

Contents

List of Abbreviations

ix

Introduction	1
1. The Topic	1
2. The Approach	2
3. The Structure	4
4. Acknowledgements	5

PART I. THE FRAMEWORK

1. The Debate on Comparative Reasoning by Courts	9
1. A Historical View	9
1.1 A Novelty ...	9
1.2 ... Rising in Quantitative Terms	14
2. The Context of the Current Debates	16
2. Foreign Law in Courts: A Typology	19
1. Mandatory Uses of Foreign Law	21
1.1 Private International Law (Conflict of Laws)	22
1.2 Mutual Recognition, Extradition, and Other Compulsory Considerations of Foreign Law	22
1.3 Directly Applicable Sources of Public International Law	23
1.4 Law of the European Union	25
1.5 Law of the European Convention on Human Rights	27
2. Advisable Uses of Foreign Law	28
2.1 Reference to a Parent International Law (and to EU Law before Accession)	28
2.2 Laws Shared with or Taken from Other States	29
2.3 General Principles of Law	30
2.4 Intra-federal References	31
3. Voluntary Uses of Foreign Law	33
4. Non-mandatory Uses of Foreign Law and Legal Comparisons	34
3. Factors Influencing the Use of Comparative Arguments by Courts	36
1. Introduction: Of Abstract Models and Causality	36
2. General Factors	39
2.1 The Political and the Legal	40
2.2 The Size	41
2.3 The Age	42
3. Institutional Factors	44
3.1 Level of the Court in the Judicial Hierarchy	44

3.2 Analytical Back-up	46
3.3 Points of Reference, Networks, Databases	47
4. Procedural Factors	50
4.1 Cases Selection	50
4.2 Activity of the Parties	51
4.3 Amicus curiae	52
4.4 Costs of Litigation	53
5. Human Factors	54
6. Comparisons in Private and in Public Law	57
7. Constitutional Adjudication and Human Rights	60

PART II. THE PRACTICE

4. Prologue: The Method and its Pitfalls	67
1. What	67
2. How	69
3. Potential Inaccuracies	72
5. England and Wales	75
1. The Doctrine	76
1.1 Precedent	77
1.2 Statutory Interpretation	78
1.3 An Axiomatically Open System	79
2. Judicial Views	80
2.1 The Judicial Forum	80
2.2 Extra-judicial Fora	82
3. The Practice	84
3.1 The Common Law and the Rest of the World Gap	84
3.2 A Glance at the Appellate Committee of the House of Lords in 2009	87
3.3 The Supreme Court of the United Kingdom	90
4. An Evaluation: A Real Change or Just a Change in Taxonomy?	90
4.1 The Unity of the Common Law—from Appeals to Coordination	90
4.2 With Whom to Compare?	93
4.3 The Voluntary Commonwealth and the Compulsory Europe	95
6. France	97
1. A Note on the Judicial Style	97
2. The Doctrine	99
2.1 The Exegesis	100
2.2 GénY and the <i>libre recherche scientifique</i>	101
2.3 Saleilles and the Search for Objective Judicial Comparisons	103
2.4 The Modern Entry Points: Dynamic Interpretation, Standards, and Gaps	104
3. Judicial Views	106
4. The Practice	107
4.1 Indirect Evidence of Comparative Analysis	108
4.2 <i>Conseil d'Etat</i>	111

4.3 <i>Cour de cassation</i>	113
4.4 <i>Conseil constitutionnel</i>	114
5. An Evaluation: Comparative Analysis as a Liberalizing Exercise?	116
7. Germany	120
1. A Note on the Structure of German Federal Jurisdictions	120
2. The Doctrine	122
2.1 The Comparative Law Debate	123
2.2 The General <i>Rechtsdogmatik</i>	127
3. Judicial Views	135
3.1 The Judicial Forum	136
3.2 Extra-judicial Fora	138
4. The Practice	139
4.1 <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i>	140
4.2 <i>Bundesgerichtshof</i>	144
4.3 <i>Bundesverwaltungsgericht</i>	147
5. The Overall Picture: The Pre-eminence of Scholarly Comparisons	148
8. Czech Republic	152
1. The Doctrine	152
2. Judicial Views	154
3. The Practice	157
3.1 <i>Ústavní soud</i>	157
3.2 <i>Nejvyšší soud</i>	162
3.3 <i>Nejvyšší správní soud</i>	164
4. Explaining the Gaps	168
4.1 Comparative Law without a Theory	168
4.2 Judicial Differentiation and Institutional Mentality	172
9. Slovakia	174
1. Judicial Views	175
2. The Practice	178
2.1 <i>Ústavný súd</i>	178
2.2 <i>Najvyšší súd</i>	185
3. The Difference: Common History Does Not Mean the Same Present	189
10. An Empirical Epilogue: Quantity, Quality, and Beyond	192
1. The Quantity	192
2. The Quality	196
3. The Theories	197
 PART III. THE APPRAISAL	
11. Comparative Reasoning by Courts: The Theoretical Playing Field	203
1. Judicial Ideologies and Judicial Decision-making	204
2. The Need for Extra-systemic Inspiration	205

2.1 Gaps in Law	206
2.2 Societal Change	208
3. Judges as Legislators	210
4. The (Positivistic) Limits of Comparative Reasoning by Courts	212
4.1 Persuasive, never Binding	213
4.2 Subsidiary, never Controlling	215
4.3 Additional, never Free-standing	216
4.4 Defendable and Selective, not Exhaustive	217
5. Summary: Of Old and New Hats	217
12. On Authority, Citation, and Silence	220
1. The Authority and its Display in a Judicial Decision	220
1.1 The Types of Authority: The Rational and the Religious	220
1.2 The Discovery and its Representation	222
1.3 The Styles of the Representation	223
2. The Meaning of a Legal Citation	225
3. To Read and/or to Quote?	227
4. The Advantages of Silence	230
4.1 The Institutional and the Substantive Legitimacy	230
4.2 The Transparency Trap	233
4.3 Transparency and Other Values	234
13. Comparative Reasoning by Courts: Some Classical Points Revisited	237
1. The Legitimacy	237
2. The Methodology	240
2.1 The Challenges: Of Cherries and Misunderstandings	240
2.2 Blurred Methodology or Blurred Yardsticks?	242
3. The Purpose	245
4. The Predictability	249
14. The Deviations: Political Over- and Non-comparisons	252
1. Politics of Comparisons	252
2. Over-comparisons	255
2.1 The Nature of a Legal Transition	255
2.2 Judiciary in a Legal Transition	257
2.3 Methodological Aspects: External Inspiration and Authority	260
2.4 Institutional Aspects: From Revolutionary Tribunals to Regular Supreme Jurisdictions	265
2.5 Of Law Importation and Temporal Colonies	269
3. Non-comparisons	272
3.1 Superiority, Exclusivity, and Political Closures	272
3.2 The American Deviation	274
Conclusions	282
<i>Select Bibliography</i>	288
<i>Index</i>	307