

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD .....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii

## *PART I INTRODUCTION*

<b>CHAPTER I BACKGROUND: FRAGMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AND “HUMAN RIGHTISM”.....</b>	<b>5</b>
I. Fragmentation of International Law.....	5
II. Does International Human Rights Law Contribute to the Fragmentation of International Law by Emphasizing Its “Special” Character? .....	7
1. Academic Interest for the Relationship Between International Human Rights Law and General International Law.....	7
2. “Special” Character of Human Rights Law: Leading to “Autonomy”, “Moderate Evolution” or “Human Rightism”? .....	11
3. Ambivalent Position of Human Rights Courts .....	15
<b>CHAPTER II RESEARCH ASSUMPTION .....</b>	<b>19</b>
I. “International Human Rights Law” .....	19
1. Useful Term of Art Referring to a Particular Subsystem of International Law .....	19
2. Focus on ACHR and ECHR and the Corresponding Subsystems ...	22
II. “General International Law” .....	23
1. Useful Term of Art with a Normative and Substantial Aspect.....	24
A. “International Law” Refers to the Normative Aspect of General Norms.....	24
B. “General” Refers to the Content of the International Law Norms .....	29
2. Misconceptions.....	31
III. “Relationship” Between “Special” and “General” International Law .....	35
1. “Special” Relationship Between “International Human Rights Law” and “General International Law”.....	36

2.	Two Acceptable Ways to Consider the “Specialty” of International Human Rights Law .....	37
A.	“Specialty” in the Sense of an Elaboration of General International Law .....	37
B.	“Specialty” in the Sense of an Exception to General International Law .....	38
C.	“Specialty” May Not Lead to Human Rightism .....	39
IV.	Research Assumption: International Human Rights Courts May Develop General International Law but Not Contradict It, Unless a Clear <i>Lex Specialis</i> Can Be Established. ....	40

**CHAPTER III METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH .....** 45

I.	Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (VCLT): An Appropriate Framework to Assess the “Specialty” Claims .....	45
1.	VCLT as General International Law on Treaties. ....	46
2.	VCLT: An Appropriate Treaty to Test the Research Assumption. ...	49
II.	Short Survey of the Other Norms of General International Law. ....	50

***PART II GENERAL INTERNATIONAL LAW ON TREATIES BEFORE HUMAN RIGHTS COURTS: HUMAN RIGHTISM OR DEVELOPMENT OF GENERAL LAW?***

**CHAPTER I RECURRENT REFERENCES TO THE CONCEPT OF LAW-MAKING TREATIES (WITH AN INDEPENDENT MONITORING ORGAN) .....** 57

I.	Doctrinal Concept of “Law-Making Treaties” .....	58
1.	Scholars Defending the Relevance of the Concept .....	58
2.	Scholars Downplaying the Relevance of the Concept .....	59
3.	Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties .....	60
II.	Human Rights Courts Regularly Refer to The Concept of “Law-Making Treaties” .....	61
1.	Non-Reciprocity as a Key Feature .....	61
A.	Objective Norms for State Parties. ....	61
B.	With a Constitutional Character?. ....	63
2.	Do All “Law-Making” Treaties Have a Judicial Organ? .....	64
3.	Consequences of this Categorization According to Human Rights Courts. ....	65

A.	Obligations for Third States? . . . . .	65
B.	Relevant for the “Special” Interpretation, Application, Modification and Termination of Human Rights Treaties? . . . .	66
III.	Recurrent References Mark but do Not Clarify the Specialty Claim. . . . .	66
1.	Concept of Law-Making Treaties Exists. . . . .	66
2.	But Is It Used to Challenge or to Develop the VCLT? . . . . .	66

