BRILL
NIJHOFF

JOURNAL OF THE HISTORY OF
INTERNATIONAL LAW 17 (2015) 1–14

JHIL
brill.com/jhil

"We do not need to always look to Westphalia . . ." A Conversation with Martti Koskenniemi and Anne Orford

Alexandra Kemmerer
Permanent Senior Research Fellow and Academic Coordinator,
Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law,
Heidelberg, Germany; Grotius Research Scholar, University of Michigan
Law School, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

There had been a long silence until the historians of international law finally spoke up. Back in 1952, the history of the discipline had been described as the 'Cinderella of the doctrine of international law' by Georg Schwarzenberger. The Cold War marked an ice age for the history and theory of international law. The real move towards historical reflection did not come until later, with the growing awareness of the inadequacies of the 'New World Order' that had evolved after 1989. In times of transformation, the history of international law emerged as a flourishing field in the last decade. The emergence of new international institutions, the rapid proliferation of international and supranational courts, new human rights regimes and the blossoming of international criminal law were all soon overshadowed by Srebrenica, 9/11, transnational terrorism and the global financial crisis. The 'fragmentation' of the international legal order, the collision and competition of various normative orders prompts questions also prompted by the very structures of international law. In order to understand the current state of international law, its possibilities and limits, its institutions and how to approach them, we should first examine how these have come to be. In a global perspective, the remnants of European imperialism are to be traced. Martti Koskenniemi, who has strongly influenced this recent 'historiographical turn' in international law with his 'Gentle Civilizer of Nations' sympathizes with the turn to contextual readings of international law,

* A German translation of this conversation was first published as »Wir müssen nicht immer nur auf Westfalen schauen . . .«: Martti Koskenniemi und Anne Orford im Gespräch mit Alexandra Kemmerer, *Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte* IX/1 Frühjahr 2015 (Theme Issue »Lange Leitung«, Alexandra Kemmerer and Martin Mulsow, eds.), 31–46.

 | DOI 10.1163/15718050-12340032

yet he is careful to draw some boundaries – not least because the reduction of a historical narrative to its context creates an artificial border between the past and the present and also conceals the fact that the reconstruction of the context, the choice of research topic and the frame of reference can themselves all be traced back to choice, to deliberate decisions on the part of the (international law) historian. Anne Orford goes one step further, subjecting British history of ideas scholar Quentin Skinner to a careful *relecture* and calling for radical anachronism which, as it turns out, is not so radical at all but in fact merely involves extending the concept of 'context' beyond the past and into the present. Our skype conversation on a Monday in late August is literally global. Out of time and space, it spans three continents and starts, at the same moment, synchronically and non-synchronically: it is early morning in Ann Arbor, midday in Helsinki, evening in Melbourne.

The increase in scholarly production increases also the number of critical voices. Jacob Katz Cogan, an international law scholar who also holds a PhD in history, is rather dissatisfied with lawyers' scholarly production on the history of international law.[1] *He argues that such efforts can be divided into two main groups. Many researchers, he says, engage in 'intensely internalist' navel-gazing (with a methodologically narrow approach that fails to go beyond established legal methods and materials). They focus only on the precursors to contemporary law, its institutions and actors, and seek merely to provide the law as it stands with an affirmative historical foundation. Either that, states Cogan, or they pursue critical agendae, setting out to deconstruct precisely the very same narratives of progress that the 'internalists' hold dear. But things are improving, he says. With increasing frequency professional historians are turning their attention to the history of international law. They offer meticulous historical contextualization, (re)placing their research subjects in their respective times and exploring international legal developments as 'embedded in their specific places and moments'. But can international lawyers be historians, and should they be?*

MK: I wonder if what international lawyers now are doing is so different from – to use your phrase – how historians understand what they are doing. I would especially contest the assumption that the historical profession has a more "objective" relationship to the world and a more "scientific" method than international lawyers. It is true that many of us lawyers have a project, and all

1 Jacob Katz Cogan, 'Book Review', 108 *American Journal of International Law* (2014), 371–376 (reviewing Bardo Fassbender and Anne Peters, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the History of International Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

kinds of normative commitments that go with it. But I think that historians also have their projects. They are just more modest, or less self-aware about them than we lawyers. I think we are doing pretty much the same thing, historians and lawyers. We are both engaged in an effort to understand what past concepts were doing in the past, and we are interested in the past that operates in the present as well – what you called a political interest. What puzzles me is these distinctions we like to draw between international law as history, the history of international law, and intellectual history – of law or political concepts. Those delimitations clearly are a part of the problem that we need to address. The best work in any of these fields has always questioned those limits, and by questioning them makes itself available and useful for everyone working with intellectual materials. Having learned so much from Anne, I now think that most of all, historical work is about the present. This is where our obsession lies. With the *Now*. With *Ourselves*. History is just one set of intellectual tools, one vocabulary through which we deal with that obsession. But as we do it as lawyers, I do not think we are so different from historians.

