYBIL *2013*, vol. 84 (2014), pp. 240–270.

6. Acceptance as law (*opinio juris*)

Boisson de Chazournes, L., "Le rôle de l'*opinio juris*: commentaire", *in* R. Huesa Vinaixa and K. Wellens, eds., *L'influence des sources sur l'unité et la fragmentation du droit international: travaux de séminaire tenu à Palma, les 20–21 mai 2005*, Brussels, Bruylant, 2006, pp. 75–80.

Braillon, C., "La théorie classique de la coutume et le rôle nouveau de l'*opinio juris*": discours de la justice en droit international et en droit interne", *Revue de la faculté de droit de l'Université de Liège*, vol. 54 (2009), pp. 663–675.

Casella, P. B., "Contemporary trends on *opinio juris* and the material evidence of customary international law", *Zanzibar Yearbook of Law*, vol. 3 (2013), pp. 27–49.

Cheng, B., "*Opinio juris*: a key concept in international law that is much misunderstood", *in* S. Yee and W. Tieya, eds., *International Law in the Post-Cold War World: Essays in Memory of Li Haopei*, London, Routledge, 2001, pp. 56–76.

Dahlman, C., "The function of *opinio juris* in customary international law", *Nordic Journal of International Law*, vol. 81 (2012), pp. 327–339.

Elias, O., "The nature of the subjective element in customary international law", *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 44 (1995), pp. 501–520.

Giannattasio, A. R. C., "A '*opinio juris sive necessitatis*': do elemento subjetivo consuetudinário à intersubjetividade jurídica", *in* P. Borba Casella and A. de Carvalho, eds., *Direito Internacional: Homenagem a Adherbal Meira Mattos*, São Paulo, Quartier Latin, 2009, pp. 575–617.

GUGGENHEIM, P., "L'origine de la notion de l''*opinio juris sive necessitatis*' comme deuxième élément de la coutume dans l'histoire du droit des gens", in *Hommage d'une génération de juristes au Président Basdevant*, Paris, Pedone, 1960, pp. 258–262.

HUESA VINAIXA, R., *El Nuevo Alcance de la "Opinio Iuris" en el Derecho Internacional Contemporaneo*, Valencia, Tirant lo Blanch, 1991.

———, "Le rôle de l'*opinio iuris*", *in* R. Huesa Vinaixa and K. Wellens, eds., *L'influence des sources sur l'unité ou la fragmentation du droit international: travaux de séminaire tenu à Palma, les 20–21 mai 2005*, Brussels, Bruylant, 2006, pp. 55–73.

KADENS, E., and E. A. YOUNG, "How customary is customary international law?", *William and Mary Law Review*, vol. 54 (2013), pp. 885–920.

LEFKOWITZ, D., "(Dis)solving the chronological paradox in customary international law: a Hartian approach", *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence*, vol. 21 (2008), pp. 129–148.

MENDELSON, M., "The subjective element in customary international law", BYBIL *1995*, vol. 66 (1995), pp. 177–208.

MILLÁN MORO, L., *La* "Opinio Iuris" *en el Derecho Internacional Contemporáneo*, Madrid, Editorial Centro de Estudios Ramon Areces, 1990.

PATTARO, E., Opinio iuris*: il diritto è un'opinione: chi ne ha i mezzi ce la impone: lezioni di filosofia del diritto*, Turin, Giappichelli, 2011.

PIZA ESCALANTE, R. E., "La '*opinio juris*' como fuente autónoma del derecho internacional ('*opinio juris*' y '*jus cogens*'", *Anuario Hispano-Luso-Americano de Derecho Internacional*, vol. 8 (1987), pp. 131–194.

SLAMA, J. L., "*Opinio juris* in customary international law", *Oklahoma City University Law Review*, vol. 15 (1990), pp. 603–656.

TAKI, H., "*Opinio juris* and the formation of customary international law: a theoretical analysis", GYBIL, vol. 51 (2008), pp. 447–466.

TASIOULAS, J., "Comment: *Opinio juris* and the genesis of custom: a solution to the 'paradox'", *Australian Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 26 (2007), pp. 199–205.

WALDEN, R. M., "The subjective element in the formation of customary international law", *Israel Law Review*, vol. 12 (1977), pp. 344–364.

WILSON, E., "*Mare liberum* and *opinio juris*: a Grotian reading of the *North Sea Continental Shelf* cases", *Monash University Law Review*, vol. 28 (2002), pp. 299–326.

WOLFKE, K., "L'elément subjectif dans la coutume internationale", *Zeszyty naukowe Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego*, Series A, No. 27 (Law) (1960), pp. 161–170.

YEE, S., "The news that *opinio juris* 'is not a necessary element of customary [international] law' is greatly exaggerated", GYBIL, vol. 43 (2000), pp. 227–238.

7. The interrelationship of customary international law and treaties

BAXTER, R. R., "Multilateral treaties as evidence of customary international law", BYBIL *1965–1966*, vol. 41 (1968), pp. 275–300.

———, "Treaties and custom", *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law, 1970-I*, vol. 129 (1970), pp. 25–105.

BORDIN, F. L., "Reflections of customary international law: the authority of codification conventions and ILC draft articles in international law", *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 63 (2014), pp. 535–567.

BOWETT, D. W., "Treaty revision in the light of the evolution of customary international law", *African Journal of International and Comparative Law*, vol. 5 (1993), pp. 84–96.

BRÖLMANN, C., "Law-making treaties: form and function in international law", *Nordic Journal of International Law*, vol. 74 (2005), pp. 383–404.

CHARNEY, J. I., "International agreements and the development of customary international law", *Washington Law Review*, vol. 61 (1986), pp. 971–996.

D'AMATO, A. A., "Manifest intent and the generation by treaty of customary rules of international law", AJIL, vol. 64 (1970), pp. 892–902.

D'AMATO, A., "Custom and Treaty: A Response to Professor Weisburd", *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, vol. 21 (1988), pp. 459–472.

DANILENKO, G. M., "Соотношение и взаимодействие международного договора и международного обычая" ["Relationship and interaction between international treaty and international custom"], *Soviet Yearbook of International Law*—1983, Moscow, Nauka 1984, pp 12–25.

DE VISSCHER, C., "Coutume et traité en droit international public", RGDIP, vol. 26 (1955), pp. 353–369.

DINSTEIN, Y., "The interaction between customary international law and treaties", *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law*, vol. 322 (2006), pp. 243–427.

Do Nascimento E Silva, G. E., "Treaties as evidence of customary international law", in *International Law at the Time of Its Codification: Essays in Honour of Roberto Ago*, Milan, Giuffrè, 1987, pp. 387–397.

Gamble, J. K., "The treaty/custom dichotomy: an overview", *Texas International Law Journal*, vol. 16 (1981), pp. 305–319.

Jia, B. B., "The relations between treaties and custom", *Chinese Journal of International Law*, vol. 9 (2010), pp. 81–109.

Kolb, R., *The Law of Treaties: An Introduction*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2016, pp. 260–269.

Kontou, N., *The Termination and Revision of Treaties in the Light of New Customary International Law*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995.

Mendelson, M., "Disentangling treaty and customary international law", *ASIL Proceedings*, vol. 81 (1987), pp. 157–164.

Morrison, F. L., "The importance of generality in law-making international agreements", *in* H. P. Hestermeyer *et al*., eds., *Coexistence, Cooperation and Solidarity:* Liber Amicorum *Rüdiger Wolfrum*, vol. II, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2012, pp. 1497–1505.