## CHAPTER II ASSESSING THE “SPECIAL” APPROACH TOWARDS

	RESERVATIONS (ARTICLES 19–23 VCLT). . . . .	69
I.	VCLT or the Ambiguity of the General Rules. . . . .	70
II.	Human Rightism or Elaboration of the VCLT? . . . . .	74
1.	A Special Definition of Reservations in the Light of the Human Rights Treaty Text? . . . . .	75
A.	Distinguishing Interpretative Declarations from Reservations. . . . .	75
1.	Intention of the State Parties Is Decisive. . . . .	75
2.	Negative Territorial Declarations Are (Not Necessarily Valid) Reservations. . . . .	76
3.	Distinguishing Limitations to the Optional (Acceptance of the) Competence of Human Rights Organs from Reservations (or Negative Territorial Limitations): A “Special” Approach. . . . .	79
B.	Existing Distinctions Develop but Do Not Challenge the VCLT and General International Law on Treaties. . . . .	84
2.	Competence of Human Rights Courts to Address the Applicability and Validity of Reservations. . . . .	86
A.	“Special” Competence of Human Rights Courts Flows from the Text of the ECHR and the ACHR. . . . .	87
1.	ECtHR’s Competence. . . . .	87
2.	IACtHR’s Competence. . . . .	89
3.	Human Rights Courts’ Broad Mandate Suffices to Defend Their “Special” Competence . . . . .	89
B.	Human Rights Courts Assess the Validity of Reservations in Line with Article 19 VCLT . . . . .	91
1.	Human Rights Courts Take Sides in the Doctrinal Debate Between Opposability and Permissibility. . . . .	91
2.	Article 57 ECHR Requires Specified Reservations (Article 19(b) VCLT) . . . . .	92
3.	Article 75 ACHR Requires Reservations to Be Compatible with the Object and Purpose of the Treaty (Article 19(c) VCLT). . . . .	96

C.	Human Rights Courts Challenge the Importance of State Acceptance and State Objections (Article 20 VCLT) . . . . .	100
1.	ECtHR's Cautious Assessment of the Relevance of States' Objections and Acceptance . . . . .	102
2.	IACtHR's Clear Rejection of the Relevance of States' Objections and Acceptance . . . . .	103
D.	Not the Conclusion That Human Rights Courts Are Competent, but the Conclusion That State Behaviour Is Irrelevant Amounts to Human Rightism . . . . .	106
3.	Assessing the Consequences of Inapplicable and Invalid Reservations: A Special Approach? . . . . .	107
A.	ECtHR's Severability Approach: Developing the VCLT . . . . .	109
1.	Origin and Justification of the Severability Doctrine . . . . .	109
2.	Recent Mitigations of this Doctrine . . . . .	111
3.	Is the ECtHR Developing a Voluntarist Variant of the Severability Doctrine? . . . . .	111
B.	IACtHR's Silence on the Topic . . . . .	112
C.	Severability Doctrine Refines the VCLT Regime, but How? . . . . .	113
4.	Withdrawal of Reservations . . . . .	117
A.	ECtHR . . . . .	117
B.	IACtHR . . . . .	118
C.	No Real Indications That Human Rights Courts Challenge the VCLT on This Issue . . . . .	119
III.	Conclusion: Human Rights Courts Essentially Develop the VCLT Reservations Regime Without Contradicting It . . . . .	120
<b>CHAPTER III SPECIAL APPLICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES (ARTICLES 24–30 VCLT)? . . . . .</b>		
<b>123</b>		
I.	Application <i>Ratione Temporis</i> (Articles 24 and 28 VCLT) . . . . .	123
1.	VCLT . . . . .	124
2.	Human Rights Courts Reject the “Specialty” Claim . . . . .	129
A.	ECtHR's Emphasis on “Facts Constitutive of the Alleged Interference” . . . . .	129
B.	IACtHR's Attempt Not to Limit Its Temporal Jurisdiction to Interferences . . . . .	136
3.	Conclusion . . . . .	142
II.	Application <i>Ratione Loci</i> (Article 29 VCLT) . . . . .	143
1.	VCLT . . . . .	143
2.	Between the Elaboration of the Traditional Approach and Human Rightism . . . . .	144

