



Interpreting Rights Collectively

**Comparative Arguments in Public Interest Litigants' Briefs
on Fundamental Rights Issues**

Laura Van den Eynde

Research Fellow (F.R.S-FNRS)

Promoters: Julie Allard (ULB) & Emmanuelle Bribosia (ULB)

Thesis Guidance Committee: Julie Allard (ULB) | Emmanuelle Bribosia (ULB)
Isabelle Rorive (ULB) | Sébastien Van Drooghenbroeck
(Université Saint-Louis – Bruxelles)

2015

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations.....	xi
Introductory Chapter	1
1. Introduction and Hypotheses.....	1
2. Public Interest Litigation: Notion and History.....	6
3. Fields and Methodology.....	19
3.1. A Comparative Approach	21
3.2. Selection of Jurisdictions	23
3.3. Selection of Case Studies: Landmark Cases	27
3.4. Data Collection.....	31
3.5. Analyzing the Data and Revealing the Briefs' Influence.....	32
4. Outline of the Chapters	37
Chapter 1: Public Interest Litigants' Forms of Participation in Proceedings.....	39
1. Introduction.....	39
2. Support to Individual Victims and Sponsoring of Test Cases or of Class Actions.....	43
3. The Public Interest Litigant Acting as Claimant: the Issue of Standing.....	51
3.1. Standing in U.S. Federal Law	52
3.2. A Limited Locus Standi at the European Court of Human Rights	57
3.3. A Generous Locus Standi in Fundamental Rights Matters in South Africa	64
4. The Amicus Curiae: Definitions, Roles and Procedure	69
4.1. An Evolving Understanding of the Amicus Curiae	69
4.2. The Roles of Amicus Curiae.....	73
4.2.1. Informational Role	74
4.2.2. Legitimizing Role.....	78
4.2.3. Reinforcement and Representational Role.....	80
4.2.4. Long-Term Advocacy and Publicizing Role.....	83
4.3. Before the United States Supreme Court	84
4.3.1. Evolution and Procedure.....	84
4.3.2. Landscape.....	87
4.4. Before the European Court of Human Rights	90
4.4.1. Evolution and Procedure.....	90
4.4.2. Landscape.....	93

4.5.	Before the South African Constitutional Court.....	98
4.5.1.	Evolution and Procedure.....	98
4.5.2.	Landscape.....	100
4.6.	The Difficult Task of Measuring Amicus Curiae’s Influence	101
5.	Conclusion.....	106
Chapter 2: Comparative Reasoning in Adjudication		113
1.	Introduction.....	113
2.	The Judicial Use of Comparative Arguments: Definitional and Novelty Aspects	114
3.	Rationales for Engaging into Comparison when Interpreting and Adjudicating Fundamental Rights.....	121
3.1.	To Learn and Produce ‘Better’ Outcomes	123
3.2.	To Act as Signaling Devices	126
3.3.	To Participate in the Global Enterprise of Human Rights Adjudication	129
4.	Critics’ Objections against the Practice v. Supporters’ Rejoinders	132
4.1.	Sovereignty and Democratic Processes	134
4.2.	Incommensurability Deriving from Particularism	136
4.3.	Cherry Picking and Judicial Activism.....	139
4.4.	Methodological Concerns	142
4.4.1.	Where to Look?.....	146
4.4.2.	How Do Judges Inform Themselves and Can Accurately Assess Foreign Material?	148
5.	Cross-Jurisdictional Variations: Scope of the Phenomenon and Interpretation Techniques 153	
5.1.	At the U.S. Supreme Court	158
5.1.1.	Scope of the Phenomenon of Judicial Dialogue	158
5.1.2.	Favored Interpretations Methods	161
5.2.	At the European Court of Human Rights.....	166
5.2.1.	Scope of the Phenomenon of Judicial Dialogue	166
5.2.2.	Favored Interpretations Methods	169
5.3.	At the South African Constitutional Court.....	175
5.3.1.	Scope of the Phenomenon of Judicial Dialogue	175
5.3.2.	Favored Interpretations Methods	177
6.	Conclusion.....	183

Chapter 3: The Comparative Elements in Public Interest Litigants’ Briefs in Inhuman and Degrading Treatment Cases (Death Penalty and Related Issues)..... 189