Schachter, O., "Entangled treaty and custom", *in* Y. Dinstein, ed., *International Law at a Time of Perplexity: Essays in Honour of Shabtai Rosenne*, Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1989, pp. 717–738.

Schwebel, S. M., "The influence of bilateral investment treaties on customary international law", *ASIL Proceedings*, vol. 98 (2004), pp. 27–30.

Scott, G. L., and C. L. Carr, "The International Court of Justice and the treaty/custom dichotomy", *Texas International Law Journal*, vol. 16 (1981), pp. 347–359.

Scott, G. L., and C. L. Carr, "Multilateral treaties and the formation of customary international law", *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy*, vol. 25 (1996), pp. 71–94.

Shihata, I. F. I., "The treaty as a law-declaring and custom-making instrument", *Revue égyptienne de droit international*, vol. 22 (1966), pp. 51–90.

Sinclair, I., "The impact of the unratified codification convention", *in* A. Bos and H. Siblesz, eds., *Realism in Law-Making: Essays on International Law In Honour of Willem Riphagen*, Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1986, pp. 211–229.

Sohn, L. B., "Unratified treaties as a source of customary international law", *in* A. Bos and H. Siblesz, eds., *Realism in Law-Making: Essays in International Law in Honour of Willem Riphagen*, Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1986, pp. 231–246.

Teboul, G., "Remarques sur le rang hiérarchique des conventions inter-étatiques et du droit international coutumier dans l'ordre juridique international", *Journal du droit international*, vol. 137 (2010), pp. 705–735.

Torrione, H., ed., *L'influence des conventions de codification sur la coutume en droit international public*. Freiburg, Editions universitaires Fribourg, 1989.

Villiger, M. E., *Customary International Law and Treaties: A Study of Their Interactions and Interrelations with Special Consideration of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties*. Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1985.

Weisburd, A. M., "Customary international law: the problem of treaties", *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, vol. 21 (1988), pp. 1–46.

Wolfke, K., "Treaties and custom: aspects of interrelation", *in* J. Klabbers and R. Lefeber, eds., *Essays on the Law of Treaties: A Collection of Essays In Honour of Bert Vierdag*. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1998, pp. 31–39.

8. Resolutions of international organizations and customary international law

Cheng, B., "United Nations resolutions on outer space: 'instant' international customary law?", *Indian Journal of International Law*, vol. 5 (1965), pp. 23–48.

Corten, O., "La participation du Conseil de sécurité à l'élaboration, à la cristallisation ou à la consolidation de règles coutumières", *Revue belge de droit international*, vol. 37 (2004), pp. 552–567.

Detter, I., "The effect of resolutions of international organizations", *in* J. Makarczyk, ed., *Theory of International Law at the Threshold of the 21st Century: Essays in Honour of Krzysztof Skubiszewski*, The Hague, Kluwer Law International, 1996, pp. 381–392.

Higashi, J., "The role of resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly in the formative process of international customary law", *Japanese Annual of International Law*, vol. 25 (1982), pp. 11–25.

Higgins, R., *The Development of International Law through the Political Organs of the United Nations*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1963.

Institut de Droit International, "Conclusions of the Thirteenth Commission on resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, with respect to the topic of the elaboration of general multilateral conventions and of non-contractual instruments having a normative function of objective", Session of Cairo, 1987. Available from www.idi-iil.org.

MacGibbon, I., "Means for the identification of international law—General Assembly resolutions: custom, practice and mistaken identity", *in* B. Cheng, ed., *International Law: Teaching and Practice*, London, Stevens and Sons, 1982, pp. 10–26.

Öberg, M. D., "The legal effects of resolutions of the UN Security Council and General Assembly in the jurisprudence of the ICJ", EJIL, vol. 16 (2006), pp. 879–906.

Schwebel, S. M., "The effect of resolutions of the U.N. General Assembly on customary international law", *ASIL Proceedings*, vol. 73 (1979), pp. 301–309.

———, "United Nations resolutions, recent arbitral awards and customary international law", *in* A. Bos and H. Siblesz, eds., *Realism in Law-Making: Essays in International Law in Honour of Willem Riphagen*, Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1986, pp. 203–210.

Simma, B., "Zur völkerrechtlichen Bedeutung von Resolutionen des UN-Generalversammlung", *Fünftes deutsch-polnisches Juristen-Kolloquium*, vol. 2 (1981), pp. 45–76.

Skubiszewski, K., "Can future international law be developed through the resolutions of intergovernmental bodies?", in *International Law Tomorrow*, Neuchâtel, Éditions Ides et Calendes, 1974, pp. 55–66.

———, "Rechtscharakter der Resolutionen der Generalversammlung der Vereinten Nationen", *Fünftes deutsch-polnisches Juristen-Kolloquium*, vol. 2 (1981), pp. 13–43.

———, "Resolutions of the UN General Assembly and evidence of custom", in *International Law at the Time of Its Codification: Essays in Honour of Roberto Ago*, Milan, Giuffrè, 1987, pp. 503–519.

Sloan, B., "General Assembly resolutions revisited (forty years later)", BYBIL, vol. 58 (1987), pp. 39–150.

———, *United Nations General Assembly Resolutions in Our Changing World*, Ardsley, New York, Transnational Publishers, 1991.

Thierry, H., "Les résolutions des organes internationaux dans la jurisprudence de la Cour internationale de Justice", *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law*, vol. 167 (1980), pp. 385–450.

Tunkin, G. I., "The role of resolutions of international organisations in creating norms of international law", *in* W. E. Butler, ed., *International Law and the International System*, Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1987, pp. 5–19.

Von Grünigen, M., "Die Resolutionen der Generalversammlung der Vereinten Nationen und ihr Einfluss auf die Fortbildung des Völkerrechts", in E. Diez et al., eds., *Festschrift für Rudolf Bindschedler zum 65. Geburtstag am 8. Juli 1980*, Bern, Stämpfli Verlag AG, 1980, pp. 187–200.

Voyiakis, E., "Voting in the General Assembly as evidence of customary international law?", *in* S. Allen and A. Xanthaki, eds., *Reflections on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, Oxford, Hart, 2011, pp. 209–223.

9. Decisions of courts and tribunals

(a) *Customary international law and the jurisprudence of the Permanent Court of International Justice and the International Court of Justice*

Alvarez-Jiménez, A., "Methods for the identification of customary international law in the International Court of Justice's jurisprudence: 2000–2009", *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 60 (2011), pp. 681–712.

Charlesworth, H. C. M., "Customary international law and the *Nicaragua* case", *Australian Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 11 (1984–1987), pp. 1–31.

Choi, S. J. and M. Gulati, "Customary international law: how do courts do it?", *in* C. Bradley, ed., *Custom's Future: International Law in a Changing World*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2016, pp. 117–147.

Ferrer Lloret, J., "La insoportable levedad del derecho internacional consuetudinario en la jurisprudencia de la Corte Internacional de Justicia: el caso de las inmunidades jurisdiccionales del Estado", *Revista Electrónica de Estudios Internacionales*, vol. 24 (2012), pp. 1–36.

Fumagalli, L., "Evidence before the International Court of Justice: issues of fact and questions of law in the determination of international custom", *in* N. Boschiero *et al.*, eds., *International Courts and the Development of International Law: Essays in Honour of Tullio Treves*, The Hague, T.M.C. Asser Press, 2013, pp. 137–148.

Geiger, R. H., "Customary international law in the jurisprudence of the International Court of Justice: a critical appraisal", *in* U. Fastenrath *et al.*, eds., *From Bilateralism to Community Interest: Essays in Honour of Judge Bruno Simma*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011, pp. 673–694.

