

ASPEN PUBLISHERS

BRADLEY
GOLDSMITH

FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW
Cases and Materials

*Third
Edition*



Wolters Kluwer

Law & Business

ASPEN PUBLISHERS

FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW

Cases and Materials

Third Edition

Curtis A. Bradley

Professor of Law
Duke University School of Law

Jack L. Goldsmith

Professor of Law
Harvard Law School



Wolters Kluwer
Law & Business

AUSTIN BOSTON CHICAGO NEW YORK THE NETHERLANDS

© 2009 Aspen Publishers. All Rights Reserved.
<http://lawschool.aspenpublishers.com>

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission to make copies of any part of this publication should be mailed to:

Aspen Publishers
Attn: Permissions Department
76 Ninth Avenue, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10011-5201

To contact Customer Care, e-mail customer.care@aspenpublishers.com, call 1-800-234-1660, fax 1-800-901-9075, or mail correspondence to:

Aspen Publishers
Attn: Order Department
PO Box 990
Frederick, MD 21705

Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

ISBN 978-0-7355-7854-8

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Bradley, Curtis A.

Foreign relations law : cases and materials / Curtis A. Bradley, Jack L. Goldsmith. — 3rd ed.
p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 978-0-7355-7854-8

1. United States — Foreign relations — Law and legislation. I. Goldsmith, Jack L. II. Title.

KF4651.B73 2008
342.73'0412 — dc22

2008044372

FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW

EDITORIAL ADVISORS

Vicki Been

Elihu Root Professor of Law
New York University School of Law

Erwin Chemerinsky

Dean and Distinguished Professor of Law
University of California, Irvine, School of Law

Richard A. Epstein

James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor of Law
University of Chicago Law School
Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow
The Hoover Institution
Stanford University

Ronald J. Gilson

Charles J. Meyers Professor of Law and Business
Stanford University
Marc and Eva Stern Professor of Law and Business
Columbia Law School

James E. Krier

Earl Warren DeLano Professor of Law
The University of Michigan Law School

Richard K. Neumann, Jr.

Professor of Law
Hofstra University School of Law

Robert H. Sitkoff

John L. Gray Professor of Law
Harvard Law School

David Alan Sklansky

Professor of Law
University of California at Berkeley School of Law

Kent D. Syverud

Dean and Ethan A. H. Shepley University Professor
Washington University School of Law

Elizabeth Warren

Leo Gottlieb Professor of Law
Harvard Law School

About Wolters Kluwer Law & Business

Wolters Kluwer Law & Business is a leading provider of research information and workflow solutions in key specialty areas. The strengths of the individual brands of Aspen Publishers, CCH, Kluwer Law International and Loislaw are aligned within Wolters Kluwer Law & Business to provide comprehensive, in-depth solutions and expert-authored content for the legal, professional and education markets.

CCH was founded in 1913 and has served more than four generations of business professionals and their clients. The CCH products in the Wolters Kluwer Law & Business group are highly regarded electronic and print resources for legal, securities, antitrust and trade regulation, government contracting, banking, pension, payroll, employment and labor, and healthcare reimbursement and compliance professionals.

Aspen Publishers is a leading information provider for attorneys, business professionals and law students. Written by preeminent authorities, Aspen products offer analytical and practical information in a range of specialty practice areas from securities law and intellectual property to mergers and acquisitions and pension/benefits. Aspen's trusted legal education resources provide professors and students with high-quality, up-to-date and effective resources for successful instruction and study in all areas of the law.

Kluwer Law International supplies the global business community with comprehensive English-language international legal information. Legal practitioners, corporate counsel and business executives around the world rely on the Kluwer Law International journals, loose-leafs, books and electronic products for authoritative information in many areas of international legal practice.

Loislaw is a premier provider of digitized legal content to small law firm practitioners of various specializations. Loislaw provides attorneys with the ability to quickly and efficiently find the necessary legal information they need, when and where they need it, by facilitating access to primary law as well as state-specific law, records, forms and treatises.

Wolters Kluwer Law & Business, a unit of Wolters Kluwer, is headquartered in New York and Riverwoods, Illinois. Wolters Kluwer is a leading multinational publisher and information services company.

To Kathy, David, and Liana

—Curtis A. Bradley

To Leslie, Jack, and Will

—Jack L. Goldsmith

Preface

This casebook examines the constitutional and statutory law that regulates the conduct of U.S. foreign relations. The topics covered include the distribution of foreign relations authority between the three federal branches, the relationship between the federal government and the states in regulating foreign relations, and the status of international law in U.S. courts. In addition to including excerpts of the major Supreme Court decisions in this area (and some lower court decisions that we thought would be helpful for teaching purposes), we have included a variety of non-case materials, including historical documents; excerpts of statutes, treaties, and Executive Branch pronouncements and memoranda; and detailed Notes and Questions.