1. Introduction	189
2. United States Supreme Court	193
2.1. Introduction	193
2.2. <i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972)	199
2.3. <i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976).....	203
2.4. <i>Coker v. Georgia</i> (1977)	205
2.5. <i>Enmund v. Florida</i> (1982).....	206
2.6. <i>Thompson v. Oklahoma</i> (1988)	207
2.7. <i>Stanford v. Kentucky</i> (1989).....	211
2.8. <i>Atkins v. Virginia</i> (2002)	214
2.9. <i>Roper v. Simmons</i> (2005)	219
2.10. <i>Baze v. Rees</i> (2008)	227
2.11. <i>Kennedy v. Louisiana</i> (2008)	230
3. European Court of Human Rights	234
3.1. Introduction	234
3.2. <i>Soering v. the United Kingdom</i> (1989)	237
3.3. <i>Öcalan v. Turkey</i> (2005)	241
3.4. <i>Boumediene and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina</i> (2008)	243
3.5. <i>Al-Saadoon and Mufdhi v. the United Kingdom</i> (2010)	246
3.6. <i>Babar Ahmad and Others v. the United Kingdom</i> (2010).....	248
3.7. <i>Al Nashiri v. Poland</i> (2014)	251
4. South African Constitutional Court.....	257
4.1. Introduction	257
4.2. <i>State v. Makwanyane</i> (1995).....	259
4.3. <i>Mohamed v. President of the Republic of South Africa</i> (2001).....	273
4.4. <i>Minister of Home Affairs and Others v. Tsebe and Others</i> (2012)	276
5. Conclusion.....	280

Chapter 4: The Comparative Elements in Public Interest Litigants’ Briefs in Sexual Orientation Cases 285

1. Introduction	285
2. The European Court of Human Rights.....	289
2.1. Introduction	289
2.2. <i>Dudgeon v. the United Kingdom</i> (1981)	293

2.3.	<i>Smith and Grady v. the United Kingdom and Lustig-Prean and Beckett v. United Kingdom</i> (1999)	297
2.4.	<i>Fretté v. France</i> (2002)	299
2.5.	<i>Karner v. Austria</i> (2003)	300
2.6.	<i>E.B. v. France</i> (2008)	302
2.7.	<i>Schalk and Kopf v. Austria</i> (2010)	303
2.8.	<i>Gas and Dubois v. France</i> (2012)	306
2.9.	<i>X. v. Austria</i> (2013)	307
2.10.	<i>Vallianatos and Others v. Greece</i> (2013)	309
2.11.	<i>Oliari and Others v. Italy</i> (2015)	312
3.	The United States Supreme Court	315
3.1.	Introduction	315
3.2.	<i>Bowers v. Hardwick</i> (1986)	320
3.3.	<i>Romer v. Evans</i> (1996)	322
3.4.	<i>Boy Scouts of America v. Dale</i> (2000)	323
3.5.	<i>Lawrence v. Texas</i> (2003)	324
3.6.	<i>Hollingsworth v. Perry</i> (2013)	328
3.7.	<i>United States v. Windsor</i> (2013)	334
3.8.	<i>Obergefell v. Hodges et al.</i> (2015)	336
4.	The South African Constitutional Court	342
4.1.	Introduction	342
4.2.	<i>National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality v. Minister of Justice</i> (1998)	348
4.3.	<i>National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality v. Minister of Home Affairs and Others</i> (1999)	354
4.4.	<i>Du Toit v. Minister of Welfare and Population Development</i> (2002)	357
4.5.	<i>Minister of Home Affairs v. Fourie</i> (2005)	358
5.	Conclusion	365
Chapter 5: Cross-Analysis and Discussion		371
1.	Introduction	371
2.	Public Interest Litigants' Comparative Material's Influence on the Judges	375
3.	Presence of Groups and Modes of Access	385
3.1.	Modes of Access: All Avenues Are Used	385
3.2.	Diverse Landscapes and Key Repeat Players' Profiles	394
3.2.1.	Professional and Assimilationist NGOs, Cause Lawyers and Epistemic Communities	399

3.2.2.	The Appearance of ‘Conservative’ Groups.....	405
4.	Presence of Comparative Material in the Briefs	411
4.1.	A Variety of Uses.....	411
4.1.1.	Comparative Reasoning ‘Sensu Lato’	414
4.1.2.	Comparative Law ‘Sensu Stricto’: Mainly Norm-Centric before the U.S. Supreme Court but Reason-Centric before the Two Other Jurisdictions.	418
4.2.	Limited Pool of Cited Jurisdictions and Scarcity of Methodological Insights	425
5.	Shaped by Legal Culture: Why Some Public Interest Litigants are More Inclined to Cite Comparative Arguments	434
5.1.	Transnational Actors	437
5.2.	Most Domestic Actors in Europe and South Africa.....	441
5.3.	Why So Few U.S. Domestic Actors?	445
6.	Shaping the Legal Culture: Public Interest Litigants’ Influence on the Sources of Adjudication: Justifications Provided for the Relevance of Comparative Material.....	450
6.1.	Cross-References Offer Guidance.....	454
6.2.	The Constitutional License (South Africa), the Framers’ Intent (U.S.) and/or the Court’s Own Jurisprudence (South Africa and U.S.).....	456
6.3.	Leadership, Diplomatic Relations and Other Practical Consequences in Foreign Policy	458
6.4.	Because Universal Fundamental Rights or Moral Questions Are at Stake.....	462
6.5.	On Consensus and Consistency among Nations	469
7.	Conclusion.....	478
	General Conclusion	483