

often encouraged junior scholars and was at his most helpful with students. He took pains to fulfill his responsibility to nurture the next generation of international trade law scholars and policymakers. Perhaps the greatest tribute to him is the broad and deep respect that this community has for his work, and for his integrity.

At a time when idealistic approaches to international law have been challenged by events, as well as attacks from within and without the discipline, Robert Hudec's scholarly modesty, empiricism, positivism, and realism deserve attention. One of Hudec's insights was that more law is not necessarily better, and that greater enforcement of law is not necessarily normatively attractive. Hudec's legal positivism and his total approach to his vocation bring to mind the encomium of Learned Hand to his teachers:

I carried away the impress of a band of devoted scholars; patient, considerate, courteous and kindly, whom nothing could daunt and nothing could bribe. The memory of those men has been with me ever since. Again and again they have helped me when the labor seemed heavy, the task seemed trivial, and the confusion seemed indecipherable. From them I learned that it is as craftsmen that we get our satisfactions and our pay. In the universe of truth they lived by the sword; they asked no quarter of absolutes and they gave none. Go ye and do likewise.⁶

JOEL P. TRACHTMAN*

CORRESPONDENCE

The *American Journal of International Law* welcomes short communications from its readers. It reserves the right to determine which letters to publish and to edit any letters printed. Letters should conform to the same format requirements as other manuscripts.

TO THE EDITOR IN CHIEF:

Professor James Crawford's *The ILC's Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts: A Retrospect* (96 AJIL 874 (2002)) states:

Of more than fifty governments that expressed views in the debate [of the Sixth Committee on the above-mentioned draft articles], only two (Mexico and Guatemala) made criticisms of such a kind as to imply rejection of the ILC's proposals—and they did so in terms of a preference for an immediate diplomatic conference rather than outright rejection of the text.¹

Nothing in the statement in question could be taken to imply any kind of rejection of the International Law Commission's draft articles by Guatemala. The statement addressed some specific and mostly minor elements of the substance of the draft articles and then went on to make suggestions as to the manner in which the General Assembly should react to the articles.

In this respect, Guatemala expressed a preference for the General Assembly to continue considering the draft articles annually until it was decided to hold a conference. The Sixth Committee would thus be able, in the meantime, to recommend changes in the draft articles to the General Assembly.

This correction reinforces the point Professor Crawford makes that in the Sixth Committee's debate on the draft articles, there was virtually no overall rejection of them.

ROBERTO LAVALLE†

⁶ LEARNED HAND, *THE BILL OF RIGHTS* 77 (1962).

* Of the Board of Editors.

¹ 96 AJIL 874, 875 (2002) (emphasis added) (footnote omitted).

† Minister Counselor, Permanent Mission of Guatemala to the United Nations.