

International Law and the Recognition of Israeli Sovereignty in the Golan Heights

Prepared written testimony of

Prof. Eugene Kontorovich
Northwestern University School of Law

Hearing before the
U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Oversight
Subcommittee on National Security

July 17, 2018

Chairman DeSantis, Ranking Member Lynch, and honorable members of the Subcommittee, I am honored to be invited to testify before you today on the potential recognition by the United States of Israeli sovereignty over the Golan Heights. I will focus my testimony on the international legality of Israel's sovereign claims, and possible U.S. recognition, and add a few words about the errors of the foreign policy conventional wisdom in these matters.

I am a professor at Northwestern Pritzker School of Law, but am moving to George Mason University's Antonin Scalia School of Law next month. I also head the international law department at the Kohelet Policy Forum, a Jerusalem think tank. I have researched and written extensively on the legal and diplomatic aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict, with articles published in major peer reviewed publications. I have testified numerous times before Congress, including this committee, as well as the Israeli Knesset, and the European Parliament.

I. The Legality of defensive conquest.

The widely-repeated view that recognizing Israeli sovereignty over the Golan Heights would be contrary to international law is based on one fundamental assumption: that at least since the adoption of U.N. Charter, international law prohibits *any* acquisition of foreign territory by force. While such a formulation of the rule is largely accurate, it omits crucial exceptions quite relevant to the case of the Golan Heights.

Whatever the current status of an absolute prohibition on territorial change resulting from war, there was certainly no such blanket prohibition in 1967, when the territory came under Israeli control. At the time, international law only prohibited acquisition of force in *illegal or aggressive* wars. This is evident from the source of the prohibition in the UN Charter, post-Charter state

practice, and the understandings of international jurists at the time. There is simply no precedent or authoritative source for forbidding defensive conquest in 1967.

The U.N. Charter prohibits war for most purposes. When the use of force is illegal, it is natural to conclude that any territorial gains from such aggression cannot be recognized as well. Thus the illegality of conquest arises from the presumptive illegality of the use of force. But crucially, the U.N. Charter does not make *all* war illegal. Indeed, it expressly reaffirms the legality of a defensive war. Since defensive war is not illegal, it follows that the defender's territorial gains from such a war would not be illegal.

A. Defensive conquest circa 1967

The fundamental legal question is whether the law as it stood in 1967 clearly barred territorial changes resulting from the legal use of force. To answer that, we must see how the state practice, and leading jurists, answered that question after the adoption of the U.N Charter and before 1967.¹

1. *The International Law Commission and leading scholars*

The legality of defensive conquest was endorsed by the International Law Commission, a body created by the General Assembly, and tasked with providing fuller explanations of the legal significance of the U.N. Charter and related documents. Composed of some of the most distinguished jurists of the time, its work in the immediate post-War period is seen as providing highly authoritative explanations of the UN Charter. In the ILC's drafting of their influential Draft Convention on the Rights and Duties of States (1949) and Draft Code of Offenses Against the Peace and Security of Mankind (1954), the question of the permissible scope of territorial conquest came up repeatedly.

The ILC repeatedly recognized that not all territorial changes in war are illegitimate. Not all annexations were bad, the U.S. delegate argued. All agreed that post-war frontier adjustments were justified to help protect the victim of aggression. There was broad consensus territorial change was only impermissible in a war of "aggression." Thus the final document provided that states have a duty "to refrain from recognizing any territorial acquisition by another State acting in violation" of the U.N. Charter or other international law rules. But Israel's use of force in 1967 was defensive – certainly the U.S. is entitled to view it as such – and thus explicitly lawful under the Charter. Thus there is no obligation to refrain from recognizing it.

Furthermore, the leading international law treatises immediately prior to 1967 reveal a disagreement between leading authorities such as Hersch Lauterpacht and Robert Jennings on whether defensive conquest was proper under the UN Charter. The majority opinion seems to side with the permissive view, but both sides acknowledged that the matter was disputed, and a clear rule had not emerged.

¹ The evidence and analysis presented here draws heavily from my article, *Resolution 242 Revisited: New Evidence on the Required Scope of Israeli Withdrawal*, 16 CHICAGO JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW 127 (2015), where a fuller presentation, and citations to the relevant sources, can be found.

2. *State practice, 1945-67*

The views of the U.N.'s International Law Commission and most scholars in finding defensive conquest as lawful under the U.N. Charter should not be surprising given that it simply reflected broad state practice under the Charter. In the years immediately following the adoption of the Charter, many of the victorious Allies took territory of the defeated nations. All these annexations have been recognized, without controversy by the U.S. and international community. To mention only a few of these instances, Holland unilaterally annexed parts of Germany in 1949; Greece and Yugoslavia took parts of Italy; the U.S.S.R and Poland annexed large parts of Germany. The ILC in its deliberations specifically addressed the legal basis for these annexations: because the underlying use of force was lawful (defensive), the acquisition of territory can be permitted.