Hagemann, M., "Die Gewohnheit als Völkerrechtsquelle in der Rechtsprechung des internationalen Gerichtshofes", *Schweizerisches Jahrbuch für internationales Recht*, vol. 10 (1953), pp. 61–88.

Haggenmacher, P., "La doctrine des deux éléments du droit coutumier dans la pratique de la Cour internationale", RGDIP, vol. 90 (1986), pp. 5–125.

Kirchner, J., "Thoughts about a methodology of customary international law", *Austrian Journal of Public and International Law*, vol. 43 (1992), pp. 215–239.

Palchetti, P., "La rilevanza dell' atteggiamento degli Stati parti nell' accertamento del diritto internazionale generale da parte della Corte internazionale di giustizia", *Rivista di Diritto Internazionale*, vol. 82 (1999), pp. 647–679.

Skubiszewski, K., "Elements of custom and the Hague Court", *Heidelberg Journal of International Law*, vol. 31 (1971), pp. 810–854.

Sørensen, M., "La 'coutume'" *in* M. Sørensen, *Les sources du droit international: Etude sur la jurisprudence de la Cour permanente de justice internationale*, Copenhagen, Einar Munksgaard 1946, pp. 84–111.

Talmon, S., "Determining customary international law: the ICJ's methodology between induction, deduction and assertion", EJIL, vol. 26 (2015), pp. 417–443.

Tams, C. J., "Meta-custom and the court: A study in judicial law-making", *The Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals*, vol. 14 (2015), pp. 51–79.

Tomka, P., "Custom and the International Court of Justice", *The Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals*, vol. 12 (2013), pp. 195–216.

———, "Customary international law in the jurisprudence of the World Court: the increasing relevance of codification"/"Le droit international coutumier dans la jurisprudence de la Cour mondiale: l'importance croissante de la codification", *in* L. Lijnzaad and Council of Europe, eds., *The Judge and International Custom*, Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2016, pp. 2–24.

Tzevelekos, V. P., "*Juris Dicere*: custom as a matrix, custom as a norm, and the role of judges and (their) ideology in custom making", *in* N. Rajkovic, T. Aalberts and T. Gammeltoft-Hansen, eds., *The Power of Legality: Practices of International Law and their Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2016, pp. 188–208.

Vismara, F., "La prova di una pratica generale accettata come diritto nella prassi della Corte internazionale di giustizia", *La Comunità Internazionale*, vol. 3 (2000), pp. 439–463.

Watts, A., "The International Court and the continuing customary international law of treaties", *in* N. Ando, E. McWhinney and R. Wolfrum, eds., *Liber Amicorum Judge Shigeru Oda*, The Hague, Kluwer Law International, 2002, pp. 251–266.

(b) *Customary international law and national court decisions*

Beaulac, S., "Customary international law in domestic courts: imbroglio, Lord Denning, stare decisis", *in* C. P. M. Waters, ed., *British and Canadian Perspectives on International Law*, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2006, pp. 379–392.

Burmester, H., "The determination of customary international law in Australian courts", *Non-State Actors and International Law*, vol. 4 (2004), pp. 39–47.

Butkevich, V. G., "Применение правил международного обычая во внутригосударственном суде" ["Transposing international customary rules to domestic courts"], *Вестник Киевского университета. Международные отношения и международное право* [Vestnik Kievskovo universiteta. Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya i mezhhdunarodnoye parvo], vol. 15 (1982), pp. 35–42.

Chibundu, M. O, "Making customary international law through municipal adjudication: a structural inquiry", *Virginia Journal of International Law*, vol. 39 (1999), pp. 1069–1149.

Collins, L. and Cross, T., "The law of international custom in the case law of the House of Lords and the United Kingdom Supreme Court"/"Le droit de la coutume internationale dans la jurisprudence de la Chambre des Lords et de la Cour suprême du Royaume-Uni", *in* L. Lijnzaad and Council of Europe, eds., *The Judge and International Custom*, Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2016, pp. 160–179.

Dedov, D., "The development of the public order concept in Russian case law"/"L'élaboration de la notion d'ordre public dans la jurisprudence russe", *in* L. Lijnzaad and Council of Europe, eds., *The Judge and International Custom*, Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2016, pp. 135–142.

Gattini, A., "Le rôle du juge international et du juge national et la coutume internationale", *in* D. Alland *et al.*, eds., *Unité et diversité du droit international: écrits en l'honneur du professeur Pierre-Marie Dupuy*, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2014, pp. 253–273.

Geiger, R., "Zur Lehre vom Völkergewohnheitsrecht in der Rechtsprechung des Bundesverfassungsgerichts", *Archiv des öffentlichen Rechts*, vol. 103 (1978), pp. 382–407.

Greenwood, C., "The contribution of national courts to the development of international law", lecture before the British Institute of International and Comparative Law, 4 February 2014.

Johnson, C. D., "*Filartiga v. Pena Irala*: a contribution to the development of customary international law by a domestic court", *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law*, vol. 11 (1981), pp. 335–341.

Jones, D. L., "The role of lawyers in 'establishing' customary international law in the *Pinochet* case", *Non-State Actors and International Law*, vol. 4 (2004), pp. 49–58.

Lauterpacht, H., "Decisions of municipal courts as a source of international law", BYBIL *1929*, vol. 10 (1929), pp. 65–95.

Lijnzaad, L., "Customary international law before Dutch courts: *Nyugat* and beyond"/"L'application du droit international coutumier par les tribunaux néerlandais, l'arrêt *Nyugat* et ses suites", *in* L. Lijnzaad and Council of Europe, eds., *The Judge and International Custom*, Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2016, pp. 121–134.

Moremen, P. M., "National court decisions as State practice: a transnational judicial dialogue?", *North Carolina Journal of International Law and Commercial Regulation*, vol. 32 (2006), pp. 259–309.

Nollkaemper, A., and E. de Wet, "The application of customary international law by national courts: introduction", *Non-State Actors and International Law*, vol. 4 (2004), pp. 1–2.

Olleson, S., "Internationally wrongful acts in the domestic courts: the contribution of domestic courts to the development of customary international law relating to the engagement of international responsibility", *Leiden Journal of International Law*, vol. 26 (2013), pp. 615–642.

Paulus, A., "Customary law before the Federal Constitutional Court of Germany"/"Le droit coutumier devant la Cour constitutionnelle fédérale d'Allemagne", *in* L. Lijnzaad and Council of Europe, eds., *The Judge and International Custom*, Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2016, pp. 106–120.

Petrič, E., "Customary international law in the case law of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Slovenia"/"Le droit international coutumier dans la jurisprudence de la Cour constitutionnelle de la République de Slovénie", *in* L. Lijnzaad and Council of Europe, eds., *The Judge and International Custom*, Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2016, pp. 143–159.

Reinisch, A., and P. Bachmayer, "The identification of customary international law by Austrian Courts", *Austrian Review of International and European Law*, vol. 17 (2015), pp. 1–48.

Roberts, A., "Comparative international law: the role of national courts in creating and enforcing international law", *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 60 (2011), pp. 57–92.

Ruffert, M., "Der Entscheidungsmaßstab im Normverifikationsverfahren nach Art.100 II GG.", *JuristenZeitung*, vol. 56 (2001), pp. 633–639.

Stirling-Zanda, S., "The determination of customary international law in European courts (France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland)", *Non-State Actors and International Law*, vol. 4 (2004), pp. 3–24.

