
CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. <i>The Topic</i>	1
2. <i>The Approach</i>	4
3. <i>The Structure</i>	5
4. <i>The Terminology</i>	8
PART ONE: THE FRAMEWORK	11
I. The Debate on Comparative Reasoning by Courts	13
1. <i>A Historical View</i>	14
1.1. A Novelty ...	14
1.2. ... Rising in Quantitative Terms	18
2. <i>The Context of the Current Debates</i>	20
II. Foreign Law in Courts: A Typology	24
1. <i>Mandatory Uses of Foreign Law</i>	26
1.1. Private International Law (Conflict of Laws)	27
1.2. Mutual Recognition, Extradition and Other Compulsory Considerations of Foreign Law	28
1.3. Directly Applicable Sources of Public International Law	29
1.4. Law of the European Union	32
1.5. Law of the European Convention of Human Rights	34
2. <i>Advisable Uses of Foreign Law</i>	35
2.1. Reference to a "Parent" International law (and to EU law before the Accession)	36
2.2. Laws Shared with or Taken from Other States	37
2.3. General Principles of Law	38
2.4. Intra-federal References	40
3. <i>Voluntary Uses of Foreign Law</i>	43
4. <i>Non-mandatory Uses of Foreign Law and Legal Comparisons</i>	43

III. Factors Influencing the Use of Comparative Reasoning by Courts	46
1. <i>General factors</i>	47
1.1. Political Factors	48
1.2. Size of the Jurisdiction	49
1.3. The Age of the Jurisdiction/Legal Regulation	50
2. <i>Institutional factors</i>	52
2.1. Level of the Court in the Judicial Structure	52
2.2. Analytical Back-up	54
2.3. Networks, Databases, Liaisons, Points of Reference	56
3. <i>Procedural factors</i>	59
3.1. Cases Selection	59
3.2. Activity of the Parties and Third Party Intervention	59
3.3. Costs of Litigation	62
4. <i>Human factors</i>	64
5. <i>Comparisons in Private and in Public Law</i>	67
6. <i>Constitutional Adjudication and Human Rights</i>	71
PART TWO: THE PRACTICE	75
IV. Prologue: The Methodology and its Pitfalls	77
1. <i>What</i>	77
2. <i>How</i>	78
3. <i>Potential Inaccuracies</i>	79
V. The Czech Republic	83
1. <i>Doctrine</i>	83
2. <i>Judicial Views</i>	86
3. <i>The Practice</i>	88
3. 1. The Constitutional Court	88
a) How	89
b) To Whom and by Whom	91
c) How Often	93
3. 2. The Supreme Court	95
3. 3. The Supreme Administrative Court	97
a) How	98
b) To Whom and by Whom	100
c) How Often	101
4. <i>Explaining the Gaps</i>	102
4. 1. Comparative Reasoning without a Theory?	103
4. 2. The Judicial Differentiation and Institutional Mentality	107

VI. The Slovak Republic	109
1. <i>Judicial Views</i>	110
2. <i>The Practice</i>	114
2.1. The Constitutional Court	114
a) How and How Often	115
b) To Whom	117
c) By Whom	120
d) The Hidden and the Flux	121
2.2. The Supreme Court	123
a) No Open Comparative Arguments	124
b) Judicial Style and Judicial “Economy”	126
c) The Absence of Persuasive Arguments	127
3. <i>The Difference: Common History Does not Mean the Same Present</i>	130
VII. Germany	133
1. <i>A Note on the Structure of German Federal Jurisdictions</i>	133
2. <i>The Doctrine</i>	135
2.1. The Comparative Law Debate	136
a) Zweigert’s Swiss Inspiration	137
b) The Orientation and the Control Function	139
c) The Doctrinal Advent of Public Law Comparisons	141
2.2. The General Rechtsdogmatik	142
a) Savigny and the Classical Canons	143
b) The Free Law Critique	145
c) The Current Streams: the Appreciation of Legislative Valuations	147
d) Whose Intent?	150
e) Comparative Reasoning: the Entry Points	151
3. <i>Judicial Views</i>	153
3.1. The Judicial Forum	153
3.2. Extra-judicial Fora	156
4. <i>The Practice</i>	157
4.1. The Federal Constitutional Court	158
a) How	158
b) To Whom and By Whom	159
c) How Often	160
4.2. The Federal Supreme Court	163
4.3. The Federal Administrative Court	166
5. <i>The Overall Picture: the Pre-eminence of Doctrinal Comparisons</i>	168
VIII. France	172
1. <i>A Note on the Judicial Style</i>	172
2. <i>The Doctrine</i>	176
2.1. The Exegesis	176
2.2. Gén \acute{e} y and the libre recherche scientifique	178