One of our goals in the book is to give students a sense of the rich history associated with foreign relations law. History is especially important in this field because much of the content of U.S. foreign relations law has developed in response to, and thus can best be understood in light of, discrete historical events. Historical research also has played a significant role in foreign relations scholarship. As a result, much of the first chapter is devoted to history, and we sketch the historical origins of all of the major foreign relations doctrines as they are presented.

Despite these historical materials, the focus of the book is on contemporary controversies, such as debates over the validity of executive agreements, the nature and limits on the war power, the scope of the treaty power, the legitimacy of international human rights litigation, and the propriety of judicial deference to the Executive Branch. In addition to describing the positions taken on these issues by institutional actors, we have attempted to give students some exposure to the extensive academic debates on these topics. We have avoided, however, including long excerpts of law review articles, which, in our experience, are not the best vehicle for teaching. Instead, we have attempted to weave the relevant academic arguments into the Notes and Questions that follow each set of cases and materials.

Without advocating any particular approach to constitutional interpretation, we also attempt to get students to focus closely on the text of the Constitution, a practice that we believe will be useful to them as lawyers. In addition, we emphasize issues of constitutional structure, especially federalism and separation of powers. Regardless of one's views about the legal relevance of these structural principles to foreign relations (a matter of some debate), we believe it is important to understand these principles at least for their political significance. A related theme of the book concerns "legal process" questions about the relative competence of various institutional actors to conduct U.S. foreign relations, questions that overlap with work that has been done in the political science area.

The casebook also emphasizes continuities and discontinuities between foreign relations law and "mainstream" constitutional law, statutory law, and federal jurisdiction issues. Indeed, we believe that many important constitutional law and federal courts doctrines—such as the political question doctrine, federal common law, and dormant preemption—have some of their most interesting applications in the foreign relations context. As a result, it is our hope that the book will appeal not only to students interested in international studies, but also to

students interested in domestic constitutional and jurisdictional issues. We also hope that domestic law scholars will be tempted by this book to teach a course in foreign relations law.

Foreign relations law is a fast-changing field, and this third edition contains a significant amount of new material. Among other things, we have included excerpts of recent Supreme Court decisions relating to foreign relations law such as *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld* (concerning the validity of the Bush administration's military commission system for trying alleged terrorists), *Medellin v. Texas* (concerning the domestic status of a decision by the International Court of Justice), and *Boumediene v. Bush* (concerning the applicability of the right of habeas corpus review to the Guantanamo Bay naval base). Because of the significant number of important legal developments in the war on terrorism, we have in this edition created a stand-alone chapter on this topic (the new Chapter 5). This chapter contains, among other things, expanded materials relating to interrogation and surveillance. Except for this new chapter, the structure of the book is similar to that of the second edition.

Although (and indeed because) we have participated as scholars in many of the debates implicated by the cases and materials in this book, we have tried hard to present the issues and questions in a balanced manner. We welcome feedback on this and any other aspect of the casebook.

Curtis A. Bradley
Jack L. Goldsmith
October 2008

Acknowledgments

Many people and institutions have helped us in creating this casebook. In preparing this third edition, we benefited greatly from the assistance of the law librarians at Duke and Harvard Law Schools. In addition, Bobby Chesney, Ingrid Wuerth, and Ernie Young provided us with helpful comments and suggestions, and Will Levi, Hagan Scotten, and J.B. Tarter provided very helpful research assistance. In preparing all three editions of this casebook, we benefited enormously from interactions with our students.

As we mentioned in the second edition, we have both worked in the Executive Branch. Professor Goldsmith served as Special Counsel to the General Counsel at the Department of Defense (2002-2003) and as Assistant Attorney General in the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel (2003-2004), and Professor Bradley served as Counselor on International Law in the State Department (2004). We both benefited greatly from these experiences and, to the extent that the information is not confidential, we have attempted to incorporate what we have learned into this casebook.

Finally, we thank the copyright holders who kindly granted us permission to reprint excerpts from the following materials:

Roger P. Alford, *Misusing International Sources to Interpret the Constitution*, 98 Am. J. Int'l L. 57 (2004). Copyright © 2004 by the American Society of International Law. Reprinted with permission of the American Society of International Law.

David P. Currie, *The Constitution in Congress: The Federalist Period, 1789-1801* (1997). Copyright © 1997 by The University of Chicago. Reprinted with permission of The University of Chicago Press.