Stirn, B., "International custom in French public law"/"La place de la coutume internationale en droit public français", *in* L. Lijnzaad and Council of Europe, eds., *The Judge and International Custom*, Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2016, pp. 101–105.

Willems, J. H. M., "Treatment of customary international law and use of expert evidence by the Dutch Court in the *Bouterse* case", *Non-State Actors and International Law*, vol. 4 (2004), pp. 65–74.

Wouters, J., "Customary international law before national courts: some reflections from a continental European perspective", *Non-State Actors and International Law*, vol. 4 (2004), pp. 25–38.

Wuerth, I., "International law in domestic courts and the *Jurisdictional Immunities of the State* case", *Melbourne Journal of International Law*, vol. 13 (2012), pp. 819–837.

10. Customary international law and the teachings of publicists

Kammerhofer, J., "Orthodox generalists and political activists in international legal scholarship", *in* M. Happold, ed., *International Law in a Multipolar World*, London, Routledge, 2012, pp. 138–157.

Oraison, A., "Réflexions sur 'La doctrine des publicistes les plus qualifiés des différentes nations' (Flux et reflux relatifs des forces doctrinales académiques et finalisées)", *Revue belge de droit international*, vol. 24 (1991), pp. 507–580.

Wood, M., "Teachings of the most highly qualified publicists (Art. 38 (1) ICJ Statute)", *in* R. Wolfrum, ed., *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012. Available from https://opil.ouplaw.com/home/mpil.

11. Persistent objector

Barsalou, O. "La doctrine de l'objecteur persistant en droit international public", *Revue québécoise de droit international*, vol. 19 (2006), pp. 1–18.

Bederman, D. J., "Acquiescence, objection and the death of customary international law", *Duke Journal of Comparative and International Law*, vol. 21 (2010), pp. 31–45.

Bradley, C. A and Gulati, M., "Withdrawing from international custom", *Yale Law Journal*, vol. 120 (2010), pp. 202–275.

Charney, J. I., "The persistent objector rule and the development of customary international law", BYBIL *1985*, vol. 56 (1985), pp. 1–24.

Colson, D. A., "How persistent must the persistent objector be?", *Washington Law Review*, vol. 61 (1986), pp. 957–970.

Dumberry, P., "Incoherent and ineffective: the concept of persistent objector revisited", *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 59 (2010), pp. 779–802.

———, "The last citadel! Can a State claim the status of persistent objector to prevent the application of a rule of customary international law in investor-State arbitration?", *Leiden Journal of International Law*, vol. 23 (2010), pp. 379–400.

Dupuy, P.-M., "A propos de l'opposabilité de la coutume générale: enquête brève sur 'l'objecteur persistant'", in *Le droit international au service de la paix, de la justice et du développement: Mélanges offerts à Michel Virally*, Paris, Pédone, 1991, pp. 257–272.

Elias, O., "Some remarks on the persistent objector rule in customary international law", *Denning Law Journal*, vol. 6 (1991), pp. 37–51.

———, “Persistent objector”, *in* R. Wolfrum, ed., *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006. Available from https://opil.ouplaw.com/home/mpil.

Eto, J., “The persistent objector rule in the *Fisheries* case”, *Toyo Hogaku*, vol. 32 (1989), pp. 295–323 (in Japanese).

———, “The theory of customary international law and the persistent objector rule”, *Journal of International Law and Diplomacy*, vol. 88 (1989), pp. 38–64.

Fitzmaurice, G., “The general principles of international law considered from the standpoint of the rule of law”, *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law*, vol. 92 (1957), pp. 1–227.

Green, J. A., *The Persistent Objector Rule in International Law*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.

———, “Persistent objector teflon? Customary international human rights law and the United States in international adjudicative proceedings”, *in* J. A. Green and C. Waters, eds., *Adjudicating International Human Rights: Essays in Honour of Sandy Ghandhi*, Leiden, Brill, 2015, pp. 167–191.

Guldahl, C. G., “The role of persistent objection in international humanitarian law”, *Nordic Journal of International Law*, vol. 77 (2008), pp. 51–86.

Kritsiotis, D., “On the possibilities of and for persistent objection”, *Duke Journal of Comparative & International Law*, vol. 21 (2010), pp. 121–141.

Lau, H., “Rethinking the persistent objector doctrine in international human rights law”, *Chicago Journal of International Law*, vol. 6 (2005), pp. 495–510.

Loschin, L., “The persistent objector rule and customary human rights law: a proposed analytical framework”, *University of California Davis Journal of International Law and Policy*, vol. 2 (1996), pp. 147–172.

McClane, J. B., “How late in the emergence of a norm of customary international law may a persistent objector object?”, *ILSA Journal of International Law*, vol. 13 (1989), pp. 1–26.

Pentassuglia, G., *La Rilevanza dell’Obiezione Persistente nel Diritto Internazionale*, Bari, Laterza, 1996.

Quince, C., *The Persistent Objector and Customary International Law*, Denver, Colorado, Outskirts Press, 2010.

Stein, T. L., “The approach of the different drummer: the principle of the persistent objector in international law”, *Harvard International Law Journal*, vol. 26 (1985), pp. 457–482.

Steinfeld, A., “Nuclear objections: the persistent objector and the legality of the use of nuclear weapons”, *Brooklyn Law Review*, vol. 62 (1996), pp. 1635–1686.

Trachtman, J. P., “Persistent objectors, cooperation, and the utility of customary international law”, *Duke Journal of Comparative and International Law*, vol. 21 (2010), pp. 221–233.

Weil, P., “Le droit international en quête de son identité”, *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law*, vol. 237 (1992), pp 189–201.

12. Particular customary international law

Briggs, H. W., “The *Colombian-Peruvian Asylum* case and proof of customary international law”, AJIL, vol. 45 (1951), pp. 728–731.

Cohen-Jonathan, G., “La coutume locale”, AFDI, vol. 7 (1961), pp. 119–140.

Crema, L., “The ‘right mix’ and ‘ambiguities’ in particular customs: a few remarks on the *Navigational and Related Rights* case”, in N. Boschiero *et al.*, eds., *International Courts and the Development of International Law: Essays in Honour of Tullio Treves*, The Hague, T.M.C. Asser Press, 2013, pp. 65–75.

D’Amato, A. A., “The concept of special custom in international law”, AJIL, vol. 63 (1969), pp. 211–223.

Elias, O., “The relationship between general and particular customary international law”, *African Journal of International and Comparative Law*, vol. 8 (1996), pp. 67–88.

Forteau, M., “Regional international law”, *in* R. Wolfrum, ed., *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006. Available from https://opil.ouplaw.com/home/mpil.

Francioni, F., “La consuetudine locale nel diritto internazionale”, *Rivista di diritto internazionale*, vol. 54 (1971), pp. 396–422.

Gamio, J. M., “Costumbre universal y particular”, *in* M. Rama-Montaldo, ed., *El derecho internacional en un mundo en transformación*, vol. 1 (1994), pp. 69–98.

Gros Espiell, H., “La doctrine du droit international en Amérique latine avant la première conférence panaméricaine”, *Journal of the History of International Law*, vol. 3 (2001), pp. 1–17.

C. Customary international law in different fields of international law

1. Customary international law and human rights

Chan, P. C. W., “The protection of refugees and internally displaced persons: *non-refoulement* under customary international law?”, *International Journal of Human Rights*, vol. 10 (2006), pp. 231–239.

Chetail, V., “The transnational movement of persons under general international law—Mapping the customary law foundations of international migration law”, *in* V. Chetail and C. Bauloz, eds., *Research Handbook on International Law and Migration*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2014, pp. 1–72.