Nor did this practice stop with the immediate aftermath of WWII in the 1940s. At the close of the Korean War in 1953, the Republic of Korea controlled and claimed sovereignty of portions of territory north of the pre-war boundary at the 38th parallel. Nonetheless, the U.S. and the international community has not seen any obstacle to recognizing Seoul's sovereignty over this territory. Most recently, both Congress² and the Executive³ have recognized Israeli sovereignty over a unified Jerusalem, though parts of the city, like the Golan Heights, only came under Israeli control in 1967. (To be sure, Israel has several other legal grounds for asserting sovereignty over Jerusalem aside from defensive conquest, such as prior title.⁴)

An examination of state practice and international legal opinion shows that international law did not prohibit, and may even have affirmatively sanctioned, defensive conquest as of 1967. The lack of clarity is itself important, because in international law there is a meta-principle dealing with situations where it is not clear whether a rule has emerged. Known as the *Lotus* Principle, the rule is that when it is not clear whether an international law rule has emerged, states remain free to act.⁵ That is, the burden of proof is on those seeking to demonstrate the existence of a rule that would limit sovereign action. That which is not clearly prohibited is permitted.⁶

It is not necessary to consider whether any norm prohibiting defensive conquest emerged subsequently to Israel's actual conquest of these territories. Under the doctrine of intertemporal law, subsequent developments in international law do not change the status of developments that occurred before those changes. That is, international law is non-retroactive, and this is most emphatically true for questions of territorial sovereignty and conquest, where any other principle would lead to chaos in international relations.⁷

Finally, it must be observed that there are other cases where territorial annexation resulting from the use of force has resulted in widely-recognized changes in sovereignty *even absent any*

² See Jerusalem Embassy Act, Pub. L. 104-45 (Nov. 8, 1995),

³ See Eugene Kontorovich, *America Recognizes One Jerusalem*, WALL STREET JOURNAL (May 12, 2018).

⁴ See Avi Bell & Eugene Kontorovich, *Palestine, Uti Possidetis Juris and the Borders of Israel*, 58 ARIZONA LAW REVIEW 633-92 (2016).

⁵ S.S. "Lotus", France v Turkey, Judgment, (1927) PCIJ Series A no 10, ICGJ 248 (PCIJ 1927), 7th September 1927.

⁶ See Daniel Bodansky, *Non Liqueur and the Rule of Law*, in INTERNATIONAL LAW AT THE CLOSE OF THE 20TH CENTURY: THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS ADVISORY OPINION, 161 (Cambridge University Press, 1999).

⁷ See MALCOLM SHAW, INTERNATIONAL LAW, 8TH ED. 377 (Cambridge 2017).

plausible claim of self-defense. Of course, Israel's control of the Golan did not arise in war of conquest or aggression, but one of defense and necessity. The discussion here of offensive conquest is only intended to underscore the point that one cannot take statements about non-recognition requirements as absolutes.

For example, the U.S. and the international community recognizes the Socialist Republic of Vietnam as sovereign over both north and south Vietnam, though of course it conquered much of it in an aggressive war against the Republic of Vietnam. Yet when the U.S. restored diplomatic relations with Hanoi under President Clinton, it fully recognized its sovereignty over the entire South. In another famous example, India invaded and annexed the sovereign Portuguese territory of Goa and other territories in 1961. While the United States strongly condemned this action, and scholars widely regard it is illegal, the international community eventually came to accept Indian sovereignty over the territory.

The Vietnamese and Goan cases do not fit in any neat doctrinal boxes: their conquest was certainly illegal. But international law clearly allows, in practice, for some flexibility or nuance in applying the rule against offensive conquest, though such exceptions must be quite narrow. For example, the main argument in favor of India turned on the illegitimacy of Portuguese rule. That argument would seem to apply *a fortiori* to Syria, a state whose extraordinary actions over the past six years have attached to it a level of international illegitimacy that is hard to match.

B. Policy arguments

Many contemporary scholars argue against defensive conquest on policy grounds. Allowing for so-called "defensive conquest" would encourage countries to undertake aggressive campaigns of conquest under the pretext of self-defense. But self-defense is already clearly authorized by the U.N. Charter, and is frequently invoked as a pretext by aggressors. It is up to members of the international community, including the U.S., to exercise their judgement as to whether the underlying use of force is lawful. If defense cannot in practice be distinguished from aggression, then this is a failing of the entire U.N. Charter. The Charter's entire security system depends on being able to distinguish between aggression and self-defense.⁸

But the policy arguments for allowing for defensive conquest are compelling. Without such a possibility, an attempted aggressor is insured against significant negative consequences. Territorial expansionism becomes a no-lose game, because aggressors will always at least break even. In short, the lack of any self-help sanctions serves as a license and inducement to aggressors, especially in the absence of a unified international security regime of the kind the Charter originally envisaged.

