

# Table of Contents

Table of Cases	15
Abbreviations	29
Introduction	31
I. The issue of judicial review in foreign affairs – three examples	31
II. Design of the thesis	38
1. Selection of jurisdictions	38
2. Structure	39
3. The thesis within the broader project of comparative foreign relations law	41
4. Methodological remarks and conceptual constraints	47
Chapter 1 – Origins of Deference	51
I. The traditional position in political philosophy	52
1. Thomas Hobbes	52
2. John Locke	54
3. Charles Montesquieu	56
II. Adoption of the traditional position in the three jurisdictions	57
1. South Africa	58
a) Jenkins, Blackstone and foreign affairs as crown prerogatives	58
b) The birth of deference in the Victorian Age	60
c) South African adoption of English foreign relations law	64
aa) Older South African constitutions	64
bb) The new South African Constitution	67
2. United States of America	68
a) A new idea of separation of powers in foreign affairs: Continental Congress and Constitutional Convention	69
b) Early constitutional practice and first traits of the traditional position	72

## Table of Contents

c) Early traces of the traditional position in the Supreme Court	74
d) The late victory of deference: from Quincy Wright to Sutherland	76
3. Germany	80
a) Prussian legal thought and constitutional practice	80
b) The German Empire	85
c) Weimar Republic	89
d) Nazi Germany	91
e) Contemporary German Law	93
III. Conclusion on the Origins of Deference	96
Chapter 2 – Defining Deference	99
I. Doctrines of procedural non-reviewability	100
1. Standing (USA)	100
2. <i>Klage- und Antragsbefugnis</i> (Germany)	105
3. The new South African rules of standing (South Africa)	109
II. Doctrines of substantive non-reviewability	115
1. Political Question Doctrine (USA)	115
2. <i>Justizfreie Hoheitsakte</i> (Germany)	118
3. From Act of State to Political Questions? (South Africa)	120
III. Doctrines of conclusiveness	122
1. Executive law-making and binding ‘suggestions’ (USA)	123
2. <i>Bindungswirkung</i> (Germany)	126
3. Certification (South Africa)	130
IV. Doctrines of discretion	133
1. Deference in the narrow sense (USA)	134
2. Areas of discretion and reduced level of review (Germany)	136
3. Reduced levels of scrutiny (South Africa)	139
V. The spectrum of deference	142
1. Other forms of deference	142
2. The deference scale	143
VI. Conclusion on Defining Deference	144

Chapter 3 – Application of Deference	149
I. Tracing deference	151
1. Treaty interpretation	151
a) United States	152
aa) Treaties and US constitutional law	152
bb) Deference in treaty interpretation	152
(1) Early jurisprudence and ‘zero deference’	152
(2) Early 20 <sup>th</sup> century and the birth of deference in treaty interpretation	154
(3) The situation under contemporary US law	157
(a) Two conflicting approaches	157
(b) <i>Chevron</i> deference in treaty interpretation	158
(c) <i>Sanchez-Llamas</i> and <i>Hamdan</i>	159
(d) Recent developments in treaty interpretation	162
b) Germany	163
aa) Situation in former German legal orders	163
bb) Situation under the Basic Law	165
(1) Early decisions concerning treaties – the Constitutional Court getting involved in foreign affairs	165
(2) The <i>Saarstatut</i> decision and the Washington Agreement – widening the scope of review	167
(3) Fundamental Relations Treaty and <i>Hess</i> case – more leeway for the executive?	169
(4) <i>Pershing</i> case and <i>Out of Area</i> - executive influence in the subsequent development of treaties	173
(5) Recent developments	175
(6) Excursus – Cases concerning interim relief	176
c) South Africa	178
aa) Older South African constitutions	178
bb) New South African Constitution	180
d) Conclusion on treaty interpretation	184
2. Recognition of states and governments	186
a) United States	188
b) Germany	192
c) South Africa	197
d) Conclusion on recognition of states and governments	201

## Table of Contents

3. State immunity	202
a) United States	203
b) Germany	207
c) South Africa	212
d) Conclusion on state immunity	215
4. Foreign official immunity	216
a) USA	217
aa) Early cases concerning individual immunity	217
bb) Situation post-FSIA and the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Samantar v Yousuf</i>	220
cc) Current developments – a circuit split	222
b) Germany	225
aa) Foreign official immunity during the Bismarck and Weimar Constitutions	225
bb) Foreign official immunity in contemporary German law	228
(1) Statutory foundations	228
(2) The Tabatabai litigation	229
(a) General background of the case	229
(b) The approach of the Regional Court	231
(c) The holding of the higher courts	231
(d) Lessons from the <i>Tabatabai</i> case	232
(3) Further developments in Germany	233
c) South Africa	234
aa) The situation under previous South African constitutions	234
bb) The situation under the new South African Constitution	236
(1) <i>Al-Bashir</i> case	238
(2) <i>Mugabe</i> case	239
(3) Lessons from the <i>Al-Bashir</i> and <i>Mugabe</i> cases	240
d) Conclusion on foreign official immunity	241
5. Diplomatic protection	242
a) United States	243
b) Germany	247
c) South Africa	252
d) Conclusion on diplomatic protection	256
6. Conclusion on the tracing of deference	257

II. General Problems in the application of deference	259
1. Non-reviewability and conclusiveness doctrines in contemporary South African law	259
a) Cases cited as a basis for non-reviewability in South Africa	261
b) Evaluating contemporary case law	264
2. The role of the executive assessments in the absence of a doctrine of non-reviewability in contemporary German law	267
3. The status of conclusiveness doctrines in contemporary US law	275
III. Conclusion on the Application of Deference	279
Chapter 4 – Dynamics of Deference	281
I. Convergence forces – a new calibration of executive and judicial power in foreign affairs	281
1. Globalization	282
a) The ‘deterritorialization’ of the state and its economy	283
b) The changing structure of the international system and international law	287
c) The development of a global legal dialogue	292
2. Entanglement of international and domestic law	297
a) General blurring of the domestic and international law divide	297
b) Closer entanglement in foreign relations law	299
3. Changing role of parliaments in foreign affairs	304
a) Traditional exclusion of the legislative branch from foreign affairs	304
b) Gradual expansion of legislative influence	307
aa) Germany	308
bb) South Africa	311
cc) United States	313
dd) International law	316
c) A (not so) silent profiteer: the judiciary	317
aa) Germany	317
bb) South Africa	319
cc) United States	321
4. Changed relationship between the state and the individual	324
a) General acceleration of convergence trends	325

## *Table of Contents*

b) Strengthening judicial review in foreign affairs	327
II. Divergence Forces – different receptiveness toward the general trend	334
1. Position within the international system	334
2. Constitutional framework	338
3. Historical experience	341
a) German legal tradition and scholarship in the 19 <sup>th</sup> century	342
b) Openness towards international law	344
c) Focus on constitutional and human rights	349
4. Populism	353
a) Populism and deference	354
b) Instances of a ‘populist’ backlash in the United States, Germany and South Africa	356
c) The impact of the populist backlash	359
III. Conclusion on the Dynamics of Deference	363
Chapter 5 – The Future of Deference	367
I. A ‘modern position’?	367
II. Future dynamics: Russia’s war in Ukraine	369
III. A normative claim	378
1. The ‘foreign affairs fairy tale’	378
2. Towards a balanced and transparent margin of discretion approach	379
IV. Conclusion – The emperor without clothes	383
Summary of Findings	385
Bibliography	397