COLAVITTI, R., "L'ONU et la protection des minorités: un droit coutumier *in statu nascendi*?", *L'Observateur des Nations Unies*, Nos. 20/21 (2006), pp. 261–283.

GREIG, D. W., "The protection of refugees and customary international law", *Australian Year Book of International Law*, vol. 8 (1978/1980), pp. 108–141.

GUNNING, I. R., "Modernizing customary international law: the challenge of human rights", *Virginia Journal of International Law*, vol. 31 (1991), pp. 211–247.

HAILBRONNER, K., "*Nonrefoulement* and 'humanitarian' refugees: customary international law or wishful legal thinking", in *The New Asylum Seekers: Refugee Law in the 1980s—The Ninth Sokol Colloquium on International Law*, Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff , 1988, pp. 123–158.

HAMMER, L. M., "Reconsidering the Israeli courts' application of customary international law in the human rights context", *ILSA Journal of International and Comparative Law*, vol. 5 (1998), pp. 23–41.

HANNUM, H., "The status of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in national and international law", *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law*, vol. 25 (1995–1996), pp. 287–397.

HENCKAERTS, J.-M. and WIESENER, C., "Human rights obligations of non-State armed groups: a possible contribution from customary international law?", *in* R. Kolb and G. Gaggioli, eds., *Research Handbook on Human Rights and Humanitarian Law*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2013, pp. 146–169.

KLEIN, E. (ed.) *Menschenrechtsschutz durch Gewohnheitsrecht: Kolloquium, 26.-28. September 2002, Potsdam*, Berlin, Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2003.

LAUTERPACHT, E. and BETHLEHEM, D., "The scope and content of the principle of *non-refoulement*: Opinion", *in* E. Feller, V. Türk and F. Nicholson, eds., *Refugee Protection in International Law*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. 87–177.

LENZERINI, F., "Suppressing slavery under customary international law", *Italian Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 10 (2000), pp. 145–180.

LILLICH, R. B., "The growing importance of customary international human rights law", *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law*, vol. 25 (1995/1996), pp. 1–30.

LOWE, A., "Customary international law and international human rights law: a proposal for the expansion of the alien tort statute", *Indiana International and Comparative Law Review*, vol. 23 (2013), pp. 523–553.

MERON, T., *Human Rights and Humanitarian Norms as Customary Law*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1991.

PAUST, J. J., "The complex nature, sources and evidences of customary human rights", *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law*, vol. 25 (1996), pp. 147–164.

SIMMA, B., and P. ALSTON, "The sources of human rights law: custom, *jus cogens*, and general principles", *Australian Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 12 (1989), pp. 82–108.

THIRLWAY, H., "Human rights in customary law: an attempt to define some of the issues", *Leiden Journal of International Law*, vol. 28 (2015), pp. 495–506.

ULLOM, V., "Voluntary repatriation of refugees and customary international law", *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy*, vol. 29 (2000/2001), pp. 115–149.

WOUTERS, J., and C. RYNGAERT, "Impact on the process of the formation of customary international law", *in* M. T. Kamminga and M. Scheinin, eds., *The Impact of Human Rights Law on General International Law*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 111–131.

ZIEMELE, I., "Customary international law in the case law of the European Court of human rights: the method", *Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals*, vol. 12 (2013), pp. 243–252.

2. Customary international humanitarian law

ALDRICH, G. H., "Customary international humanitarian law: an interpretation on behalf of the International Committee of the Red Cross", BYBIL, vol. 76 (2005), pp. 503–524.

ARROCHA, P., "The never-ending dilemma: is the unilateral use of force by States legal in the context of humanitarian intervention?", *Anuario Mexicano de Derecho Internacional*, vol. 11 (2011), pp. 11–44.

BELLINGER, J. B., and W. J. HAYNES, "A US government response to the International Committee of the Red Cross study *Customary International Humanitarian Law*", *International Review of the Red Cross*, vol. 89 (2007), pp. 443–471.

BENOIT, J. P., "Mistreatment of the wounded, sick and shipwrecked by the ICRC study on customary international humanitarian law", *Yearbook of International Humanitarian Law*, vol. 11 (2008), pp. 175–219.

BOTHE, M. "Customary international humanitarian law: some reflections on the ICRC Study", *Yearbook of International Humanitarian Law*, vol. 8 (2005), pp. 143–178.

BRUUN, L. L., "Beyond the 1948 Convention: emerging principles of genocide in customary international law", *Maryland Journal of International Law and Trade*, vol. 17 (1993), pp. 193–226.

BUGNION, F., "Droit international humanitaire coutumier", *Revue suisse de droit international et de droit européen*, vol. 17 (2007), pp. 165–214.

Carducci, G., "L'obligation de restitution des biens culturels et des objets d'art en cas de conflit armé: droit coutumier et droit conventionnel avant et après la Convention de La Haye de 1954: l'importance du facteur temporel dans les rapports entre les traités et la coutume", RGDIP, vol. 104 (2000), pp. 289–357.

Charney, J. I., "Customary international law in the *Nicaragua* case judgment on the merits", *Hague Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 1 (1988), pp. 16–29.

Dahlitz, J., "The role of customary law in arms limitation", *in* J. Dahlitz and D. C. Dicke, eds., *The International Law of Arms Control and Disarmament: Proceedings of the Symposium, Geneva, 28 February–2 March 1991* (United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.91.0.14), pp. 157–178.

d'Aspremont, J., "Théorie des Sources—An autonomous regime of identification of customary international humanitarian law: do not say what you do or do not do what you say?", *in* R. van Steenbergh, ed., *Droit international humanitaire: un régime spécial de droit international?* Brussels, Bruylant, 2013, pp. 73–101.

Dinstein, Y., "The ICRC Customary International Humanitarian Law Study", *International Law Studies*, vol. 82 (2006), pp. 99–112.

Emanuelli, C., "L'étude du CICR sur le droit humanitaire coutumier: la coutume en question", RGDIP, vol. 110 (2006), pp. 435–444.

Fleck, D., "Die IKRK-Gewohnheitsrechtsstudie", *Humanitäres Völkerrecht*, vol. 22 (2009), pp. 120–124.

Greenwood, C., "Customary law status of the 1977 Geneva Protocols", *in* A. J. M. Delissen and G. J. Tanja, eds., *Humanitarian Law of Armed Conflict: Challenges Ahead—Essays in Honour of Frits Kalshoven*, Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1991, pp. 93–114.

Hakimi, M., "Custom's method and process: lessons from humanitarian law", *in* C. Bradley, ed., *Custom's Future: International Law in a Changing World*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2016, pp. 148–171.

Henckaerts, J.-M., "International humanitarian law as customary international law", *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, vol. 21 (2002), pp. 186–193.

———, "Study on customary international humanitarian law: a contribution to the understanding and respect for the rule of law in armed conflict", *International Review of the Red Cross*, vol. 87 (2005), pp. 175–212.

———, "Customary international humanitarian law: a response to US comments", *International Review of the Red Cross*, vol. 89 (2007), pp. 473–488.

———, and L. Doswald-Beck, *Customary International Humanitarian Law*, vol. I, *Rules* and vol. II, *Practice*, International Committee of the Red Cross, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Lynn Hogue, L., "Identifying customary international law of war in Protocol I: a proposed restatement", *Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Journal*, vol. 13 (1990), pp. 279–303.

Mendelson, M. H., "The *Nicaragua* case and customary international law", in W. E. Butler, ed., *The Non-Use of Force in International Law*, Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1989, pp. 85–99.