Furthermore, it is hard to believe that a rogue regime that would not respect the basic norm against aggression would be marginally deterred by a corollary prohibiting its acquisition of force through such unlawful action. In practice, what stops aggressors from engaging in conquest (or emplacing puppet regimes) is forcible resistance by the victim, with backing by the

⁸ Thus the U.S. and other countries distinguish between the lawfulness of the circumstances under which the Golan fell under Israeli control, and, for example, the circumstances under which Crimea fell under Russian control. The ability to make that distinction suggests it can be extended to the consequences of the control.

international community. A rule against defensive conquest only works to limit the scope of allowable resistance by the victim state.

Many would say that Israel's ongoing de facto control of the Golan is lawful, but its sovereignty cannot be recognized. Again, this effectively punishes the victim. Even a rule allowing a defender to occupy territory seized in a defensive war indefinitely (until a genuinely peaceable regime emerges on the other side) - but without asserting sovereignty - is costly to the defender. This means the defending state controls the territory for decades, investing in its infrastructure, supporting its population, and so forth, but must be willing to forfeit all this at a moment's notice. One might say a reasonable and equitable rule would place the fault for failing to secure peace on the aggressor state after some period of time -certainly after 50 years - and thus waive any residual claim it has.

II. The disproven foreign policy consensus on Jerusalem and the Golan

Even discussing Israeli sovereignty over the Golan purely from a legal perspective goes sharply against the grain of consensus among Middle East experts. The conventional view is that Israel must at some point return the Golan Heights to the Syrian Arab Republic. Many will likely argue that recognition would harm U.S. relations with the Arab world, or be "destabilizing." Thus in closing, a few observations are in order about the value of the accepted wisdom in these matters.

It is useful to recall the debate over moving the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem, about which I had the honor to testify before this committee less than a year ago.⁹ The conventional foreign policy wisdom at the time was that such an action would lead to an eruption of violence in Jerusalem, and threaten the security of U.S. missions and citizens around the world. Those predictions proved, thankfully, spectacularly wrong, in a way that should cast serious doubt on the predictive power of Middle East expertise.

The same degree of systematic error can be observed in the foreign policy establishment's recommendations regarding Israel and Syria. Less than a decade ago, the conventional wisdom of the foreign policy establishment was that Israel should return the Golan Heights to Syria in a peace deal.

Not only would an Israeli withdrawal make peace between the two countries, the story went, it would get Damascus to break its alliance with Iran. The views of Amb. Martin Indyk in a 2010 New York Times op-ed were typical:

*Today, nothing could better help Obama to isolate Iran than for Netanyahu to offer to cede the Golan. . . Netanyahu must make a choice: take on the president of the United States, or take on his right wing.*¹⁰

This position was standard. Indeed, never were experts more confident that Assad was a partner for peace than in the years just prior to his campaign of systematic ethnic cleansing and gassing of his own population. In 2009, a blue-ribbon panel that that included Zbigniew Brzezinski,

⁹ *U.S. Policy on Israel Held Hostage by Threats and Outdated Arguments*, testimony before the U.S. House Committee on Oversight, Subcommittee on National Security (Nov. 7, 2017).

¹⁰ Martin S. Indyk, *When Your Best Friend Gets Angry*, NEW YORK TIMES (April 29, 2010).

Chuck Hagel, Lee Hamilton, Brent Scowcroft and others released a report about the “last chance” for peace. Among other things, it recommended that the U.S push for a full Israeli withdrawal from the Golan to “fundamentally transform the regional landscape and ultimately detach Damascus from its uneasy strategic partnership with Iran.”¹¹

In the same vein, Richard Haass, the head of the Council on Foreign Relations, painted this rosy picture:

Israel's security could be further buttressed by demilitarizing the territory returned to Syria. Technology could provide early-warning systems. Peacekeepers (possibly American) could be stationed there, much as they are in the Sinai to buttress the peace between Israel and Egypt. And the Syrian leadership is sufficiently strong that it could live up to security commitments.”¹²

Today, every aspect of the assumptions behind these suggestions has been entirely discredited. Firstly, Assad is not and never was a peacemaker. The notion that he would abide by a deal with Israel any more than the countless ceasefires, chemical weapons agreements and treaties, and basic international commitments that he has flouted in the past seven years strains credulity.

Second, his alliance with Iran is not a bad relationship he stumbled into, but rather his greatest strategic asset. Iran has ensured the survival of his regime and family when most others countries would turn away in disgust: that is not an alliance he would give up for the Golan.

As for peacekeepers in a possible peace deal, the U.N. peacekeepers already stationed in the Golan fled their positions at the outbreak of the civil war. The demilitarized zone between Israel and Syria – the fruit of earlier diplomatic accords - has been remilitarized by both Assad and rebel groups. Nor have U.S. allies in Syria, such as the Kurds, been able to rely much on direct U.S. backing when the going gets tough. Thus the peace deal widely favored just a few years ago by leading policy experts would have expanded Assad’s power and threatened Israel – for naught.