AO: Mark Mazower's *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations* – which is in many ways a very rich account of the early period of the United Nations, quite apart from having one of the best titles of any book – demonstrates this distinction I am trying to make between historical and legal approaches to the past. Mazower there treats certain key texts, policy documents, or speeches as having quite coherent and stable meanings that also represent the position of the United Nations at particular moments. That seemed different from the way a lawyer would approach the same material. So when I was working with archives from the early period of the United Nations, I wanted to understand how particular texts worked as political and legal interventions at the time they were written, how they have been given a kind of institutional force going forward, and how they have been reinterpreted. I was interested in how certain concepts or principles or new institutional practices began to be transmitted as part of legal and organizational routine, and how officials understood themselves as being bound by those new concepts, principles, or practices. For Mazower, that more dynamic sense of texts or concepts being put to work while also being unstable and contested seemed less evident. And I think concepts or principles or arguments from the past have a more dynamic feel to them and matter differently if you understand them still to be a potential source of obligation in the present. If you want to understand the decisions that were made by the Secretary General in the early years of decolonization, and the way they were rationalized, and those rationalizations handed on, to the next set of officials, that's about being concerned with both the past and the present – about being concerned that

the reading that you give is going to shape international law and politics right now. I don't know whether you learn that only as a lawyer. I think you could learn that in all sorts of ways, but at the least you do learn that as a lawyer. We can't say: it's all in the past. Because so many concepts from the past are in play still. And we are responsible for how they are in play.

Now, here we have the often and vehemently criticized anachronistic thinking and writing. Why is there such a fierce interest to keep international law and history strictly separated?

AO: There is a push to make that division from both sides. On the side of law that push comes with the intention of trying to reject natural law, trying to reject any kind of theological account as the foundation for the discipline – and perhaps also to reject any sense of responsibility for the imperial past. So then the argument is: "We are positivists, we are not interested in history. States have a will, and they can decide right now, and there is nothing else that binds us to the past. It is all up to us sovereigns. We are sovereign in time as well as in space. And we get to decide what our law is. So we don't want to hear about this history, at least it has got nothing to do with us as a source of present obligations. And perhaps we will even put those legal historians in another faculty. They are certainly not doing the same thing as we lawyers are doing". And what has been interesting me lately is the push-back from historians against lawyers engaging with the past as a form of critique – lawyers not even necessarily claiming that what they are doing is history, but nonetheless being policed by historians saying: "Well, you are doing the wrong thing with these past texts. If you are going to talk about the past, then you have to do it like this". Interdisciplinary work can often be enlivening, and productive, and critically transformative, and can open things up in a discipline that has become insular, but then it can also do exactly the opposite: it can be used to shut things down, it can be used to police, it can be used to constrain new work in a discipline or make it harder to ask certain questions.

The dark sides of interdisciplinary legal scholarship . . .

MK: Interdisciplinarity – to take that awful word – has all kinds of implications. And politically speaking I have always found it more unproductive than productive – that is: more conservative than revolutionary. One never becomes as conscious of working in a "discipline" as when one is working in an interdisciplinary project. Nevertheless, I of course wholly welcome the kind of broad-

ening to other fields that does not think of itself in disciplinary terms but adopts the attitude "well, let's see what's going on there, and whether we can use what they use for our purposes". That is really delightful. To have that attitude involves also a conscious turn against the idea that there *are* clear disciplines, and that those disciplines have boundaries, methods, and all that. This to me always seemed implausible.

There is an irritating silence between lawyers and historians when it comes to research topics and areas explored by both professions. How can we start to engage in a conversation?