Meron, T., "The Geneva Conventions as customary law", AJIL, vol. 81 (1987), pp. 348–370.

———, "The continuing role of custom in the formation of international humanitarian law", 90 AJIL (1996) 238–249.

———, "Revival of customary humanitarian law", AJIL, vol. 99 (2005), pp. 817–834.

———, "Customary humanitarian law today: from the academy to the courtroom", *in* A. Clapham and P. Gaeta, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Law in Armed Conflict*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 37–49.

Morkyte, D., "International law as a legal basis for unilateral humanitarian intervention", *Hague Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 24 (2011), pp. 121–152.

Pocar, F. "To what extent is Protocol I customary international law?", in A. E. Wall, ed., *Legal and Ethical Lessons of NATO's Kosovo Campaign*, Newport, Rhode Island, Naval War College, 2002, pp. 337–351.

Post, H. H. G., "The role of State practice in the formation of customary international humanitarian law", *in* I. F. Dekker and H. H. G. Post, eds., *On the Foundations and Sources of International Law*, The Hague, T.M.C. Asser Press, 2003, pp. 129–147.

Rijpkema, P. R., "Customary international law in the *Nicaragua* case", *Netherlands Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 20 (1989), pp. 91–116.

Sheldon, J. M., "Nuclear weapons and the laws of war: does customary international law prohibit the use of nuclear weapons in all circumstances?", *Fordham International Law Journal*, vol. 20 (1996), pp. 181–262.

Szpak, A., "The Eritrea-Ethiopia Claims Commission and customary international humanitarian law", *Journal of International Humanitarian Legal Studies*, vol. 4 (2013), pp. 296–314.

Villanueva Sainz-Pardo, P., "Is child recruitment as a war crime part of customary international law?", *International Journal of Human Rights*, vol. 12 (2008), pp. 555–612.

Zajadło, J., "Humanitarian intervention: threat to international order, moral imperative, or customary norm *in statu nascendi*?", *Polish Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 27 (2004/2005), pp. 33–48.

3. Customary international criminal law

Arajärvi, N., *The Changing Nature of Customary International Law: Methods of Interpreting the Concept of Custom in International Criminal Tribunals*. Abingdon, Oxon, Routledge, 2014.

———, "The role of the international criminal judge in the formation of customary international law", *European Journal of Legal Studies*, vol. 1 (2007), pp. 90–120.

Bufalini, A., "The principle of legality and the role of customary international law in the interpretation of the ICC Statute", *Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals*, vol. 14 (2015), pp. 233–254.

Cryer, R., "Of custom, treaties, scholars and the gavel: the influence of the international criminal tribunals on the ICRC Customary Law Study", *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, vol. 11 (2006), pp. 239–263.

Fałkowska, M., "La coutume dans les statuts et la jurisprudence des juridictions pénales internationales: vers l'émergence d'une nouvelle définition de la coutume internationale?", *in* M. Arcari and L. Balmond, eds., *Diversification des acteurs et dynamique normative en droit international*, Naples, Editoriale Scientifica, 2013, pp. 159–194.

Frulli, M., "The contribution of international criminal tribunals to the development of international law: the prominence of *opinio juris* and the moralization of customary law", *Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals*, vol. 14 (2015), pp. 80–93.

Kirakosyan, Y., "Finding custom: the ICJ and the international criminal courts and tribunals compared", in L. Van den Herik and C. Stahn, eds., The Diversification and Fragmentation of International Criminal Law, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2012, pp. 149–161.

Mack, E. C. W., "Does customary international law obligate States to extradite or prosecute individuals accused of committing crimes against humanity?", *Minnesota Journal of International Law*, vol. 24 (2015), pp. 73–100.

Massé, M., "Droit pénal international: la coutume internationale dans la jurisprudence de la Chambre criminelle : affaires Kadhafi et Aussarès", *Revue de science criminelle et de droit pénal comparé*, vol. 4 (2003), pp. 894–901.

Mettraux, G., "Identifying customary international law and the role of judges in the customary process", in *International Crimes and the Ad Hoc Tribunals*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006, pp. 13–18.

O'Keefe, R., "Customary international crimes in English courts", BYBIL, vol. 72 (2001), pp. 293–335.

———, *International Criminal Law*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Plesch, D. and Sattler, S., "A new paradigm of customary international criminal law: the UN War Crimes Commission of 1943–1948 and its associated courts and tribunals", *Criminal Law Forum*, vol. 25 (2014),pp. 17–43.

Schabas, W., "Customary law or 'judge-made' law: judicial creativity at the UN criminal tribunals", *in* J. Doria *et al.*, eds., *The Legal Regime of the International Criminal Court: Essays in Honour of Professor Igor Blishchenko*, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2009, pp. 77–101.

Schlütter, B., *Developments in Customary International Law: Theory and the Practice of the International Court of Justice and the International ad hoc Criminal Tribunals for Rwanda and Yugoslavia*. Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2010.

Singer, I., "Reductio ad absurdum: the Kapo Trial judgements contribution to international criminal law jurisprudence and customary international law", *Criminal Law Forum*, vol. 24 (2013), pp. 235–258.

van den Herik, L., "Using custom to reconceptualize crimes against humanity", *in* S. Darcy and J. Powderly, eds., *Judicial Creativity at the International Criminal Tribunals*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 80–105.

———, "The decline of customary international law as a source of international criminal law", *in* C. Bradley, ed., *Custom's Future: International Law in a Changing World*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2016, pp. 230–252.

4. Customary international law on the use of force

Ambos, K. and Timmermann, A., "Terrorism and customary international law", *in* B. Saul, ed., *Research Handbook on International Law and Terrorism*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2014, pp. 20–38.

Banks, W. C. and Criddle, E. J., "Customary constraints on the use of force: article 51 with an American accent", *Leiden Journal of International Law*, vol. 29 (2016), pp. 67–93.

Brisibe, T. C., "Customary international law, arms control and the environment in outer space", *Chinese Journal of International Law*, vol. 8 (2009), pp. 375–393.

Cannizzaro, E. and Palchetti, P., eds., *Customary International Law and the Use of Force: A Methodological Approach*, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2005.

Constantinou, A., *The Right of Self-Defence under Customary International Law and Article 51 of the United Nations Charter*. Brussels, Bruylant, 2000.

Corten, O., *Le droit contre la guerre: L'interdiction du recours à la force en droit international contemporain*, 2nd ed. Paris, Pedone, 2014, pp. 9–63.

———, Dubuisson, F., "L'hypothèse d'une règle émergente fondant une intervention militaire sur une 'autorisation implicite' du Conseil de sécurité", RGDIP, vol. 104 (2000), pp. 873–910.

Koplow, D. A., "ASAT-isfaction: customary international law and the regulation of anti-satellite weapons", *Michigan Journal of International Law*, vol. 30 (2009), pp. 1187–1272.

Ruys, T., *"Armed Attack" and Article 51 of the UN Charter: Evolutions in Customary Law and Practice*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Schreiber, R. E., "Ascertaining *opinio juris* of States concerning norms involving the prevention of international terrorism: a focus on the U.N. process", *Boston University International Law Journal*, vol. 16 (1998), pp. 309–330.

Waldock, C. H. M., "The regulation of the use of force by individual States in international law", *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International* Law, vol. 81 (1952), pp. 451–517.

Wilmshurst, E., "The crime of aggression: custom, treaty and prospects for international prosecution", *in* I. Buffard *et al.*, eds., *International Law Between Universalism and Fragmentation: Festschrift in Honour of Gerhard Hafner*, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2008, pp. 603–623.

