

The questions for the session 2

- 1 What is the “anxiety“ Koskenniemi and Laino are talking about? What is the claim of those speaking about “fragmentation” and “proliferation of international tribunals”?
- 2 (Not only) for those of you interested in social sciences: How does “postmodernity” play out in political science or international relations? Does it have anything in common with the “postmodernity” in international law?
- 3 Why did the former judges of the International Court of Justice criticize International Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia? (Hint: Nicaragua v Tadić case in Koskenniemi and Laino).
- 4 Please scan Al-Jedda case and extract the central conclusions thereof. What is the structure of the judgment? Is it similar to your national judgments?
- 5 Between which “self-contained” regimes has arisen the conflict in Al-Jedda? How to resolve it? (Hint: Marko Milanić's text).
- 6 Even if you have not had to read Kadi case, could you guess, with the help of Kumm's text, what are its implications for international law and its relation to European law?
- 7 Can you explain the models of the relation between international and European law that are proposed by Kumm?