

(a) The contemporary role and scope of power and litigational-fairness theories	136
(b) The respective importance of state and party concerns	137
(c) The complex, diverse, elusive, and changing nature of connecting factors resting on convenience, fairness, and justice.	139
B. Germany	142
1. The Code of Civil Procedure (Zivilprozeßordnung) (1877)	142
2. The emergence of general theory	144
(a) The first efforts	144
(b) Pioneering works	148
(c) Neuhaus	150
3. The contemporary scene	154
(a) Heldrich	155
(b) Schröder	156
(c) Kropholler	157
(d) Geimer	159
4. Constitutional control and the emergence of comprehensive theory: Pfeiffer's contribution (1995)	160
(a) Pfeiffer's system	161
(b) The appropriate treatment for jurisdictional purposes of plaintiffs and defendants	163
(c) The relevance of (minimum) contacts	166
(d) Application of Pfeiffer's theory	167
5. The contribution of the German courts	171
(a) The principal decisions	171
(i) Uncoupling adjudicatory jurisdiction and venue: BGH 14 June 1965	172
(ii) Restricting the scope of ZPO § 23: BGH 2 July 1991	174
(iii) Dictum of the Constitutional Court respecting ZPO § 23: BVerfG 12 April 1983	176
(iv) Unconstitutionality of ZPO § 606b No. 1: BVerfG 3 December 1985	177
(b) The significance of the case law	178
Part II. Basic themes and pervasive issues	179
Chapter IV. The <i>actor sequitur forum rei</i> principle: are defendants jurisdictionally preferred? Should they be?	179
A. Introductory	179
B. The principle's standing in practice	180
1. Do contemporary legal systems claim to practice the principle?	181
2. Is the <i>actor sequitur</i> principle consistent with the principal theories of adjudicatory authority?	185
(a) Relational theories	186
(b) Power theories	188
(c) Convenience, fairness, and justice theories	189
3. Do plaintiffs' or defendants' forums predominate in contemporary practice?	191
C. The allocation of litigational risks and opportunities between plaintiffs and defendants	194
1. What makes a forum more attractive to one party than to the other?	194

ACADÉMIE DE DROIT INTERNATIONAL
FONDÉE EN 1923 AVEC LE CONCOURS DE LA
DOTATION CARNEGIE POUR LA PAIX INTERNATIONALE

RECUEIL DES COURS

COLLECTED COURSES OF THE HAGUE
ACADEMY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

2002

Tome 295 de la collection



2003

MARTINUS NIJHOFF PUBLISHERS
The Hague/Boston/London

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I. The foundations and emergence of jurisdictional theory	27
Chapter I. Adjudicatory authority: reasons for its exercise and its principal types	27
A. The province of private international law	27
B. Dispute resolution: mechanisms and theoretical foundations	29
1. Introductory	29
2. General theories regarding governmental authority	30
(a) The principal theoretical accounts	31
(b) The relevance of these accounts for claims of adjudicatory authority over multistate transactions or controversies	33
C. Choice-of-law and enforcement of judgments considerations	36
1. Choice-of-law	36
(a) In general	36
(b) Qualifications of the separateness principle	38
(i) Divorce	39
(ii) Workers' compensation	45
(iii) Where serious choice-of-law difficulties, not normally encountered, arise	50
2. Recognition of judgments abroad	52
D. Further considerations affecting the assertion of adjudicatory authority	56
1. An inherent right and duty to dispense justice	56
2. A legal order's interest in development of certain areas of law	57
3. Economic considerations	58
E. Appropriate terminology for comparative analysis: basic categories of adjudicatory authority	59
1. The insularity of traditional terminologies	59
2. The inadequacies of traditional terminologies for comparative and theoretical purposes	62
3. A terminology for comparative and theoretical purposes: general jurisdiction, category-specific jurisdiction, and specific jurisdiction	63
Chapter II. The design of jurisdictional provisions	68
A. Basic policies and tensions	68
B. Connecting factors: their design and systemic importance	69
1. The paradigms: administrability and predictability; litigational convenience, fairness, and justice	69
2. The tensions between the paradigms	70
C. The designers of jurisdictional provisions	72
1. In general	72
2. In the United States	73
3. In Germany	74
D. Designing jurisdictional rules and norms	75