5. Customary international law of treaties

Corten O., Klein P., eds., *The Vienna Conventions on the Law of Treaties: A Commentary*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011.

Distefano G., Gaggioli G. and Hêche A., eds., *La convention de Vienne de 1978 sur la succession d'États en matière de traités: commentaire article par article et études thématiques*. Brussels, Bruylant, 2016.

Sinclair I., "The scope of the Convention and its relationship to customary law", *in* I. Sinclair, *The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties*, 2nd ed., Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1984, pp. 1–28.

Vierdag, E.W., "The law governing treaty relations between parties to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and States not Party to the Convention", AJIL, vol. 76 (1982), pp. 779–801.

6. Customary international law of State immunity

Bring, O.E., "The impact of developing states on international customary law concerning protection of foreign property", *Scandinavian Studies in Law*, vol. 24 (1980), pp. 97–132.

Cuniberti, G., "Droit international coutumier et régime de l'immunité diplomatique", *Journal du droit international*, vol. 2 (2012), pp. 668–676.

Vylegzhanin, A. N., Churilina, N. A., "Международно-правовые основания юрисдикционного иммунитета государств" ["International legal bases of jurisdictional immunity of States"], *Moscow Journal of International Law*, vol. 98 (2015), pp. 35–47.

7. Customary international law and diplomatic immunities

Pedretti, R., *Immunity of Heads of State and State Officials for International Crimes*. Leiden, Brill, 2015.

Wood, M., "The immunity of official visitors", *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law*, vol. 16 (2012), pp. 35–98.

8. Customary international law of international responsibility

Brugnatelli, S., "Human rights judicial and semi-judicial bodies and customary international law on State responsibility", *in* N. Boschiero et al, eds., *International Courts and The Development of International Law: Essays in Honour of Tullio Treves*, The Hague, T.M.C., Asser Press, 2013, pp. 475–487.

Crawford, J., *State responsibility: The General Part*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Verdier, P.-H., "Cooperative States: international relations, State responsibility and the problem of custom", *Virginia Journal of International Law*, vol. 42 (2002), pp. 839–867.

Wood, M., "'Weighing' the articles on responsibility of international organizations" *in* M. Ragazzi, ed., *Responsibility of International Organizations. Essays in Memory of Sir Ian Brownlie*, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2013, pp. 55–66.

9. Customary international law of the sea

Arrow, D.W., "The customary norm process and the deep seabed, ocean development and international law", *Journal of Marine Affairs*, vol. 9 (1981), pp. 1–59.

Bangert, K., "Internal waters: customary rules of the extension of internal waters", *Nordic Journal of International Law*, vol. 61 (1992), pp. 43–60.

Bernhardt, R., "Verfall und Neubilding von Gewohnheitsrecht im Meeresvölkerrecht", *in* H. P. Ipsen and K. H. Necker, eds., *Recht über See. Festschift für Rolf Stöder zum 70. Geburtstag am 22.4.1979*, Hamburg, Springer, 1979, pp. 155–166.

Bernhardt, R., "Custom and treaty in the law of the sea", *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law*, vol. 205 (1987), pp. 247–330.

Charney, J. I., "The Antarctic system and customary international law", *in* F. Francioni and T. Scovazzi, eds., *International Law for Antarctica*, The Hague, Kluwer Law International, 1996, pp. 51–101.

Chigara, B., "The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea and customary international law", *Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review*, vol. 22 (2000), pp. 433–452.

Hutchinson, D. N., "The seaward limit to continental shelf jurisdiction in customary international law", BYBIL, vol. 56 (1985), pp. 111–188.

Jiménez de Aréchaga, E., "Customary international law and the Conference on the Law of the Sea", *in* J. Makarczyk, ed., *Essays in International Law in Honour of Judge Manfred Lachs*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1984, pp. 575–585.

Larson, D. L., "Conventional, customary, and consensual law in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea", *Ocean Development and International Law*, vol. 25 (1994), pp. 75–85.

Laylin, J. G., "Emerging customary law of the sea", *International Lawyer*, vol. 10 (1976), pp. 669–680.

Le Floch, G., "La coutume dans la jurisprudence de la Cour Internationale de Justice en Droit de la Mer", *Revue juridique de l'Ouest*, vol. 14 (2001), pp. 535–573.

MacRae, L. M., "Customary international law and the United Nations' Law of the Sea Treaty", *California Western International Law Journal*, vol. 13 (1983), pp. 181–222.

Mahmoudi, S., "Customary international law and transit passage", *Ocean Development and International Law*, vol. 20 (1989), pp. 157–174.

Peschurov, I. S., "Режим дна Северного Ледовитого океана согласно международному обычному праву", *Moscow Journal of International Law*, vol. 95(2014), pp. 145–170.

Roach, J. A., "Today's customary international law of the sea", *Ocean Development and International Law*, vol. 45 (2014), pp. 239–259.

Ruiz Fabri, H., "Règles coutumières générales et droit international fluvial", AFDI, vol. 36 (1990), pp. 818–842.

Schwabach, A., "The United Nations Convention on the Law of Non-navigational Uses of International Watercourses, customary international law, and the interests of developing upper riparians", *Texas International Law Journal*, vol. 33 (1998), pp. 257–279.

Schweisfurth, T., "The influence of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea on international customary law", *Heidelberg Journal of International Law*, vol. 43 (1983), pp. 566–584.

Slouka, Z. J., *International Custom and the Continental Shelf: A Study in the Dynamics of Customary Rules of International Law*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1968.

Sohn, L. B., "The law of the sea: customary international law developments", *American University Law Review*, vol. 34 (1985), pp. 271–280.

Talaie, F., "Final chapter in a conflict over the breadth of the territorial sea: recognition of the twelve nautical mile limit as declaratory of customary international law", *Indian Journal of International Law*, vol. 36 (1996), pp. 36–63.

Treves, T., "Appunti sull'influenza sull diritto consetudinario della Terza Conferenza delle Nazioni Unite sul diritto del mare", in *Studi in onore di Giuseppe Sperduti*, Milan, Giuffrè, 1984, pp. 333–343.

———, "Notes on transit passage through straits and customary law", *in* A. Bos and H. Siblesz, eds., *Realism in Law-Making: Essays in International Law in Honour of Willem Riphagen*, Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1986, pp. 247–259.

———, "Codification du droit international et pratique des Etats dans le droit de la mer", *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law*, vol. 223 (1990), pp. 9–302.

———, and X. Hinrichs, "The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea and customary international law"/"Le Tribunal international du droit de la mer et le droit international coutumier", *in* L. Lijnzaad and Council of Europe, eds., *The Judge and International Custom*, Leiden, Brill Nijhoff, 2016, pp. 25–45.

10. Customary international law and outer space

Danilenko, G. M., "Space activities and customary law of environmental protection", *in* K. H. Böckstiegel, ed., *Environmental Aspects of Activities in Outer Space: State of the Law and Measures of Protection*, Cologne, Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1990, pp. 169–180.

Frowein, J. A., "Customary international law and general principles concerning environmental protection in outer space", *in* K. H. Böckstiegel, ed., *Environmental Aspects of Activities in Outer Space: State of Law and Measures of Protection*, Cologne, Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1990, pp. 163–167.

Jennings, R. "Customary law and general principles of law as sources of space law", *in* K. H. Böckstiegel, ed., *Environmental Aspects of Activities in Outer Space: State of Law and Measures of Protection*, Cologne, Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1990, pp. 149–152.