MK: One thing that has always puzzled me is the presence of two traditions of doing international law. There are Kant and Hegel and a whole line of European philosophers who have never had any difficulty in throwing in the expression "law of nations" or *ius gentium*, in their texts. But what they have wanted to convey with this has had nothing – or it has had very little – to do with what professional lawyers have wanted to use those expressions for. There had been a "philosophical" and a "lawyerly" way to speak about international law and little shared understanding between them. Among lawyers, I have detected an almost conscious effort to dismiss the philosophers. "Oh, those philosophers do not really know what they are talking about". Clearly, when philosophers address the "law of nations", they do this within the rules of their own profession, their interest of knowledge, which has nothing or little to do with the concerns we lawyers have. But perhaps the gap is slowly being breached. I have been impressed that someone like Jürgen Habermas can have a conversation in the Max-Planck-Institute with international lawyers and legal historians about how they envisage international law and what Europe is becoming in terms of constitutional principles. Maybe this does not answer your question. But I have been wondering about the significance of this rapprochement – presuming that it can be generalized. When I read Kant's *Perpetual Peace* in the mid-nineties, I came to read it as a philosophical piece. And it is only very recently that I have come to think that it may be as much international law as what, say, Bruno Simma would write in a law journal today.

Is legal scholarship intellectually isolationist? Do lawyers close off literatures that are not "strictly legal"?

MK: I have been disturbed by the lack of intellectual interest in the discipline of international law itself, maybe in law in general. Readings that are offered as

providing our professional self-identification are narrow. There are so many and diverse literatures out there that are helpful to understand international law. I never thought of my engagement with these readings in terms of 'engaging history', or the history of political thought, I thought of it more in terms of just widening my own horizon; in this, texts classified as "sociology", "history", or "philosophy" have absolutely no status different from novels or *bandes dessinées*. Everything that speaks of life, speaks of international law, too. It is not only fun to read in these other literatures, but they somehow help in making oneself a better professional, too. And it works the other way as well. What one knows about law helps one to move about into those other writings better, enables one to ask sharper questions, and to see things others perceive only vaguely. Law is most interesting when we use it outside "law".

The question has been raised – and not only by advocates of global history perspectives – how adequately to approach the much-deplored eurocentrism of international law and its history. Jochen von Bernstorff has just made a strong plea for a postcolonial turn in German international law scholarship.[2] *But it is not just people and events that are informed by this European focus; eurocentrism has also shaped and coined positions and concepts – and the very standards of historiography. But can research in international legal history really leave behind the Eurocentric framework of international law without also, at the same time, renouncing its claim to presenting a history of international law* (*and not just, as Rose Parfitt has recently pointed out,*[3] *a historiography of something else*)*?*

MK: International law is a thoroughly Eurocentric business. That is clear. Is such study, too, then Eurocentric? Well, I do not think that this question has good answers. Perhaps it is the wrong question. In any case, I have begun to increasingly feel that the validity of a statement about the past doesn't depend so much on *what* is being said but on *who* says it. That is an outrageous proposition, I know, because it suggests that we should look beyond propositional validation, beyond what's being proposed or written, and instead try to examine the intentions and motives and structures that have produced what is being

2 Jochen von Bernstorff, 'German International Law Scholarship and the Postcolonial Turn', EJIL: *Talk!*, 7 January 201, online at: http://www.ejiltalk.org/german-international-law-scholarship-and-the-postcolonial-turn (28 June 2015).

3 Rose Parfitt, 'The Spectre of Sources', *European Journal of International Law* 25 (2014), 297–306, 302 (reviewing Bardo Fassbender and Anne Peters, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the History of International Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

said. The same statement may thus be right or wrong, depending on who utters it, or where it is uttered, in defense of what kind of point. What I mean is that Eurocentrism is perhaps not so much about the *substance* of what is being said or studied, but what the *point* of a statement or a study is, what kinds of normative commitments it is intended to support (or actually does support, independently of the intentions of who produced it). That problem cannot be fruitfully addressed within the traditional debate about Eurocentrism.

AO: The question is: Who wants to problematize Eurocentrism now, and in what situation do they want to do that, and to what effect? And I guess that would also raise the question of the claim to the 'global'. Why would we aspire to write a global history? I was listening to a great podcast about history, about what happened in the move from Roman to Christian histories, and how already of course Christianity has a historical consciousness because it sees itself as the realization of the prophecies in Judaic scripture. The Romans had already been writing histories, but then suddenly with the rise of Christianity they get to write history that starts with the beginning of the world. People were writing histories that started with the world being created, and ended with whatever is going on in their monastery that week – so the resulting histories would be global but in quite a peculiar way. That really reminded me of international law. We have this ambition to write global history, but sometimes the result can have a little of that peculiar quality of medieval Christian history, because it will end up with some oddly specific event or doctrinal debate that is the obsession of the moment, and begin with "god made man", and in the middle is something more conventionally historical. So I wonder about the impulse to write a global history, or a universal history. What is the source of that impulse, really? Instead, I would want to ask: how universal does my study need to be in order to explore the question I am trying to explore? How global does my scope have to be in order to understand what I want to understand?