1. The United States	75
(a) Introductory: the influence of federalism	75
(b) Legislative reactions to the <i>International Shoe</i> decision	75
(i) State legislation	75
(ii) Treaties and federal legislation	77
a. In general	77
b. The role of international conventions and federal legislation	78
2. Germany	82
(a) Introductory	82
(b) The German Code of Civil Procedure (1877): executive and legislative design	82
(i) The original design	82
(ii) The gradual increase in the importance of the courts	85
3. The Brussels and Lugano Conventions and the Brussels Regulation	86
(a) Introductory: the influence of European integration	86
(b) The emergence of a European legal regime for jurisdiction and recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments	88
(i) The Brussels and Lugano Conventions	88
(ii) "Communitarization" of the conflict of laws: the Brussels Regulation	91
(c) The philosophy of European integration	92
Chapter III. The emergence of jurisdictional theory in the United States and Germany	95
A. The United States	95
1. The constitutional bases for judicial control over exercises of adjudicatory authority	95
(a) The Full Faith and Credit Clause	96
(b) The Due Process Clause	99
(i) The background	99
(ii) The first steps towards constitutional control of state-court exercises of adjudicatory authority: <i>Pennoyer v. Neff</i> (1877)	102
2. The reign of the power theory: 1877-1945	104
(a) The theory in operation	104
(b) Power-theory "metaphysics"	110
(i) The "presence" of intangibles	111
(ii) The "presence" of legal persons	112
3. The passage from a power to a litigational-justice theory of adjudicatory authority	115
4. The litigational-justice theory: <i>International Shoe</i> (1945) and beyond	117
(a) The tension between power and litigational-justice theories	121
(b) Confrontation?: <i>Shaffer v. Heitner</i> (1977)	123
5. Can claims of general and category-specific jurisdiction pass constitutional muster in terms of their typical effects?	126
6. Co-existence: <i>Burnham v. Superior Court of California</i> (1990)	129
7. Ambiguities and uncertainties in American jurisdictional theory and practice as the twenty-first century begins	135

(ii) <i>Forum non conveniens</i>	413
(iii) <i>Lis pendens</i>	416
C. The teachings of the Hague experience	417
1. The changing scene	417
2. Efforts to achieve convergence and to strike compromises: the first stage (June 2001) of the nineteenth diplomatic session . .	419
(a) A scaled-down or a comprehensive convention?	420
(b) The difficulty of agreeing on the bases of jurisdiction to be prohibited	422
3. Universal conventions in matters of private international law: twenty-first-century prospects	423
D. The future	425
Table of cases	426

a.	The applicability issue is posed: <i>Gubisch</i>	363
b.	The Court of Justice treats coercive and negative declaratory actions alike: " <i>Tatry</i> "	364
c.	Critique of the " <i>Tatry</i> " solution	365
6.	Comparative remarks	368
E.	Fine tuning in an evolving European Union	370
1.	In general	370
(a)	The Union's evolution	371
(b)	The relationship between the two Union courts and the national courts of Union Members	374
2.	The 1968 Convention's <i>raison d'être</i> : ensuring "a true internal market"	376
3.	The Brussels instruments' approach to judicial "fine tuning"	377
4.	Fine tuning under the forum's local law in matters that trench on a Brussels instrument	379
(a)	<i>Forum non conveniens</i>	381
(i)	Introductory	381
(ii)	The English view	381
a.	<i>In re Harrods</i>	381
b.	<i>Owusu v. Jackson</i>	385
(iii)	Do the Brussels instruments forbid in all or some situations the courts of Member States granting <i>forum non conveniens</i> stays?	388
(b)	Antisuit injunctions	392
(i)	Introductory	392
(ii)	<i>Turner v. Grovit and Others</i>	393
(iii)	Are antisuit injunctions compatible with the Brussels instruments?	397
F.	Judicial fine tuning: comparative reflections	399
Part III.	Epilogue	402
Chapter VII.	Convergence and compromise in private international law: the role of international instruments	402
A.	Introductory	402
1.	Legal cultures and their interpenetration	402
2.	The twentieth century and globalization	403
B.	The task of achieving convergence and harmonization	404
1.	The design of international instruments: single, mixed, and double conventions	404
2.	Regional harmonization: the Brussels Convention	407
3.	Worldwide harmonization: the proposed Hague Convention on International Jurisdiction and Foreign Judgments	408
(a)	The project's initial stage	408
(i)	The United States proposal for a mixed convention	408
(ii)	The Special Commission's preference for a double convention	409
(b)	Matters for which the Special Commission achieved a measure of harmonization or struck a meaningful compromise	411
(i)	Damage awards	413