The profound and demonstrable error of the foreign policy consensus in these matters – from Jerusalem to the Golan – is something that must be taken into account going forward. It suggests that in charting future policy, the U.S. should not be guided by the same hollow certitudes. In the wake of these serious misjudgments by leading Middle East professionals, it would behoove the U.S. to look in totally different directions for solutions. Just as many said “now is not the right time” to move the embassy, a similar refrain will be heard about the Golan. But now – in the wake of falsely positive predictions about the nature of the Assad regime and falsely negative ones about the consequences of moving the embassy to Israel – it is the right time to seek entirely new paradigms in these matters. Recognizing Israeli sovereignty over the Golan is a start.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to address these issues, and I welcome your questions.

¹¹ U.S./Middle East Peace Project, *A Last Chance for A Two-State Israel-Palestine Agreement*.

¹² Richard H. Haas, [Obama Needs to Talk to Damascus Now](#), NEWSWEEK, (Feb. 27,2009).

**Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
Witness Disclosure Requirement — “Truth in Testimony”**

Pursuant to House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(5) and Committee Rule 16(a), non-governmental witnesses are required to provide the Committee with the information requested below in advance of testifying before the Committee. You may attach additional sheets if you need more space.

Name:

1. Please list any entity you are representing in your testimony before the Committee and briefly describe your relationship with each entity.					
Name of Entity	Your relationship with the entity				
2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) you or the entity or entities listed above have received since January 1, 2015, that are related to the subject of the hearing.					
Recipient of the grant or contact (you or entity above)	Grant or Contract Name	Agency	Program	Source	Amount
3. Please list any payments or contracts (including subcontracts) you or the entity or entities listed above have received since January 1, 2015 from a foreign government, that are related to the subject of the hearing.					
Recipient of the grant or contact (you or entity above)	Grant or Contract Name	Agency	Program	Source	Amount

I certify that the information above and attached is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signature Eugene Kontorovich

Date: _____

Page ____ of ____

Prof. Eugene Kontorovich
Northwestern University School of Law
375 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, IL 60611
Ph: 312.503.0429
e-kontorovich@law.northwestern.edu

POSITIONS HELD

George Mason University, Antonin Scalia Law School, Professor of Law, Aug. 2018 – present;
Assistant Professor, Jan. 2003 – May 2007.

Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law, *Professor*, 2011 – Aug. 2018; *Associate Professor*, June 2007-11; *Visiting Professor*, Fall 2006.

Courses taught: Constitutional Law; Federal Jurisdiction; Public International Law.

University of Chicago Law School, *Visiting Professor*, 2005-07.

Judge Richard Posner, U.S. Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit, *Law Clerk*, Aug. 2001 – Aug. 2002.

Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz, L.L.P., *Summer Associate*, 2000.

The Wall Street Journal, *Assistant Features Editor*, editorial page, April - July 1998.

The New York Post, *Editorial Board Member*, March 1997 – Feb. 1998.

Forward, *Contributing Editor*, 1996 – 2000; service in New York, Washington, Israel bureaus

EDUCATION

University of Chicago Law School, J.D. with High Honors, June 2001.

- Awards: Order of the Coif; Bradley Fellowship in Law and Econ., 2000-01; Institute for Humane Studies Fellowship, 2000-2001; Bradley Fellowship in Law & Governance, 1999-2000.
- Member, *University of Chicago Law Review*, vols. 67 & 68.
- Research Assistant, Profs. Richard Posner and William Landes.

University of Chicago, B.A., with General Honors and Special Departmental Honors, Dec. 1996.

AWARDS & FELLOWSHIPS

Paul M. Bator Prize (2012), The Federalist Society (awarded annually to law professor under age of forty for excellence in legal scholarship and teaching, and who has made a significant public impact)

Institute for Advanced Study, *Member*, School of Social Sciences, 2011-12

Lady Davis Visiting Professorship, Hebrew University (2013-14).

PUBLICATIONS

Books

ECONOMICS ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW (editor) (with Francesco Parisi) (EDWARD ELGAR 2016)

Academic Articles & Book Chapters

Posner's Pragmatic Justiciability Jurisprudence, 85 UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO L. REV. __ (symposium) (forthcoming, 2019)

The Parochial Uses of Universal Jurisdiction, 94 NOTRE DAME L. REV. __ (forthcoming, 2018)

Jus Post Bellum of Illegally Implanted Settler Populations, in JUS POST BELLUM AND THE JUSTICE OF PEACE, CARSTEN STAHN ET AL. (EDS.) (under contract, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS) (forthcoming, 2018)

Unsettled: A Global Study of Settlements in Occupied Territory, 9 JOURNAL OF LEGAL ANALYSIS 285-350 (2017) [peer reviewed]

Palestine, Uti Possidetis Juris and the Borders of Israel, 58 ARIZONA LAW REVIEW 633-92 (2016) (with Abraham Bell)

International Decisions: In re Arctic Sunrise (Netherlands v. Russia), 110 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW 96 (2016)

Economic Dealings With Occupied Territories, 53 COLUMBIA JOURNAL TRANSNATIONAL LAW 584 (2015)

Resolution 242 Revisited: New Evidence on the Required Scope of Israeli Withdrawal, 16 CHICAGO JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW 127 (2015)

