

AUGUST REINISCH

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	page xi
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
<i>Table of cases</i> I <	xvii
<i>Table of legal instruments</i>	ly
<i>List of abbreviations</i> •	• lxv

1 Purpose, subject and methodology of this study	1
Introduction	1
Subject of the study	4
Survey of existing material and literature	• 17
Methods	21

PARTI DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

2 Avoidance techniques	35
NonTrecognition as a legal person under domestic law	37
Non-recognition of a particular act of an international organization - <i>ultra vires</i> acts and non-attributability	70
Prudential judicial abstention through doctrines concerning act of state, political questions, and non-justiciability	84
Lack of adjudicative power of domestic courts	99
No case or controversy ,	124
judicial discretion to prevent harassing lawsuits and mock trials	126
According immunity to international organizations	127

Strategies of judicial involvement	169
Non-qualification as international organization	170
No delegation of immunity	172
Recognition of an international organization as a legal person under domestic law	175
Denying immunity	177
Restricting the scope of immunity	185
Broad waiver interpretation	214

PART II POLICY ISSUES

4 Rationales for judicial abstention	233
The protection of the functioning and independence of an international organization	233
A counterbalance to the relative weakness of international organizations	238
The influence of states on an international organization should be channelled through its 'internal law'	239
Equality of the member states of an international organization	241
Securing uniformity in dispute settlement	243
Derived or delegated state sovereignty	245
Immunity as an inherent quality of international legal personality	246
Lack of territory	248
Precedent and prestige	250
5 Reasons for assenting jurisdiction	252
Judicial protection as a public good sought by and against international organizations	252
Making sense of immunity qualifications	253
Encroachment on the territorial sovereignty of the forum state	254
Higher degree of integration: the federal state analogy	255
Enhancing the creditworthiness of international organizations as a functional reason to limit immunity	255
No immunity for <i>iure gestionis</i> activities: the same immunity standard as the one used for states	258
Fairness to third parties	262
Human rights and constitutional limits	278

PART III FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

6	Do national courts provide an appropriate forum for disputes involving international organizations?	317
	Critical appraisal of the quality of the existing case law	317
	The broader framework	318
	The parameters	324
	Possible solutions	328
7	Conclusions	391
	<i>Bibliography</i>	394
	<i>Index</i>	444