Louis Henkin, *U.S. Ratification of Human Rights Conventions: The Ghost of Senator Bricker*, 89 Am. J. Int'l L. 341 (1995). Copyright © 1995 by the American Society of International Law. Reprinted with permission of the American Society of International Law.

Robert Kagan, *A Twilight Struggle: American Power and Nicaragua, 1977-1990* (1996). Copyright © 1996 by Robert Kagan. Reprinted with permission of Robert Kagan.

Gerald L. Neuman, *The Uses of International Law in Constitutional Interpretation*, 98 Am. J. Int'l L. 82 (2004). Copyright © 2004 by the American Society of International Law. Reprinted with permission of the American Society of International Law.

Bradford Perkins, *The Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations, Volume 1: The Creation of a Republic Empire, 1776-1865* (1993). Copyright © 1993 by Cambridge University Press. Reprinted with permission of Cambridge University Press.

Jack N. Rakove, *Making Foreign Policy—The View from 1787*, in *Foreign Policy and the Constitution* (Robert A. Goldwin & Robert A. Licht eds., 1990). Copyright © 1990 by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C. Reprinted with permission of the American Enterprise Institute.

Edward T. Swaine, *The Constitutionality of International Delegations*, 104 *Colum. L. Rev.* 1492 (2004).

Ernest A. Young, *Stalking the Yeti: Protective Jurisdiction, Foreign Affairs Removal, and Complete Preemption*, 95 *Cal. L. Rev.* 1775 (2007).

Editorial Notice

In editing the cases and other materials in this book, we have used ellipses to indicate deletions and brackets to indicate additions. We have not generally signified the deletion of citations or footnotes, and we have not used ellipses at the end of the excerpted material. We have retained citations within the excerpted material only when we thought the citations served a pedagogical purpose or when the citations were needed to identify the source of a quotation.

Overview of International Law and Institutions

Because U.S. foreign relations law often intersects with international law, students may find it useful to acquaint themselves at the outset of this course with the basic sources of international law and some of the most important international institutions. The following is a brief overview.*

1. Sources of International Law

International law can be divided into two categories: public international law and private international law. Traditionally, public international law regulated the interactions between nations, such as the laws of war and the treatment of diplomats. Since the mid-twentieth century, it also has regulated to some extent the way nations treat their own citizens. Private international law, by contrast, encompasses issues relating to transactions and disputes between private parties, such as international commercial standards, international choice of law rules, and the standards for enforcing foreign judgments. References in this course to international law are primarily references to public international law.

There are two principal sources of public international law: treaties and customary international law. Treaties are, quite simply, binding agreements among nations. All such agreements are referred to as “treaties” under international law, regardless of what they are called under each nation’s domestic law. By contrast, under U.S. domestic law, “treaties” refers only to the international agreements concluded by the President with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate and does not include “executive agreements” made by the President alone or with a majority approval of Congress.

There are both “bilateral” treaties (between two nations) and “multilateral” treaties (among multiple nations). Typical bilateral treaties include extradition agreements, Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation treaties, and Bilateral Investment Treaties. Multilateral treaties—some of which resemble international legislation in their scope and detail—cover a wide range of subjects, including international trade, the environment, and human rights.

Customary international law results from the general practices and beliefs of nations. By most accounts, customary international law forms only after nations have consistently followed a particular practice out of a sense of legal obligation. It is also commonly accepted that nations that persistently object to an emerging customary international law rule are not bound by it, as long as they do so before the rule becomes settled. Nations that remain silent, however, may become bound by the rule, even if they did not expressly support it. Silence, in other words, is considered a form of implicit acceptance.

Treaties and customary international law have essentially equal weight under international law. As a result, if there is a conflict between these two sources of

*For more extensive discussions, see, for example, Restatement (Third) of the Foreign Relations Law of the United States §§101-103 (1987); David J. Bederman, *International Law Frameworks* (2001); Mark W. Janis, *International Law* (5th ed. 2008); and Sean D. Murphy, *Principles of International Law* (2006).

international law, the later of the two will be controlling. International and domestic adjudicators will likely attempt to reconcile these two sources, however, if that is reasonably possible. Although it is not uncommon for treaties to supersede customary international law, there are relatively few examples in which customary international law has superseded a treaty.

Before the twentieth century, customary international law was the principal source of international law. Subjects regulated by customary international law included maritime law, the privileges and immunities of diplomats, and the standards for neutrality during wartime. Although customary international law continues to play an important role today, its importance has been eclipsed to some extent by the rise of multilateral treaties, which now regulate many areas previously regulated by customary international law.