Why Judges Always Vote, 43 INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF LAW AND ECONOMICS 190-99 (2015) (with Tonja Jacobi) [peer reviewed]

Pirate "Globalisation": Dividing Responsibility Among Countries, Companies, and Criminals, in DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES IN INTERNATIONAL LAW, ANDRE NOLLKAEMPER & DOV JACOBS, EDS. pp. 386-403 (Cambridge U. Press 2015)

The Problems of Pirate Punishment, in PROSECUTING MARITIME PIRACY: DOMESTIC SOLUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL CRIME, MICHAEL SCHARF, ET. AL., EDS. pp. 299-319 (Cambridge U. Press 2015)

When Gravity Fails: Israeli Settlements and Admissibility in the International Criminal Court, 47 ISRAEL LAW REVIEW 379-99 (2014) [peer reviewed]

Three International Courts and Their Constitutional Problems, 99 CORNELL LAW REV. 1353-86 (2014)

Kiobel Surprise: Unexpected by Scholars but Consistent With International Trends, 89 NOTRE DAME LAW REVIEW 1671 (2014)

Israel/Palestine – The ICC's Uncharted "Territory," 11 JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE 979-99 (2013) [peer-reviewed]

International Decisions: United States v. Dire, 107 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW 644-49 (2013)

Discretion, Delegation and Defining in the Constitution's Law of Nations Clause, 106 NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW 1675-51 (2012)

A Tort Statute, With Aliens and Pirates, 107 NORTHWESTERN U. LAW REV. COLLOQUY 100 (2012)

The Piracy Prosecution Paradox Political and Procedural Problems with Enforcing Order on the High Seas, 13.2 GEORGETOWN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (2012) [peer-reviewed]

Piracy, in NATIONAL SECURITY LAW IN THE NEWS: A GUIDE FOR JOURNALISTS, SCHOLARS AND POLICYMAKERS, Timothy McNulty, et. al., eds. (ABA 2012)

An Economic Analysis of Fact Witness Payment, 3 JOURNAL OF LEGAL ANALYSIS 139-64 (with Ezra Friedman) (2011) [peer-reviewed]

An Empirical Examination of Universal Jurisdiction for Piracy, 104 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW 326 (with Steven Art) (2010) [peer-reviewed]

"A Guantanamo on the Sea": The Difficulty of Dealing With Pirates and Terrorists, 98 CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW 234 (2010)

The Constitutionality of International Courts: The Forgotten Precedent of Slave Trade Tribunals, 158 UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA LAW REVIEW 39 (2009)

The "Define and Punish" Clause and the Limits of Universal Jurisdiction, 103 NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW 149 (2009)

International Decisions: United States v. Shi, 103 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW 734-40 (2009)

Beyond the Article I Horizon: Congress's Enumerated Powers and Universal Jurisdiction Over Drug Crimes, 93 MINNESOTA LAW REVIEW 1191 (2009)

The Inefficiency of Universal Jurisdiction, 2008 UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW 389-418 (2008)

Originalism and the Difficulties of History in Foreign Affairs, 53 ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY LAW JOURNAL 39-52 (2008)

What Standing is Good For, 93 VIRGINIA LAW REVIEW 1663 (2007)

Inefficient Customs in International Law, 48 WILLIAM & MARY LAW REVIEW 859-922 (2006)

Disrespecting the "Opinions of Mankind": International Law in Constitutional Interpretation, 8 GREEN BAG 2D 261 (2005)

The Constitution in Two Dimensions: A Transaction Cost Analysis of Constitutional Remedies, 91 VIRGINIA LAW REVIEW 1135-1198 (2005)

Implementing Sosa v. Alvarez-Machain: What Piracy Teaches About the Limits of the Alien Tort Statute, 80 NOTRE DAME LAW REVIEW 111 (2004)

Liability Rules for Constitutional Rights: The Case of Mass Detentions, 56 STANFORD LAW REVIEW 755 (2004)

The Piracy Analogy: Modern Universal Jurisdiction's Hollow Foundation, 45 HARVARD INTERNATIONAL LAW JOURNAL 183 (2004)

The Arab League Boycott and WTO Accession: Can Foreign Policy Excuse Discriminatory Sanctions? 4 CHICAGO JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW 283 (2003)

The Mitigation of Emotional Distress Damages, 68 UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW REVIEW 491 (2001)

Congressional testimony

U.S. Policy on Israel Held Hostage by Threats and Outdated Arguments, testimony before the U.S. House Committee on Oversight, Subcommittee on National Security (Nov. 7, 2017)

Two Recent Examples of Executive Undermining of Congress's Spending and Foreign Commerce Powers, testimony before the U.S. House Judiciary Committee, Task Force on Executive Overreach (May 12, 2016)

Economic Warfare Against Israel: Its Status in United States Law and International Trade Law, testimony before the U.S. House Committee on Oversight, Subcommittee on National Security (July 28, 2015)

The Palestinian ICC Bid and U.S. Interests, testimony before the U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East & North Africa Hearing (Feb. 4, 2015)

Reviews, white papers, etc.

