Preface

The *UCLA Journal of International Law & Foreign Affairs* is pleased to present Volume Twenty-Five, Issue Two. The pieces contained in this issue provide insight into a range of timely issues. The result is a unique and novel contribution to the international, foreign, and comparative law literature.

Oliver Mawuse Barker-Vormawor provides a historical account of how international law scholarship came to rely upon the presumption that States are rational actors by examining the legacy of early theorist Francisco de Vitoria. He reasons that Vitoria's reliance on reason was central to his account of *jus gentium* and that this reliance has led to system justification practices. He proposes that the designation of human attributes to State actors has contributed to a disconnect between the scholarship and reality of international law and governance.

Lindsay Freeman considers the challenges to admitting information that has become publicly available as a result of hacking or leaking into evidence in international criminal cases. For instance, she examines the leaked Iraq and Afghan war logs, National Security Agency files, and the Panama Papers. She analyzes the relevant rules of evidence of the International Criminal Court and examines applicable evidentiary challenges and precedent. She highlights the tension between admitting such evidence in order to prosecute disclosed international crimes while not rewarding the unlawful means of acquisition.

Mao-wei Lo and Chien-Huei Wu examine the decline of Hong Kong's autonomy and the evolution of the United States' policy toward Hong Kong—from the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 to the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019 and the Hong Kong Autonomy Act of 2020. They argue that U.S. sanctions on Chinese and Hong Kong officials and the revocation of preferential treatment are legal in the context of public international law and international trade law. They also explore whether Hong Kong risks losing its special customs territory status and thus its membership in the World Trade Organization.

David Eichert's Comment argues that international law on genocidal sexual violence should include men, transgender women, and intersex/nonbinary/third-gender individuals. He discusses how

international lawyers and academics have concentrated on cisgender women and provides examples of how violence against individuals of all genders can and should qualify as genocide under the Genocide Convention. He advocates that international courts should move toward a more expansive view of gender when investigating genocidal forms of sexual violence.

We would like to extend a special thank you to our authors, our faculty advisor, Professor Aslı Bâli, and UCLA Law's publications director, Liz Purvis, for helping us publish this Issue in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic and an entirely remote environment. We are appreciative of your continued support.

—The *JILFA* Executive and Editorial Boards