A.	“Special” Clauses in Human Rights Treaties . . . . .	144
B.	Reference to Jurisdiction: Exception to the Territorial Approach of the VCLT? . . . . .	145
1.	Concept of Jurisdiction in Public International Law . . . . .	147
2.	Human Rights Courts Develop the Concept of Jurisdiction. . . . .	149
3.	Conclusion. . . . .	164
III.	Application <i>Ratione Personae</i> of Human Rights Treaties and Jurisdiction <i>Ratione Personae</i> of Human Rights Courts . . . . .	166
1.	VCLT and Other Relevant General Rules. . . . .	166
2.	Human Rights Courts Rely on a Clear <i>Lex Specialis</i> or Develop the General Rule. . . . .	168
A.	Application of Human Rights Treaties <i>Ratione Personae</i> : Legitimation via General International Law. . . . .	168
1.	Confirming and Clarifying the General Rules on the Attribution of State Responsibility: About State Organs, Persons or Entities Exercising Elements of Governmental Authority, Insurrectional Movements and Paramilitary Groups . . . . .	169
2.	Attribution of State Responsibility in Connection with the Act of an International Organization: Making International Law of Cooperation Work. . . . .	180
3.	Attribution of State Responsibility in Connection with the Act of an Individual (not a State Organ) . . . . .	193
B.	Jurisdiction <i>Ratione Personae</i> : “Special” Legitimation via the Treaty Texts . . . . .	194
1.	Individual Complaints: A Revolution Orchestrated by the States. . . . .	194
2.	State Complaints: Developing the Concept of Obligations <i>Erga Omnes Contractantes</i> ? . . . . .	201
3.	Conclusion. . . . .	203
IV.	<i>Ratione Materiae</i> . . . . .	205
1.	Establishing the Material Scope of a Treaty is Essentially a Matter of Interpretation . . . . .	205
2.	Human Rights Courts Endorse the General Rule That the Treaty Norms Prevail over Domestic Law (Articles 27 VCLT and 46 VCLT). . . . .	207
3.	Conclusion. . . . .	209
V.	Human Rights Courts Mostly Respect and Develop the General Rules. . . . .	209

<b>CHAPTER IV SPECIAL APPROACH TOWARDS INTERPRETATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES (31–33 VCLT)?</b> .....	213
I. Introduction .....	213
1. Approach .....	213
2. Preliminary Remark: No Watertight Distinction Between Interpretation and Application .....	214
II. Treaty Interpretation According to the VCLT .....	217
1. Articles 31–33 VCLT: Interpretation as a Comprehensive Exercise with Various Elements .....	217
2. Various Schools of Interpretation .....	220
A. Textual Approach .....	221
B. Subjective (or Intentional) Approach .....	222
C. Teleological Approach .....	224
D. Inclusive or Holistic Approach .....	225
3. Conclusion .....	226
III. Human Rights Courts Emphasize “Special” Aims of the Interpretative Process .....	227
1. Autonomous Interpretation .....	229
A. Specific Aim .....	229
1. Autonomous Interpretation Serves to Delimit the Scope of the Treaty Terms and the Treaty .....	232
B. One-Way Autonomy? .....	235
C. Underlying Methodology .....	238
2. Evolutive Interpretation .....	243
A. Specific Aim .....	243
1. Interpreting in the Light of Present Day Conditions .....	243
2. Allowing International Courts to Recognize New Treaty Obligations .....	246
B. Underlying Methodology .....	253
1. Important Role of Object and Purpose .....	253
2. Consensus as a Decisive Element to Establish the Evolving Object and Purpose of the ECHR Provisions? ..	263
3. Evolving Understanding of the International Legal System as a Decisive Element to Establish the Understanding of the Objective Nature of the ACHR Provisions? .....	294
3. Principle of Effectiveness .....	312
A. Specific Aim .....	312
B. Underlying Methodology .....	317
4. Margin of Appreciation? .....	317
A. Specific Aim .....	319

1.	Clarifying the Division of Powers Between International Courts and Domestic States when Different Rights Need to Be Balanced . . . . .	319
2.	Margin of Appreciation Theory: Interpretation or Application? . . . . .	323
B.	Underlying Methodology . . . . .	327
1.	Consensus . . . . .	327
2.	Importance of the Right Involved . . . . .	328
3.	Nature of the Restriction . . . . .	329
4.	Role of Domestic Policy Maker . . . . .	330
C.	Superfluous Theory to Be Replaced by a <i>Pro Persona</i> Approach (as the IACtHR Seems to Suggest)? . . . . .	330
5.	Interim Conclusion . . . . .	334
IV.	Holistic Reading of the VCLT Does Not Amount to Human Rightism . .	335
1.	“Special” Rules Are Compatible with a “Holistic” Reading of the VCLT . . . . .	336
A.	Autonomous Interpretation and the VCLT . . . . .	336
B.	Evolutionary Interpretation and the VCLT . . . . .	339
C.	Principle of Effectiveness and VCLT . . . . .	342
D.	Margin of Appreciation and VCLT . . . . .	343
2.	Lessons to Be Drawn from the Case Law of Human Rights Courts . . . . .	345
A.	Holistic Reading of VCLT . . . . .	345
B.	Understanding the Limits of the Holistic Approach Is a Difficult but Feasible Exercise . . . . .	346
C.	Treaties May Have the “Special” Objective to Divide Rule-Making Powers Between States and International Courts . . . . .	347