Refugees and Return in Prolonged Occupations, 51 ISRAEL LAW REVIEW 63-70 (2018) (conference proceedings)

Avi Bell & Eugene Kontorovich, *Challenging the EU's Illegal Restrictions on Israeli Products in the World Trade Organization*, Kohelet Forum Policy Paper # 18 (Oct. 2015)

Can States Fund BDS?: Is banning the use of public money to support companies that boycott Israel unconstitutional and illegal?, TABLET MAGAZINE (July 13, 2015)

When Fasces Aren't Fascist: The Strange History of America's Federal Buildings, CITY JOURNAL 114-119 (Spring 2014)

EU's Grant Guidelines: A Legal and Policy Analysis, Kohelet Policy Forum Research Paper (with Avi Bell) (Oct. 2013)

Review of economic and philological books on piracy, 41 JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY HISTORY 624-27 (2011)

Equipment Articles for the Prosecution of Maritime Piracy, discussion paper for the One Earth Future Foundation (May 2010) [cited by Seychelles Supreme Court]

Introductory Note, *Exchange of Letters Between European Union and Kenya to Prosecute Pirates*, 48 INTERNATIONAL LEGAL MATERIALS 747-750 (2009)

International Legal Responses to Piracy off the Coast of Somalia, ASIL INSIGHTS, vol. 13, no. 2 (Feb. 6, 2009)

International Responses to Territorial Conquest, 102 AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW PROCEEDINGS 437-40 (2009)

Prosecute worldwide pirates, NATIONAL LAW JOURNAL 17 (May 11, 2009)

The Law of the Latke, GREEN BAG 2D 205-207 (2006)

War Powers, POLICY REVIEW 77 (April 2006) (review of JOHN YOO, THE POWERS OF WAR AND PEACE)

A to Zzz, LEGAL AFFAIRS pp. 18-19 (July/August 2003) (with David Lisitza) (critical essay on the lost charms of *Black's Law Dictionary*)

WORKS-IN-PROGRESS

Problems with the Paris Climate Accord as a Sole Executive Agreement

EU's "Differentiation" Policy and Discrimination in International Trade Law (with Avi Bell)

OCCASSIONAL ESSAYS & OP-EDS (SELECTED LIST)

Palestine, Uti Possidetis Juris and the Borders of Israel, 58 ARIZONA LAW REVIEW 633-92 (2016)

[Anti-Israel Activists Subvert a Scholarly Group](#), WALL STREET JOURNAL A17 (with Jesse Fried) Dec. 4, 2017)

Russia Recognizes Jerusalem as Israel's Capital. Why Can't the U.S.?, WALL STREET JOURNAL (May 14, 2017)

The states, the feds and climate change, NEW YORK DAILY NEWS (June 3, 2017)

[Did George Washington Take 'Emoluments'?](#), THE WALL STREET JOURNAL A13 (April 14, 2017)

[At the U.N., Only Israel Is an 'Occupying Power'](#), THE WALL STREET JOURNAL A15 (with Penny Grunseid) (Sept. 14, 2016)

[Boycotting Israel Isn't Free Speech](#), NEW YORK DAILY NEWS (June 11, 2016)

[Those Israel Boycotts Are Illegal](#), THE WALL STREET JOURNAL (with Steve Davidoff Solomon) (Dec. 2, 2015)

Europe Mislabeled Israel, NEW YORK TIMES A35 (Nov. 13, 2015)

Can States Fund BDS?, Tablet Magazine (July 13, 2015)

A Tale of Two Green Lines, CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION (Nov. 17, 2014)

Sweden's Unprincipled Stance on Recognition, JERUSALEM POST (Oct. 12, 2014) [also appeared in Swedish version, in DAGEN]

A Court's Collapse: The International Criminal Court gives up on its prosecution of Kenyan president Uhuru Kenyatta, NATIONAL REVIEW ONLINE (Sept. 15, 2014)

Crimea, International Law, and the West Bank, COMMENTARY 25-29 (June 2014)

The Other Crimes: Seizing territory isn't out of date, it's just conveniently ignored, LOS ANGELES TIMES A13 (March 24, 2014)

Legal 'standing': Obama's executive branch escape hatch, LOS ANGELES TIMES A24 (March 2, 2014)

Putin's Occupation Olympics, REUTERS NEWS SERVICE (Feb. 5, 2014)

The Case Against Early Voting, POLITICO MAGAZINE (with John McGinnis) (Jan. 29, 2014)

New EU/Morocco fisheries deal and its implications for Israel, JERUSALEM POST 16 (Dec. 10, 2013)

The Obamacare 'Fix' Is Illegal, POLITICO MAGAZINE (Nov. 22, 2013)

The EU is right about Western Sahara — which means it is wrong about Israel, GLOBAL POST (Nov. 21, 2013)

Africa's Undermining of the International Criminal Court, GEORGETOWN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS ONLINE (Oct. 29, 2013)

