tive roles of the ICJ as the organ for inter-state complaints and the ICTFY as Tribunal for individuals. In the same vein, he fails to distinguish clearly between the obligatory nature of the statute and the self-executing effect of some of its provisions. Whereas the former is not subject to serious doubt, the latter is currently hotly contested in the *Blaskic* case.[6]

Both commentaries provide extensive documentation. Professor Bassiouni reproduces a large part of the summaries and conclusions of the Commission of Experts. In the article-by-article part, he consistently quotes the Secretary-General's report, the Tribunal's first annual report and diverse comments on the respective parts of the ILC draft. In addition, he provides a translation of the military regulations of the former Yugoslavia (with the original text) and excerpts from its Criminal Code (without the original). All this documentation is inserted in the text or annexed to certain parts of it, which makes it difficult to find. Morris and Scharf have done better by publishing the documentation in a separate volume. Their extensive documentation contains the UN Secretary-General's report, Tribunal documents, the relevant Security Council resolutions including the Council's debates, the proposals for the Statute, and the Nuremberg Statute and rules. Some of these documents are not easily accessible, and their practical value cannot be overstated.

Given the complexity of the task, perfection could not be expected. For those whose interest lies more in criminal law aspects, Professor Bassiouni's commentary is the more useful; those more interested in international law, the drafting history and documentation will be better served by Morris and Scharf.

The jury is still out on whether the Tribunal will be considered as a first step towards the establishment of a permanent court with a considerable role in the administration of criminal justice or whether it will remain an idealistic footnote to the gruesome history of the Yugoslav conflict. Both Morris and Scharf and Professor Bassiouni have made important contributions to strengthening the former viewpoint with a more dependable legal basis.

*Andreas L. Paulus*
*Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München*

6 Case No. IT-95-14-PT, see Orders of 28 February and 7 March.

Mendlovitz, Saul and Burns H. Weston (eds.). *Preferred Futures for the United Nations*. New York: Transnational Publishers, 1995. Pp. ix, 505. Index. $75.

It is not fashionable today to promote a movement for a just world order. Suggesting, however, that a reformed United Nations should play a central part in a project aimed at humane global governance will probably situate you somewhere between the stern adherents to utopian world order fantasies, post Second World War idealists and 1970s world economic enthusiasts – in other words, beyond the pale. In an intellectual climate where cynicism and timidity mixes with hard-balled pragmatism to create a shoulder-shrugging malaise, the editors of this volume remain unintimidated and unconvinced. On the occasion of the United Nations 50th anniversary, they organized a symposium at the University of Iowa, with the aim of undertaking a fundamental reconsideration of the United Nations. As the sole intergovernmental institution with global jurisdiction authorized to address the entire human rights agenda, the UN has the potential, according to the authors, to be the institutional centrepiece of a system of humane global governance. The selection of articles reproduced in this volume formed the preparatory reading for the symposium.

With David Kennedy's 'A New World Order: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow', the book begins with a sceptic's perspective: every now and again a new generation of international law enthusiasts enters the scene and criticizes the mainstream with the same set of renewable ideas, stylizing themselves as mavericks, just as their predecessors did. The question, however, is not what will further the international order, but which 'international' to further. Kennedy favours an international melting into the local, focusing on the order that structures civil society within and among states and showing an interest in particular redistributional strug-

gles, rather than misunderstanding the support for the international order as a substitute for substantive political choices. The UN has no privileged role to play.

From the perspective of liberal international relations theory, Anne-Marie Slaughter reconceives the UN as a forum for global governance as opposed to the realist idea of a great power alliance or the legalist conception of a nascent world government. The central point is that states are not unitary, identical actors with identical interests. Instead, states' interests are a function of the process of state preference formation, which the UN can help to shape. The state is conceived as desegregated, distinct institutions performing specific (legislative, executive, judicial) governmental functions, each of which interacts with individuals and groups that are part of transitional society. It makes a difference whether a state is democratic or not. Important implications include redrawing boundaries between what is of concern and what is a question of domestic jurisdiction and refocusing funding priorities.

In other essays, Hilary Charlesworth describes a future for the UN from a feminist perspective. Richard A. Falk provides a highly critical assessment of the role of the UN in establishing the Rule of Law in international affairs. Björne Hettne writes about the role of the new regionalism in UN conflict management. Additionally, there are articles about reforming the UN to eliminate war, to secure human rights, to eradicate poverty and maldevelopment and to ensure environmentally-sustainable development. Finally, the Appendix includes a draft memorial in support of the application by the World Health Organization for an Advisory Opinion by the International Court of Justice on the legality of the use of nuclear weapons under international law.

*Mattias Kumm*
*Harvard Law School*

Reuter, Paul. *Introduction au droit des traités*. 3ème édition. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1995. Pp. xi, 251. FF 200.

This book is the updated version of Paul Reuter's well-known *Introduction au droit des traités*, first published in 1972. The second edition of the book was translated into English by José Mico and Peter Haggenmacher (Kegan Paul, ed.). In his Preface to this third edition, Philippe Cahier acknowledges that his contribution to this edition, prepared after the death of Paul Reuter, is intentionally discrete and mainly limited to recent developments in relation to the 1986 Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations.

The book therefore maintains the structure of the previous editions. An introductory chapter dedicated to the *'phénomène conventionnel'* is followed by three chapters, covering the conclusion and entry into force of treaties, their effects and the circumstances of their non-application (invalidity, suspension and termination). Each chapter is followed by interesting 'complementary notes', providing ample bibliographical references and insightful remarks. The text of the Vienna Conventions of 1969 and 1986 are reproduced at the end of the volume, together with the various declarations.

This rather conformist structure reflects a fine analysis of the law of treaties, very much in line with the tradition of French positivism. Of course, positivism is out of date, considered by many to be mistaken and of little interest. But positivism at its best is a difficult skill and Paul Reuter's *Introduction* is in this regard a masterpiece of clarity, precision and conciseness. Its primary pedagogical purpose could probably not have been better, nor otherwise achieved. Besides, treaty law, like contract law or even plumbing, is a technique and the methods for learning it correctly are not so abundant.

Written by a former member of the International Law Commission who took part in the negotiation of the Vienna Convention of 1969, the book is, however, obviously more than just an introduction to the technique of treaty law. It is more generally an essay on the question of the (contractual) creation of law in a decentralized community of states. No doubt the problem lies at the root of international law and is so intrinsically linked to it that perhaps no other field of study could so directly reveal the chief features of that legal order. But, as always, the idea that one has of the system influences the under-