

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	page xi
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
<i>Table of cases</i>	xvii
<i>Table of legal instruments</i>	lv
<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
PART I DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS	
2 Avoidance techniques	35
Non-recognition 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

viii CONTENTS

3	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 asserting 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