

under an international legal obligation to heed the various normative strands of “sustainable development” is of no practical consequence as the banks already take into account non-economic, or institutional, social and environmental factors in their lending activities. At the same time, his insistence that the constituent treaties of MDBs bar them from engaging in “political activities” implies that the authoritative policies discussed are “political activities” and hence inadmissible. Bank decisions on lending activities are being *legally* circumscribed as a function of the emergence of relevant international public policy and law, the internationally mandated criteria for achieving sustainable development. This is appropriate and not “political,” for MDBs, like other actors on the international legal plane, are subject to general international law. As such they cannot insulate themselves against the reach of evolving international law by invoking a traditional understanding of the principles enshrined in their constituent treaty, especially when the new international norms not only permit but mandate a different view of what nowadays constitute prohibited “political activities.”

GUNTHER F. HANDL

*Tulane University School of Law*

TO THE CO-EDITORS IN CHIEF:

I have read with great interest the recent review (92 AJIL at 358) of the English edition of my book on the United Nations, *The Law and Practice of the United Nations* (1996). I am indeed grateful to the reviewer for having pointed out a certain number of linguistic mistakes in the translation. I wish to assure him that those who translated the book will be asked to take the necessary measures in order that the next edition will not contain such mistakes.

Once the next edition appears I hope that the American Journal, in accordance with its long-standing tradition and outstanding reputation, will proceed to a review of the substance of the book.

BENEDETTO CONFORTI

*Judge of the European Court of Human Rights*