MK: For me, the call for global history tends to imply a ridiculously high ambition, perhaps even the old European effort of finding finally that place where one's statement can be stamped "global", to be able to say "this is global", whereas that thing over there isn't. No doubt, the move to think in global history is useful in as much as it means that more people from the global south have access to universities to learn history and to write about history. Nothing against that. Also I think it useful to examine geographical locations or events that have not been looked at in the past. In this process the meaning of "global" is "more complete". We do not need to always look to Westphalia, to 1648, to

Europe. We can look at China, we can look at an African location. It is very banal what I am saying. But I think it has a political meaning – not new, but still important. However, I don't think that there is such a thing as a specific *method* of the global. My own intuition has always been to go the other direction: not to make claims about the "universal", or to emphasize the "global" quality of what one has to say, but instead to make things small, human-sized, to bring these preposterous statements about world history down to a human scale, to articulate them as statements about *those* people at *those* moments, acting for *those* reasons.

AO: I do think there is some very useful work that is being done under the label of global history – in particular the growing body of work that focuses on the twentieth century, and tries to understand international institutions and other transnational organisations as political forms that have to be taken seriously. On the other hand, I do wonder a little about the seriousness of the global turn more generally. I have heard historians comment critically that everything is global now, so if you put 'global' in front of 'history', then you get more funding for it – but often it is still basically national history. I asked a colleague in the US: "If historians are writing a global history of the US, what archive do they use?" And she said: "They use exactly the same National Archives, in Washington". I think that trying to assemble new archives is an important part of this attempt to write new global or internationalist histories. There is a wonderful piece by Emma Rothschild, called "The archives of universal history", that raises this question of the materiality of our work and the archives we use to write universal history. If we take seriously international institutions now as having a kind of political weight, their archiving practices and resources become important. I have been to magical places in the search for the archives of universal history – the archive of the Swedish workers' movement, for example, with all its old hand-written documents and socialist materials, or the basement of the optimistically modernist UNESCO building in Paris, or the India Office archives in London. We may not be able to get a grip on all the world's history in these archives, but we can learn more about the thinking of the international officials who now shape everyday life for many people on this planet.

MK: We should of course also mention that a part of global history is produced by postcolonial historians for whom the global really marks an emancipatory direction. The motivation and intention there is to change not only the way history is written, but also what's being told in those histories. As a statement of a political project, I can associate with that. But otherwise, it also often

sounds to me as an updating of the old idea of universal history, or then just a meaningless addition that is there because of academic reasons, of reasons of prestige, or of completing a funding application.

How to relate institutions and individuals, structures and protagonists?

MK: Like many others, I think the agent-structure problem is over. We do not need to struggle with it any longer. When we speak of actors, we speak of structures, and the other way round. I also think that big things about structures can be said in biographical terms, and in metaphorical terms. History is literature, and can be written in many ways.

For both of you biographical approaches are quite relevant. In international law, we have seen an emerging interest in such studies over the last few years. What can be gained by these approaches?

MK: I do not really think of these studies, I mean the ones on past lawyers, so much in biographical terms but rather as adopting a narrative technique directed to maximal effect in the present. By telling a story of somebody dead long ago, a story that highlights the actor as an element of an operational structure, as a psychologically plausible individual dealing with problems that are familiar to us, as an item with which we can sympathize, or maybe identify with, this may open in the reader an ability to respond in a way that for my contemporary interests is very important. I am less interested in writing biography in order to be true to the lives of past heroes than in developing a technique of communicating with an audience to bring things that are usually seen as tremendously abstract and global and universal onto a human scale, so that we would notice how we, too, are faced with problems not that different from theirs, and how we can think about those problems, in the little choices that we have in our careers, or lives in general. To me, writing in terms of individuals is useful in that sense.