Some customary international law rules are said to constitute “*jus cogens*” or “peremptory” norms. A *jus cogens* norm is, according to one widely accepted definition, “a norm accepted and recognized by the international community of States as a whole as a norm from which no derogation is permitted and which can be modified only by a subsequent norm of general international law having the same character.”* These norms transcend requirements of national consent, such that nations are not allowed to opt out of them, even by treaty. Norms frequently described as *jus cogens* norms are the prohibitions (now contained in treaties) on genocide, slavery, and torture.

2. International Institutions

The United Nations was established at the end of World War II, pursuant to the United Nations Charter, a multilateral treaty. Today, 192 nations—essentially all the nations in the world—are parties to the Charter and thus members of the United Nations. The purposes of the United Nations, according to the Charter, are to maintain international peace and security; develop friendly relations among nations; achieve international cooperation in solving economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian problems, and in promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; and to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in attaining these ends.

The central deliberative organ of the United Nations is the General Assembly, which is made up of representatives of all the member nations. The General Assembly is an important forum for discussion and negotiation, but it does not have the power to make binding international law. Instead, it conducts studies and issues non-binding resolutions and recommendations reflecting the views of its members.

The principal enforcement arm of the United Nations is the Security Council. The Council is made up of representatives from fifteen nations. Five nations (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) have permanent seats on the Council, as well as a veto power over the Council’s decisions. The other ten seats on the Council are filled by representatives of other nations elected by the General Assembly. Under the United Nations Charter, the Council is given “primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.” To address any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act

*Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, art. 53, May 23, 1969, 1155 U.N.T.S. 331.

of aggression, “the Council may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply” measures not involving the use of armed force, such as economic sanctions. If the Council determines that such non-military measures are inadequate, it may authorize “such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.” The Charter obligates each member to “accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council.”

Another component of the United Nations system is the International Court of Justice (also sometimes referred to as the “World Court”), which is based in The Hague, in the Netherlands. There are fifteen judges on the Court and they are elected to staggered nine-year terms. The Court has jurisdiction over two types of cases: contentious cases and cases seeking an advisory opinion. In contentious cases, only nations may appear as parties. In cases seeking advisory opinions, certain international organizations may also be parties. To be a party to a contentious case before the International Court of Justice, a nation must ordinarily be a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice (a multilateral treaty) and have consented to the Court’s jurisdiction. Consent to jurisdiction can be given in several ways: a special agreement between the parties to submit their dispute to the Court; a jurisdictional clause in a treaty to which both nations are parties; or a general declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

In addition to the United Nations system, there are a variety of international institutions established to administer particular treaty regimes. A prominent example is the World Trade Organization (WTO), which was established in 1995 to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and related agreements. The WTO has its own dispute settlement body, which adjudicates trade disputes between member nations. To enforce its decisions, the dispute settlement body can authorize the prevailing party to impose trade sanctions on the losing party. Another example is the International Criminal Court, based in The Hague, which has jurisdiction to try and punish certain international offenses, such as genocide.

Finally, there are regional international institutions, the most prominent of which is the European Union (EU). The EU currently is made up of 27 member countries. The EU has a number of constitutive organs, including a European Parliament, which is elected by individuals in the member countries; a Council of the European Union, which has representatives from the member governments; and a European Commission (an executive body). It also has a European Court of Justice, based in Luxembourg, which interprets and applies the treaty commitments of the Union. Although not part of the EU system, there is also a European Court of Human Rights, based in Strasbourg, France, which interprets and applies the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (which has been ratified by over 40 countries). The decisions of both the Court of Justice and the Court of Human Rights are binding on the member countries.

FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW

Summary of Contents

<i>Contents</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>xix</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xxi</i>
<i>Editorial Notice</i>	<i>xxiii</i>
<i>Overview of International Law and Institutions</i>	<i>xxv</i>
Chapter 1 Introduction: Historical and Conceptual Foundations	1
Chapter 2 Courts and Foreign Relations	41
Chapter 3 Congress and the President in Foreign Relations	141
Chapter 4 War Powers	205
Chapter 5 War on Terrorism	289
Chapter 6 States and Foreign Relations	385
Chapter 7 Treaties and Other International Agreements	443
Chapter 8 Customary International Law and International Human Rights Litigation	569
Chapter 9 Extraterritoriality	671
Appendix A: Constitution of the United States	757
Appendix B: Select Jurisdictional Provisions	773
Appendix C: Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act	781
<i>Table of Cases</i>	<i>795</i>
<i>Index</i>	<i>805</i>