2.3. Saleilles and the Search for Objective Judicial Comparisons	180
2.4. The Modern Entry Points: Dynamic Interpretation, Standards and Gaps	181
3. <i>Judicial Views</i>	184
4. <i>The Practice</i>	186
4.1. Indirect Evidence of Comparative Analysis	187
4.2. Conseil d'Etat	190
4.3. Cour de cassation	193
4.4. Conseil constitutionnel	195
5. <i>An Evaluation: Comparative Analysis as a Liberalising Exercise?</i>	196
IX. England and Wales	200
1. <i>The Doctrine</i>	201
1.1. Precedent	202
1.2. Statutory Interpretation	204
2. <i>Judicial Views</i>	205
2.1. The Judicial Forum	205
2.2. Extra-judicial Fora	207
3. <i>The Practice</i>	208
3.1. The Common Law and the Rest of the World Gap	208
3.2. A Glance at the Appellate Committee of the House of Lords in 2009	211
4. <i>An Evaluation: A Real Change or Just a Change in Taxonomy?</i>	214
4.1. The Unity of the Common Law – from Appeals to Persuasiveness	214
4.2. With Whom to Compare?	217
4.3. The Flood of Compulsory Europe	219
X. An Empirical Epilogue	221
1. <i>The Quantity</i>	221
2. <i>The Quality</i>	224
3. <i>The Theories</i>	225
PART THREE: THE APPRAISAL	229
XI. Comparative Reasoning by Courts: The Theoretical Playing Field	231
1. <i>Judicial Ideologies and Comparative Reasoning</i>	232
2. <i>The Judge as Legislator</i>	234
3. <i>The Need for Extra-Systemic Inspiration</i>	236
3.1. Gaps in Law	236
3.2. Societal Change	238
4. <i>The (Positivistic) Limits of Comparative Reasoning by Courts</i>	240
4.1. Persuasive, not Binding Authority	241
4.2. A Subsidiary, Never a Controlling Argument	243

4.3. Defendable and Selective, not Conclusive	244
XII. Comparative Reasoning and Legal Transitions	245
1. <i>Legal System in Transition and Foreign Inspirations</i>	246
2. <i>Judiciary and Legal Transitions</i>	249
3. <i>Methodological Aspects: Appeals to External Values and Inspiration</i>	253
3.1. Purposive Reasoning and the Logic of Legal Revolutions	253
3.2. Comparative Arguments and the Search for External Authority	257
4. <i>Institutional Aspects:</i>	
<i>From Revolutionary Tribunals to Supreme Jurisdictions</i>	259
5. <i>On Influence, Importation and Mimicking</i>	264
XIII. On Authority, Citation, and Silence	269
1. <i>The Authority and Its Display in a Judicial Decision</i>	269
1.1. The Types of Authority: the Rational and the Religious	269
1.2. The Discovery and its Representation	271
1.3. The Styles of the Representation	273
1.4. The Meaning of a Legal Citation	275
2. <i>To Read and/or to Quote?</i>	277
3. <i>The Advantages of Silence</i>	279
3.1. The Transparency Trap	280
3.2. The Institutional and the Substantive Legitimacy	282
3.3. Transparency and Other Values	284
XIV. Comparative Reasoning by Courts:	
Some Classical Points Revisited	287
1. <i>Courts Travelling Abroad – A Problem of Modern Constitutionalism?</i>	287
1.1. The Dialectic	288
1.2. The Shifting Compromise	289
1.3. The American Deviation	291
2. <i>Blurred Methodology or Blurred Yardsticks?</i>	297
2.1. The Challenges	297
2.2. The Clash of Visions and Types of Authority	300
3. <i>The Purpose of Judicial Comparisons</i>	302
Conclusion	307

Bibliography	311
<i>Books</i>	311
<i>Articles and Book Chapters</i>	325

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE
Department of Law

COMPARATIVE REASONING IN EUROPEAN SUPREME COURTS
A Study in Foreign Persuasive Authority

Michal Bobek

Thesis submitted for assessment with a view to obtaining the degree of
Doctor of Laws of the European University Institute

Examining Board:

Professor Jacques Ziller, Università degli studi di Pavia/EUI (Supervisor)
Professor Bruno de Witte, De Universiteit Maastricht/EUI
Professor Alec Stone Sweet, Yale University
Professor John Bell, University of Cambridge

© 2010, Michal Bobek

No part of this thesis may be copied, reproduced or
transmitted without prior permission of the author