AO: I was thinking about biography, and whether that is quite the right word for what you both do, for what Martti has done and, Alexandra, what you are doing, with your work on Eric Stein and the early stages of European legal integration. I think that generically it doesn't quite get at what you are doing, even though of course your work does involve biography in some ways. And there is

also that potential slippage from biography into hagiography, which is so often part of more celebratory disciplinary histories of founding fathers. The way that you both write about particular figures is about doing something else altogether. The same is true for my interest in writing about Dag Hammarskjöld. People sometimes assume that I wrote about him because I think he is a great man, but it's not that. It is because he is such a complex figure, and his story is emblematic of something that is so interesting to try and grasp, the emergence of a new form of international public authority. So engaging with someone like Hammarskjöld is a way of trying to grasp broader social transformations. We can explore that person's networks, what kind of institutional supports they have, how they have been trained, who they think their allies are, who their enemies are, to whom they are beholden, and with whom they share concepts and theories. All that stuff is much easier to study if you look at specific people. I find it very exciting when you realize that: yes, X really did talk to Y, I knew that they must have known each other, that explains how one set of developments related to developments in other times and places.

MK: But, Anne, don't you think that is just also how a professed contextualist such as Ian Hunter, who has so harshly criticized Antony Anghie's *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law*, would characterize good historical work?

AO: My problem is never with context, as I have pointed out in the two recent pieces I've written exploring this question. Of course, to be a good lawyer you have to be able to understand how a text or a concept is functioning in a given context. My problem is when historians have used the idea of 'context' as a proxy for policing anachronism – when they say, as Quentin Skinner originally said, that the proper context for considering the meaning of a text is the temporal context in which it was presented or published. Then I have a problem with the notion of context. Often a legal concept or text will be invoked in multiple contexts, and our role is to try and grasp that movement of concepts across time and space. I have recently been reading a wonderful book of essays by JGA Pocock called *The Discovery of Islands,* where he talks about an 'antipodean perspective' – about how colonial settlers know they arrive in a new place carrying an inheritance that they will have to continue but also to change. So perhaps I have this view because I have lived and worked in the antipodes for almost half a century, but I would go even further and say that from an antipodean perspective, if you are not thinking about how things and ideas travel, you are not thinking.

Are there limits of contextualism? How to choose scope and scale when taking a biographical approach? How much distance is needed? Writing about a pioneer of transnational legal integration and constitutionalism while sitting in the very building where he taught and researched for more than six decades necessarily raises questions of proximity and distance, identification and limitations.

AO: Martti, you must have had that too with Lauterpacht . . .

MK: Oh, absolutely, and it continues. I thought I had been as clear as I could about the ambivalence of his personality – but no, it's assumed that I should finally decide one way or the other. "Now, come on, you know so much about him – was he good, or was he a bad guy?" I do not know. But I also must confess that people who write in those terms, I mean that there are the "evil people" and there are the "good people", I find their stories implausible or worse, boring. Boring because predictable. Stories engage as long as they retain the ambivalence of their characters. That's why I think Anthony Pagden's new celebration of the enlightenment, his enthusiastic *The Enlightenment – and why it still matters* may still actually make a disservice for his cause. He seems to have decided, that after all the good work that he has done on the enlightenment, that he still needs to pinpoint the heroes of his stories. And so he is compelled by that choice to write in a way that is pretty linear and predictable. That is a shame. Wanting to have an effect on one's readers one would wish to engage them with the complexity of the past – including of past individuals – so as make us think about the complexity of the present.

AO: With Hammarskjöld, my ambivalence remains. I am completely ambivalent about him. And I did not find that this mattered to my audiences, even in the context of presenting my work at a talk hosted by the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation in Uppsala. What mattered was that I cared enough to engage carefully with his writings, and with his archives. Sometimes though I have to work harder at being ambivalent – because I do tend to take a clear position, for or against someone, early on. And so, for me, a lot of the work is trying to get some ambivalence into my response to a text or an author rather than responding with: well, he is just clearly a baddy.

MK: Well, I wonder to what extent maybe you can write about baddies in an interesting way, if that's all you want to say, that they are baddies. It is clear that if you have someone like Hitler, then the strategy of writing cannot be that you inject ambivalence into them as individuals. Instead, the strategy would be to

show how the personal evil is an *illustration* of some larger evil out there. I mean turning the agent-and-structure-issue into some political use. The story would not be one about the individual, but you would go through the individual in order to examine the structure that he personifies. Whereas in the case of Lauterpacht, and I guess Hammarskjöld, that move isn't interesting. You can't say, at least not immediately, interesting things by reducing them to some structure. With them, the interesting thing is precisely the ambivalence . . .

AO: . . . and taking them out of the structure.

MK: Yeah, so as to demonstrate that there were alternatives, that what they did also emerged from what they *chose*.

