

# Denver Journal of International Law & Policy

---

Volume 5  
Number 2 *Fall*

Article 2

---

January 1975

## Foreword

Denver Journal International Law & Policy

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/djilp>

---

### Recommended Citation

Foreword, 5 Denv. J. Int'l L. & Pol'y (1975).

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Denver Sturm College of Law at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Denver Journal of International Law & Policy by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact [jennifer.cox@du.edu](mailto:jennifer.cox@du.edu), [digitalcommons@du.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@du.edu).

---

## Foreword

### Keywords

Presidency, International Law: History, History



# Denver Journal

## OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AND POLICY

### Foreword

The Board of Editors of the DENVER JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AND POLICY is proud to present the first in a continuing series of mini-symposia, the "Middle East Consensus Project." A review of the recent literature on the Middle East reveals that much of this work suffers from one or more common pitfalls: a failure to eschew partisan advocacy, an inability to descend from the lofty heights of the academic world to the reality of the situation, or a lack of understanding of the peoples involved, to name but a few. It was hoped that by narrowing the scope of the inquiry somewhat, these problems might be avoided. In May 1975, a number of scholars familiar with the Middle East were invited to prepare a short article for this issue. Wherever possible, theoretical approaches were to be combined with more practical aspects, in order to make the contribution of the "academic community" something more than abstract theorizing.

In recent years, regional diplomacy has been most successful on an incremental basis. So, with this technique in mind, three areas of consideration were suggested: (1) principles: concepts of international law that can be applied as the normative framework upon which to establish a foundation for consensus; (2) facts: areas in which consensus already exists, whether perceived or not, which can be used as the first points of an agreement; and (3) directions: building upon accepted facts (political, military, economic, geographic) in areas where consensus may not now exist, but where development of future consensus would most likely occur.

Readers having comments regarding the above framework, or any of the papers appearing herein, are invited to submit them to the Editor-in-Chief for consideration for publication in a future issue. It should be noted that much of the material appearing in this issue was prepared prior to the September 1975 accord between Egypt and Israel, and thus may not incorporate it specifically.

*The Board of Editors*