How the EU Directly Funds Settlements in Occupied Territory, JERUSALEM POST 13 (Sept. 29, 2013)

A Supreme Rebuke to Global Forum-Shopping, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL A21 (April 23, 2013)

UN vote: From 'occupation' to border dispute, JERUSALEM POST (Dec. 10, 2012)

Precedents, Pirates, and the Presumption Against Extraterritoriality (Symposium on *Kiobel v. Shell*), SCOTUSBLOG (July 10, 2012)

Prisoner trades and the case for Gitmo, LAWFARE: HARD NATIONAL SECURITY CHOICES (May 23, 2012)

Does the new anti-boycott law harm free speech?, JERUSALEM POST 15 (April 12, 2011)

Is Gaza Still Occupied?, JERUSALEM POST (with Paula Kweskin) (July 17, 2011)

The New Arab Tactic against Israel, NATIONAL REVIEW ONLINE (May 18, 2011)

'Impending diplomatic tsunami' is greatly exaggerated, JERUSALEM POST (April 12, 2011)

A Shining Target on a Hill That Nobody Tries to Hit, WALL STREET JOURNAL W9 (April 15, 2010)
[discussing compatibility of National Cathedral with First Amendment's Establishment Clause]

Why the Piracy Police Isn't Working, OPINIO JURIS (Feb. 10, 2009)

A Second Look at Kosovo, NEW YORK SUN (March 19, 2008)

Bitter Irony, NEW YORK SUN (Feb. 13, 2008)

A Man of His Word, review of THE GREAT SPEECHES OF ABBA EBAN, WORLD JEWISH DIGEST (Oct. 2007)

Naked Aggression: Sheba Farms and the Law, NEW YORK SUN 9 (Aug. 27, 2006).

Religious Radicals, WALL STREET JOURNAL W13 (July 22, 2005)

Reform strategy for Saudi Arabia, WASHINGTON TIMES B3 (August 1, 2004)

Severe and prolonged harm: Defining torture in international and U.S. law, WASHINGTON TIMES A21 (June 25, 2004).

Is this a good time to ask for Pollard's release, JERUSALEM POST B11 (Aug. 1, 2003).

Riyadh's WTO Outrage, NEW YORK POST 31 (December 26, 2002)

The ICC – Open and Shut, JERUSALEM POST B8 (May 10, 2002).

A Dubious Warning, NEW YORK POST 27 (January 3, 2002).

ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES

- Contributor, *Volokh Conspiracy* blog, hosted by Reason Magazine
- Head of International Law Department, Kohelet Policy Forum (Jerusalem, Israel)
- Editorial Board, Maritime Safety and Security Law Journal
- Referee for peer reviews: Yale University Press; Oxford University Press (3); Cambridge University Press; *Journal of Leg. Studies*; *Journal of Law, Econ., & Org.*; *Rev. of Law and Econ.*; *Sup. Ct. Econ. Rev.*; *Int'l Rev. Law & Econ.*; Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung; Am. Law & Econ. Assoc. Ann'l Mtg; *J. of Int'l Criminal Justice*, *Leiden J. of Int'l Law*; *Melbourne Journal of Int'l Law*; *Journal of Nat'l Security Law & Policy*; *Israel Law Review*; *Oxford Bibliographies Online*; *Journal of Int'l Law & Int'l Relations*; *Maritime Safety & Sec. L. J.*; *Israel Law Review*; *Business & Human Rights Journal*; also for *Harvard L. Rev.* and *Stanford Law Rev.*
- Frequent commentator in popular media, such as *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Slate*, NPR News and other programs, ABC News, NBC News, Fox News, Associated Press, Reuters, *New Yorker*, *Slate*, *ABA Journal*, etc.
- Member of Jewish National Fund, Federalist Society, Hamilton Society & other speakers bureaus
- Visiting Professor: Tel Aviv University Faculty of Law, Nov. – Dec. 2004; Bar Ilan University Faculty of Law, June 2012.
- Conference Organizer (w/Samuel Estreicher), *International Law and the Israeli-Arab Dispute*, Northwestern University School of Law, May 17, 2010
- Academic Review Committee, Human Studies Fellowship (2011) (grant referee)

- Visiting Scholar, Princeton University Program in Law and Public Affairs, 2011-12

LITIGATION, TESTIMONY and ADVISORY ROLES

- *Zivotofsky v. Kerry*, Supreme Court Amicus Curiae Brief for Louis Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under the Law and Professors of Constitutional and Foreign Relations Law (2014) (with Alan Gura)
- External Consultant, U.S. Department of Defense (2013)
- Consultant for defense attorneys in criminal cases raising constitutional and international law issues in United States Supreme Court and other federal courts (2004); wrote merits sections of briefs for respondent in *Illinois v. Caballes*, 543 U.S. 405 (2005)

SELECTED ACADEMIC PRESENTATIONS

American Society for International Law Research Forum* (Oct. 2017; 2015)

American Law & Economics Association Annual Meeting*: (2014; 2010; 2007; 2006)