## CHAPTER V SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR THIRD PARTIES

	(ARTICLES 34–38 VCLT AND 53)? . . . . .	349
I.	Human Rights Treaties Can Become Binding on Third States Through International Custom (Article 38 VCLT) . . . . .	350
II.	Various Positions in Legal Doctrine on the Normative Weight of Human Rights Treaties . . . . .	354
1.	Various “Special” Approaches in Legal Doctrine . . . . .	355
2.	Customary International Law: A Contemporary View . . . . .	360
A.	Objective Element: State Practice ( <i>Usus</i> ) . . . . .	363
1.	Acts Constituting State Practice . . . . .	363
2.	Density of the Practice (Extent, Uniformity, Representativity) . . . . .	366

3.	Persistent Objector Theory .....	368
4.	Regional Practice .....	369
B.	Subjective Element: <i>Opinio Juris</i> .....	369
1.	Concept. ....	369
2.	Proof of the Existence of <i>Opinio Juris</i> .....	372
3.	Regional Custom Only Differs from General Custom When it Comes to the Required Legal Conviction .....	375
III.	Human Rights Courts Do Not Refer to the ECHR or the ACHR as Customary Human Rights Law .....	377
1.	Human Rights Courts Almost Never Explicitly Refer to the Customary Nature of the ECHR or the ACHR .....	377
2.	Explaining the Lack of Explicit Recognition of Customary International Human Rights Law by Human Rights Courts .....	381
A.	Lack of Jurisdiction .....	381
B.	Regional Customary Law: A Difficult Concept .....	381
C.	Constitutive Elements of Custom Are Already Used Separately .....	384
D.	Conclusion .....	384
IV.	According to Human Rights Courts General Principles of Law Underlie the ECHR and the ACHR .....	385
1.	ECtHR and IACtHR Agree That General Principles of Human Rights Law Underlie the ECHR and the ACHR .....	385
2.	Normative Significance of General Principles of Law According to Human Rights Courts .....	393
A.	General Principles of Human Rights Law Recognized by Civilized Nations Before the ECtHR .....	393
1.	Subsidiary Normative Role of General Principles in <i>Golder</i> .....	394
2.	Assessing the Normative Role of General Principles Relating to Human Rights Law in <i>K.-H.W. v. Germany</i> ..	398
3.	Conclusion .....	401
B.	General Principles of Human Rights Law Recognized by Civilized Nations before the IACtHR .....	403
V.	Conclusion .....	405

<b>CHAPTER VI SPECIAL STATUS FOR THE NORMS ENSHRINED IN THE ECHR OR THE ACHR (ARTICLES 30, 34-42, 53, 59 AND 64 VCLT)? .....</b>		<b>407</b>
I.	Human Rights Treaty Provisions as <i>Jus Cogens</i> (Article 53 VCLT)? ...	408
1.	Concept of <i>Jus Cogens</i> .....	409



A.	Establishing the Existence of <i>Jus Cogens</i> . . . . .	409
B.	Normative Weight of <i>Jus Cogens</i> . . . . .	414
2.	Do Human Rights Courts Consider the Human Rights Treaty Provisions to Have Acquired the Status of <i>Jus Cogens</i> ? . . . . .	419
A.	Restrictive Approach of the ECtHR Towards <i>Jus Cogens</i> . . . . .	419
1.	<i>Jus Cogens</i> in the Case Law of the ECtHR. . . . .	419
2.	Referring to a Regional Public Order Instead of <i>Jus Cogens</i> . . . . .	426
B.	The Extensive Approach of the IACtHR Towards <i>Jus Cogens</i> . . . . .	427
3.	Human Rightist Attitude? . . . . .	436
II.	Modifying Human Rights Treaties: Impossible in the Light of the Peremptory Nature of the Underlying Principles? . . . . .	438
1.	Revising a Treaty According to the VCLT . . . . .	439
A.	Revision of Treaties . . . . .	439
B.	Revision of <i>Jus Cogens</i> . . . . .	445
III.	Approach of Human Rights Courts . . . . .	446
1.	Explicit <i>Lex Specialis</i> . . . . .	447
2.	Consequences of <i>Lex Specialis</i> According to Human Rights Courts. . . . .	450
A.	Subsequent (and Previous) Treaties Can Only Revise the Treaty Text if They Enhance Protection. . . . .	450
B.	<i>Pactum Tacitum</i> May Revise the Treaty Text if it Enhances Protection . . . . .	454
3.	Human Rightism? . . . . .	457
IV.	Conclusion: Choosing Between <i>Jus Cogens</i> and the Concept of a Regional Public Order. . . . .	458
<b>CHAPTER VII WITHDRAWAL FROM HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES (ARTICLE 56 VCLT)</b> . . . . .		465
I.	VCLT . . . . .	466
II.	Special Approach by Human Rights Courts? . . . . .	469
III.	Conclusion. . . . .	476
<b>CHAPTER VIII INTERIM CONCLUSION TO PART II</b> . . . . .		477