4. The instruments of judicial fine tuning	313
(a) <i>Forum non conveniens</i> stays	313
(b) Antisuit injunctions	314
(c) Overlapping and conflicting proceedings: <i>lis pendens</i>	314
B. <i>Forum non conveniens</i> : contemporary theory and practice	315
1. Civil-law jurisdictions	315
2. Common-law jurisdictions	317
(a) The United States	318
(b) England	321
(c) Contemporary evaluations of the doctrine	324
C. Antisuit injunctions	326
1. Civil-law jurisdictions	327
2. Common-law jurisdictions	328
(a) England and Scotland	328
(i) Introductory	328
(ii) A landmark decision: <i>Airbus Industries G.I.E. v. Patel and Others</i>	330
a. The litigation	330
b. The comity requirement	332
c. Comity in alternative forum cases	335
(b) The United States	335
(i) Recognition of sister-state injunctions	337
(ii) Retaliatory antisuit injunctions	338
D. Avoiding duplicative litigation: the <i>lis pendens</i> doctrine as an alternative to judicial fine tuning	341
1. In general	341
(a) In local litigation	342
(b) In multistate and international litigation	342
2. Civil-law jurisdictions	344
3. Common-law jurisdictions	345
(a) Scotland and England	345
(b) The United States	346
4. The Brussels Convention and Regulation	348
(a) In general	348
(b) The <i>Gasser</i> reference	351
5. Significance of temporal priority for negative declaratory judgments	353
(a) The availability of declaratory relief	353
(i) When should declaratory relief be available in principle?	353
(ii) When is such relief available in practice?	354
(b) Tactical forum shopping by natural defendants in international situations	357
(i) French and German practices	358
(ii) Common-law practices	359
(c) Should <i>lis pendens</i> protection be accorded to actions for negative declaratory judgments?	361
(i) The positions of national legal orders	361
(ii) The European Union's position	362

(a) Principal issues	246
(i) The significance of the general law of contract for forum-selection clauses	246
(ii) Can parties by agreement displace or modify official dispute-resolution processes?	247
(b) Stipulations for non-exclusive jurisdiction: prorogation clauses	247
(c) Stipulations for exclusive jurisdiction: derogation clauses .	248
(i) American law	250
(ii) German law	257
a. Introductory	257
b. Circumstances that led to the 1974 Reform Act . .	258
c. The 1974 Reform Act	260
(iii) The Brussels Convention and Regulation	263
a. The original Convention	263
b. The 1978 amendments	264
c. The 1989 amendments	266
d. The Brussels Regulation	267
E. Party stipulations for a private dispute-resolution process of their own design: arbitration agreements	268
1. France	268
2. Prussia and the German Reich	271
(a) Book X of the Zivilprozeßordnung (1877)	271
(i) In general	271
(ii) The arbitration law of Book X	273
(b) The Reform Act of 1998	274
3. Common-law jurisdictions	277
(a) England	277
(b) United States	281
(i) A general view	281
(ii) The "federalization" of American arbitration law . .	289
a. The original understanding	291
b. The erosion of the conceptual structure on which the original understanding rested: the significance of <i>Erie R.R. v. Tompkins</i>	292
c. The post- <i>Erie</i> change in the understanding of the FAA	295
d. The <i>Southland</i> decision (1984): concepts, history, and policy in tension	299
4. Supranational arbitration law: the New York Convention of 1958	301
Chapter VI. Forum shopping and fine tuning: herein of <i>forum non con-</i> <i>veniens</i> , antisuit injunctions, and <i>lis pendens</i>	306
A. Forum choice by the moving party and the level playing-field prin- ciple	308
1. The significance for procedural justice of differences between legal systems	308
2. Forum shopping	310
3. The role of public international law and international conven- tions	311
(a) Public international law	311
(b) "Decisional harmony" and forum shopping	312

2. Should plaintiffs or defendants be preferred for jurisdictional purposes?	196
(a) Preferring plaintiffs on grounds of corrective justice and to ensure procedural economy and simplicity	197
(b) Preferring plaintiffs in order to equalize litigational capacity	201
Chapter V. Consent and adjudicatory authority: consequences of splitting causes of action, participating as a litigant, and choice of forum agreements	204
A. Introductory	204
1. General remarks	204
2. The two paradigmatic situations	205
B. The extent of party control over the preclusive effects of litigating: herein of "splitting"	206
1. Introductory	206
2. The maximum preclusive effect of an adjudication	207
(a) American law	208
(i) At common law and under Field's Code	208
(ii) Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and comparable state systems	209
(b) German law	211
3. Contemporary practice	213
(a) American law	213
(b) German law	215
C. Adjudicatory authority grounded on participation in court proceedings as a litigant	217
1. In general	217
2. Participation without objection as a defendant	219
(a) Introductory	219
(b) American theory and practice	220
(c) German theory and practice	222
(d) The Brussels Convention and Regulation	224
3. Participation in the role of plaintiff	225
(a) American theory and practice	225
(i) The traditional position	225
(ii) The present standing of the rule in <i>Adam v. Saenger</i>	227
a. The Restatements Second of Conflict of Laws and of Judgments	227
b. Is the rule in <i>Adam v. Saenger</i> still constitutional?	231
(b) German theory and practice	232
(i) Introductory	232
(ii) The German Code of Civil Procedure (ZPO)	236
(c) The Brussels Convention and Regulation	237
D. Party agreement respecting the exercise of adjudicatory authority: prorogation and derogation	240
1. Introductory	240
(a) Plan and private autonomy: in general	240
(b) Plan, private autonomy, and dispute resolution	243
2. Prorogation and derogation	245