University of Vienna, Conference: “An End to Anti-Semitism,” Feb. 2018

San Diego State University, Jewish Studies Program (April 2015; 2017)

The Peace Palace (The Hague), University of Leiden Grotius Center for International Legal Studies conference on “Jus Post Bellum” (Sept. 29, 2016)

Syracuse University, Institute for National Security and Counterterrorism, Carol Becker Speaker Series (March 2016)

Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, Faculty Workshop (Jan. 2016)

Tel Aviv University Faculty of Law: Faculty Workshop (May 2015)

Bar Ilan University, Dept. of Political Science (Sept. 2014 & May 2015)

Interdisciplinary Center (Herzilya), Lauder School of Government, Diplomacy, and Strategy: Graduate Seminar (May 2015)

Hebrew University Faculty of Law: Public Law and International Law Workshops (May/June 2014; June 2015)

Haifa University Law: Faculty Workshop (May 2014)

Ramat Gan College of Law: Faculty Workshop (May 2014)

DePaul University College of Law: Conference on *People of the Book: Judaism and Constitutional Law* (April 2014)

2014 AALS Annual Meeting: Symposium on Extraterritoriality, Conflict of Laws Interest Group Panel

University of Amsterdam (SHARES Project): The Distribution of Responsibilities in International Law Seminar (May 2013)

Loyola University Law School: International Law Colloquium (Feb. 2013)

Conference on Empirical Legal Studies, Stanford University*, Nov. 9, 2012

DePaul University College of Law Center for Jewish Law & Judaic Studies (Dec. 2012)

Assoc. for the Study of the Middle East and Africa, 5th Annual Conference, Wash., D.C., Oct. 12, 2012

Princeton University, Program in Law and Public Affairs, March 12, 2012

Institute for Advanced Study, School of Social Science Seminar, Jan. 26, 2012

Stanford Law School, “International Bodies and Sovereignty” panel, Conference on the Constitution and the World Conference, Oct. 28th 2011

Harvard Law School, National Security Law Conference, Sept. 16-17th, 2011

Special Address at SMi’s 2nd Annual Maritime Domain Awareness Conf., London, UK, June 20-21, 2011

Israeli Defense Forces Military Advocate General, Dept’ of Int’l Law, June 16, 2011

University of Chicago Conference on Global Law, May 6, 2011

European Society of International Law, 4th Annual Research Symposium, Tallin, Estonia, May 2011*; 2nd Biennial Meeting, Paris, May 2006*

Yale Journal of International Law Conference: Non-State Actors and International Law, Feb. 2011

University of San Diego Faculty Workshop, Dec. 1, 2010

University of Texas Law School Faculty Workshop, Oct. 14, 2010

Yale University, Law, Economics, and Organization Workshop, March 11, 2010

University of California, Berkeley, Law of the Sea Institute/California Law Review Seminar on Piracy, April 22, 2010

Israel Law and Economics Association Annual Meeting, Haifa 2010

Midwestern Law and Economics Association Annual Meeting: 2008; 2007; 2005

Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting 2013, 010;, 2004

Searle Center, Northwestern University, Public Policy Roundtable: The Alien Tort Statute and U.S. Enforcement of Foreign Judgments, April 29, 2010

American Association of Law Schools Annual Meeting, Jan. 2010 [paper one of four selected in refereed call for papers on national security and international law]*

American Society of International Law, Annual Workshop on International Law in Domestic Courts*: Dec. 2009 - UC Hasting; Dec. 2007 – Texas/Austin [one of five papers selected out of dozens for presentation]

Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government, Expert Panel on Maritime Piracy, Dec. 2009†

American Society of International Law, Seminar on Maritime Piracy [internet broadcast], Dec. 1, 2009†

Georgetown Law School Foreign Relations Colloquium, Oct. 2009

American Society for International Law--Academic Council on the United Nations System, Expert Panel on Suppressing Maritime Piracy, October 2009†

Harvard University Law School Foreign Relations Workshop, Oct. 2009

National Security Junior Scholars Workshop, University of Texas, March 10, 2009*

American Society of International Law Annual Meeting*, 2008 - paper was selected in competition for young scholars; 2005 [paper was one of four selected from 55 submissions]

International Law and Economics Conference, Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods (Bonn, Germany – Dec. 16, 2006)

University of Illinois Faculty Workshop, Oct.11, 2010; 2004

Southeastern Association of Law Schools Annual Meeting: Young Scholars Workshop,* 2004; 2006: paper distinguished as one of four selected in a conference-wide Call for Papers

* = *paper selected in competitive call-for papers*

† = *panelist, no paper presented*

Student groups: I have spoken at the invitation of student groups at colleges and law schools and colleges Harvard, Yale, Brown University Columbia University, NYU, University of Michigan, Johns Hopkins, University of Chicago, University of Pennsylvania, Duke, UNC, Georgetown, Berkeley (Boalt Hall), Boston University, Washington University, Vanderbilt University, University of Kansas, University of Missouri, University of Miami, University of Florida, Case Western Reserve, Tulane, and many others.