**PART III “SPECIAL” UNDERSTANDING OF GENERAL  
INTERNATIONAL LAW (OTHER THAN GENERAL INTERNATIONAL  
LAW ON TREATIES)?**

<b>CHAPTER I SPECIALTY CLAIM FOR VARIOUS TOPICS OF GENERAL INTERNATIONAL LAW TREATED BY HUMAN RIGHTS COURTS</b>	487
I. Diplomatic Protection	488
1. ILC Draft Articles on Diplomatic Protection	488
2. Case Law of Human Rights Courts	491
II. Exhaustion of Local Remedies	496
1. Generally Recognized Rules of International Law Concerning Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies	497
2. Case Law of Human Rights Courts	500
III. State Responsibility	504
1. Obligations That Result from the Commission of an Internationally Wrongful Act	505
A. Draft Articles on State Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts	505
B. Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law (Basic Principles and Guidelines)	508
C. <i>Lex Specialis</i> in the ECHR and the ACHR	511
1. Case Law of the ECtHR	511
2. Case Law of the IACtHR	518
3. Conclusion	525
2. Countermeasures	528
A. Draft Articles on State Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts	529
B. <i>Lex Specialis</i> in the ECHR and the ACHR?	530
3. Serious Breaches	532
A. Serious Breaches of Peremptory Norms in the Draft Articles on State Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts	532
B. Human Rights Law and Serious Breaches	533
IV. Foreign (Adjudicatory) State Immunity	535
1. Foreign State Immunity: Current Status Under General International Law	535

2. Special Approach towards Foreign State Immunity in International Human Rights Law? .....	538
V. State Succession (in Respect of Treaties) .....	544
1. Vienna Convention on Succession of States in Respect of Treaties and General International Law .....	544
2. Case Law of Human Rights Courts.....	547

<b>CHAPTER II HUMAN RIGHTISM OR DEVELOPMENT? .....</b>	<b>553</b>
I. Clear <i>Lex Specialis</i> in the Treaty Text .....	553
II. Unwritten International Law Provides an Exception .....	555
III. Absence of a <i>Lex Specialis</i> .....	557

#### ***PART IV CONCLUSION***

<b>CHAPTER I HARMONY, NOT AUTONOMY.....</b>	<b>563</b>
I. Reservations .....	563
II. Temporal Jurisdiction .....	564
III. Jurisdiction: An Essentially Territorial Notion.....	567
IV. Attribution of State Responsibility .....	569
V. Interpretation .....	573
VI. Conclusion: Human Rights Courts Develop General International Law .....	577

<b>CHAPTER II “SPECIALTY” CLAIMS OF HUMAN RIGHTS LAW ARE SELDOM CONCLUSIVE TO DEPART FROM GENERAL INTERNATIONAL LAW .....</b>	<b>581</b>
I. <i>Lex Specialis</i> in Treaty Text.....	581
II. Unwritten <i>Lex Specialis</i> .....	584
III. Conclusion: Cautious Approach of Human Rights Courts.....	586

<b>CHAPTER III SPECIAL STATUS OF HUMAN RIGHTS NORMS NEEDS TO BE CLARIFIED BY GENERAL INTERNATIONAL LAW ....</b>	<b>589</b>
---	------------

<b>CHAPTER IV INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW DOES NOT THREATEN THE UNITY OF GENERAL INTERNATIONAL LAW.....</b>	<b>595</b>
--	------------

**BIBLIOGRAPHY** ..... 597

**INDEX**..... 623