Kolosov, Y. M. and Yuzbashyan, M. R., "Вклад российской (советской) юриспруденции в становление и развитие международного космического права", *Moscow Journal of International Law*, vol. 98 (2015), pp. 12–31.

Marcoff, M. G., "Sources du droit international de l'espace", *Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law*, vol. 168 (1980), pp. 9–122.

Rauschning, D., "Customary international law and general principles of international law concerning the protection of outer space from pollution?", *in* K. H. Böckstiegel, ed., *Environmental Aspects of Activities in Outer Space: State of Law and Measures of Protection*, Cologne, Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1990, pp. 181–186.

Vereshchetin, V. S. and G. M. Danilenko, "Custom as a source of international law of outer space", *Journal of Space Law*, vol. 13 (1985), pp. 22–35.

11. Customary international law and the environment

Bodansky, D., "Customary (and not so customary) international environmental law", *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, vol. 3 (1995), pp. 105–119.

Brownlie, I., "A survey of international customary rules of environmental protection" *Natural Resources Journal*, vol. 13 (1973), pp. 179–189.

Del Lujan Flores, M., "The scope of customary international law on the question of liability and compensation for environmental damage", *in* N. Al-Nauimi and R. Meese, eds., *International Legal Issues Arising under the United Nations Decade of International Law*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1995, pp. 237–271.

Dupuy, P. M., "Overview of the existing customary legal regime regarding international pollution", *in* D. B. Magraw, ed., *International Law and Pollution*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991, pp. 61–89.

Kiss, A., "La contribution de la Conférence de Rio de Janeiro au développement du droit international coutumier", *in* N. Al-Nauimi and R. Meese, eds., *International Legal Issues Arising under the United Nations Decade of International Law*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1995, pp. 1079–1092.

McIntyre, O., "The role of customary rules and principles of international environmental law in the protection of shared international freshwater resources", *Natural Resources Journal*, vol. 46 (2006), pp. 157–210.

12. Customary international law and international investment

Al Faruque, A., "Creating customary international law through bilateral investment treaties: a critical appraisal", *Indian Journal of International Law*, vol. 44 (2004), pp. 292–318.

Alvarez, J. E., "A bit on custom", *Journal of International Law and Politics*, vol. 42 (2009), pp. 17–80.

Alvarez-Jiménez, A., "Minimum standard of treatment of aliens, fair and equitable treatment of foreign investors, customary international law and the Diallo case before the International Court of Justice", *Journal of World Investment and Trade*, vol. 9 (2008), pp. 51–70.

Alvarez-Jiménez, A., "Foreign investment protection and regulatory failures as States' contribution to the state of necessity under customary international law: a new approach based on the complexity of Argentina's 2001 crisis, *Journal of International Arbitration*, vol. 27 (2010), pp. 141–177.

Audit, M. and Forteau, M., "Investment arbitration without BIT: toward a foreign investment customary based arbitration?", *Journal of International Arbitration*, vol. 29 (2012), pp. 581–604.

Congyan, C., "International investment treaties and the formation, application and transformation of customary international law rules", *Chinese Journal of International Law*, vol. 7 (2008), pp. 659–679.

D'Aspremont, J., "International customary investment law: story of a paradox", *in* T. Gazzini and E. De Brabandere, eds., *International Investment Law: The Sources of Rights and Obligations*, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2012, pp. 5–47.

Dolzer, R. and von Walter, A., "Fair and equitable treatment—lines of jurisprudence on customary law", *in* F. Ortino et *al.*, eds., *Investment Treaty Law: Current Issues II*, London, British Institute of International and Comparative Law, 2007, pp. 99–115.

Dumberry, P., "Are BITs Representing the 'new' customary international law in international investment law?", *Pennsylvania State International Law Review*, vol. 28 (2010), pp. 675–702.

Dumberry, P., "The legal standing of shareholders before arbitral tribunals: has any rule of customary international law crystallised?", *Michigan State Journal of International Law*, vol. 18 (2010), pp. 353–374.

Dumberry, P., *The Formation and Identification of Rules of Customary International Law in International Investment Law*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Forteau, M., "La contribution au développement du droit international général de la jurisprudence arbitrale relative aux investissements étrangers", *Anuário Brasileiro de Direito Internacional*, vol. 4 (2009), pp. 11–39.

Gazzini, T., "The role of customary international law in the field of foreign investment", *Journal of World Investment and Trade*, vol. 8 (2008), pp. 691–715.

Kill, T., "Don't cross the streams: past and present overstatement of customary international law in connection with conventional fair and equitable treatment obligations", *Michigan Law Review*, vol. 106 (2008), pp. 853–880.

Kishoiyian, B., "The utility of bilateral investment treaties in the formulation of customary international law", *Northwestern Journal of International Law and Business*, vol. 14 (1993), pp. 327–375.

Lee, L. J., "*Barcelona Traction* in the 21st Century: Revisiting its Customary and Policy Underpinnings 35 Years Later", *Stanford Journal of International Law*, vol. 42 (2006), pp. 237–289.

McLachlan, C., "Investment treaties and general international law", *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 57 (2008), pp. 361–401.

Milano, E., "The investment arbitration between Italy and Cuba: the application of customary international law under scrutiny", *Law and Procedure of International Courts and Tribunals*, vol. 11 (2012), pp. 499–524.

Orrego Vicuña, F., "Customary international law in action: from the international minimum standard to fair and equitable treatment" *in* H. P. Hestermeyer *et al*., eds., *Coexistence, Cooperation and Solidarity: Liber Amicorum Rüdiger Wolfrum*, vol. I, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 2012, pp. 181–197.

Porterfield, M. C., "State practice and the (purported) obligation under customary international law to provide compensation for regulatory expropriations", *North Carolina Journal of International Law and Commercial Regulation*, vol. 37 (2011), pp. 159–197.

Reisman, W. M., "Canute confronts the tide: States versus tribunals and the evolution of the minimum standard in customary international law", *ICSID Review*, vol. 30 (2015), pp. 616–634.

Viñuales, J. E, "Customary law in investment regulation", *Italian Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 23 (2013), pp. 23–48.

13. Customary international law and international finance

Bohoslavsky, J. P., Y. Li, and M. Sudreau, "Emerging customary international law in sovereign debt governance?", *Capital Markets Law Journal*, vol. 9 (2013), pp. 55–72.

Dodge, W. S, "Corporate liability under customary international law", *Georgetown Journal of International Law*, vol. 43 (2012), pp. 1045–1051.

Lim, C. L., "The strange vitality of custom in the international protection of contracts, property, and commerce", *in* C. Bradley, ed., *Custom's Future: International Law in a Changing World*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2016, pp. 205–229.

Thomas, S., "Customary international law and State taxation of corporate income: the case for the separate accounting method", *Berkley Journal of International Law*, vol. 14 (1996), pp. 99–136.

Waibel, M., "Out of thin air?: Tracing the origins of the UNCTAD Principles in Customary International Law", *in* C. Esposito *et al*., eds., *Sovereign Financing and International Law: The UNCTAD Principles on Responsible Sovereign Lending and Borrowing*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013, pp. 87–112.

Zamora, S., "Is there customary international economic law?", GYBIL, vol. 32 (1989), pp. 9–42

14. Customary international trade law

Cook, G., *A Digest of WTO Jurisprudence on Public International Law Concepts and Principles*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2015, pp. 237–241.

Zin, S.M., and A.U.S. Kazi, "The role of customary international law in the World Trade Organisation (WTO) disputes settlement mechanism", *International Journal of Public Law and Policy*, vol. 2 (2012), pp. 229–262.