

## PREFACE

The *UCLA Journal of International Law & Foreign Affairs* is pleased to present Volume Twenty-Six, Issue One. The pieces contained in this issue were drawn from our 2021 Symposium—titled International Human Rights and Corporate Accountability: Current and Future Challenges—which was hosted alongside UCLA’s Promise Institute for Human Rights. The Symposium brought the international legal community together at JILFA’s first-ever virtual Symposium.

Professors Steven Freeland and Danielle Ireland-Piper discuss the advent of human-rights approaches in space. Because space law and international human rights law have common origins and outer space activities impact human rights and the environment, the authors contend that the use of space should be considered from a human rights perspective. The Article then explores the role of private corporations in space use and how current laws are inadequate in holding corporations accountable. Finally, the Article concludes by advocating for a specialized body with jurisdiction to adjudicate conduct by private actors in space.

Professor Scott J. Shackelford, Isak Nti Asare, Rachel Dockery, Professor Anjanette H. Raymond, and Alexandra Sergueeva perform a comparative analysis on national Artificial Intelligence (AI) strategies. Analyzing more than forty existing national AI strategies, the authors utilize qualitative and quantitative content analysis over government documents to discern common AI norms amongst nations. Based on their findings, the authors assert that States are beginning to converge around certain AI principles, focusing specifically upon public benefit. These findings serve as an important first step for international norm development in the AI space.

Professor Alveena Shah examines the ways in which water has been subject to privatization, viewed as a commodity rather than a collective resource. Professor Shah uses Argentina and its water privatization regime as a case study, analyzing the arbitral award in the case *Urbaser v. Argentina*, where the tribunal considered human-rights counterclaims raised by Argentina against a private water utility who failed to invest in its infrastructure. The Article concludes by analyzing more generally two approaches to alternative dispute resolution: the contractual

approach and the total obligations approach, the latter of which would allow arbitrators to more comprehensively consider the human right to water in investment cases.

Professor Timothy Webster discusses contemporary reparations efforts by victims who suffered human-rights abuses during World War II. In particular, Professor Webster examines recent decisions, rendered by South Korean courts, awarding victims monetary damages against large multinational corporations. As Professor Webster's article examines through a comparative and historical lens, these decisions constitute uncharted territory in jurisprudence concerning the intersection of corporate criminal liability, war, and victim reparations.

Mara González Souto discusses how extractive multinational corporations (MNC), such as Royal Dutch Shell, take advantage of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Federal Rules of Evidence to obstruct alien tort statute (ATS) litigation against them. She specifically analyzes the procedural tactics in two lawsuits to demonstrate how procedural rules fall short, and places these examples in context of general MNC tactics to defeat ATS litigation. Finally, she concludes by making several recommendations for reform to improve victim redress in ATS litigation.

We would like to extend a special thank you to our authors, our faculty advisor, Professor Asli Bâli, and UCLA Law's publications manager, Iman Jafri, for helping us publish this Issue during the COVID-19 pandemic. We thank you for your continued support.

—The *JILFA* Executive and Editorial Boards