I would like to come back to this idea of 'Juridical Thinking'. In German legal scholarship, we tend to emphasize a 'genuinely legal perspective', even a 'proprium of legal scholarship'. What is, in that context, 'juridical thinking'? Do we even need it, to ensure the survival of law and legal scholarship in a world of blurring disciplinary boundaries?

AO: You have to understand that I used the phrase 'juridical thinking' as an intervention in a conversation about method. I was reacting to three papers that were saying "the right way to study institutions is to use sociological method, and in particular to use Bourdieu", or "the right way to think about the past is to think about events historically in a particular geopolitical context" (the entire conversation has been published in the *London Review of International Law*). One might label my strategy as an "Occupy Law" strategy. I want to be clear that I am not interested in setting up again some kind of dogmatic account of 'pure law' or of what juridical thinking should be. But I do want to try and reclaim the space of the law and of conceptual innovation – a space that has been abandoned by the critical left.

MK: Abandoned by the right as well . . .

AO: No, I don't think so. No, I don't think so. I think they are very good at being 'ideological innovators', to borrow Skinner's phrase, in a legal-conceptual field.

MK: I do not think there is a serious right-wing academia standing for what you called 'juridical thinking', saying "this is juridical thinking". If you are really right-wing, then that wouldn't be an interesting thing for you to say. The juridical

would not be a platform on which you feel confident to stand, you would feel rather vulnerable. That's why I think the right prefers recourse to economic and managerial languages that do not call for the kinds of claims that you are making, claims as to for what juridical thinking would seem to stand.

So I think "juridical thinking" is a left type of thinking. And of course we need to occupy the centre. I always thought I did. I am already there.

Let's keep our eyes on the centre and speak about your current projects . . .

AO: I am deeply into the project I am working on right now. In fact it is very difficult to talk about anything else, because I am so deeply into it. But I am also not in a position where I can be articulate about it either. It is a 200-year-span project of looking at food security, and more broadly access to resources, as a question that is central to both political economy and international law, and the interrelation between the two. The project started out because I wanted to understand why food security remained so unevenly distributed in the twenty-first century, and whether those persistent patterns of vulnerability had anything to do with the legacies of imperialism. It is incredibly absorbing, and I am loving it. The project is now structured around five highly contested concepts that together (and they do work together) have been integral to debates about the constitution of an integrated global economy since the late eighteenth century: free trade, investment, population control, intervention, and rights. The fact that it is a book about law does mean that I am consciously working with these historically contested concepts to intervene in a contemporary debate. And if you could see the bit of the floor here that you can't see on the Skype camera, it's just surrounded by books and papers, and piling up to the desk.

MK: I do feel the same way. I look at the books and the papers, and photocopies and everything around me in the office as I am starting my ninth year with this project. It would be really tragic if I were to say no, I don't like it. I am not saying that. In the present project I try to articulate, I think for the first time, international law in the context of "capitalism". I try to show, as precisely as I can, how what we have understood as the "private" and the "public", property and sovereignty, constantly construct each other, come always together in ways that are familiar, though usually invisible. I want to describe these two forms of human domination, how humans are sometimes ruled in public law terms, sometimes in private law terms, but always in definitively legal terms. In my present work, what I just called "capitalism" is the way sovereignty and property have collaborated to support a certain type of global dominance.

I pick up this in two terms. Firstly, in disciplinary terms, it is really frustrating how wide is the separation between public law and private law, and between public lawyers and private lawyers. The proposition that sovereignty and property are different things has been so deeply entrenched in our legal thinking, and has come to require a specialization that really blinds us to their intimate connection. Yet, everything depends on bringing these two together. That is the disciplinary ambition of my present work. I want to say: "Hey, as long as you only think in terms of *either* property *or* sovereignty, you will not get it, you will only continue to operate the ideological machine. Look at how they collaborate!" The second point is, as it has been for a long time, to demonstrate the centrality of law to power and domination, and to everything we do. I think the under-appreciation is not by accident, but there is some vicious ideological reason behind our inability to see law's centrality to rulership. I just try to bring that awareness to the surface, not to get rid of law, but to understand and operate it better.

Martti Koskenniemi
is Academy Professor and Director of the Erik Castrén Institute of International Law and Human Rights at the University of Helsinki, a Professorial Fellow at Melbourne Law School, and Centennial Professor at the London School of Economics and Political Science.

Anne Orford
is Michael D Kirby Chair of International Law and an Australian Research Council Laureate Fellow at Melbourne Law School.