INDEX

Suffix 'f' stands for figure, 't' for table and 'n' for footnote.

abstention, 25–26
acceptance, deference as, 6, 25–27
activism/restraint, 6–7, 27–28, 38
adaptive practices *see* persuasive argumentation; public legitimation
ADPF & IHRDA v Mali, 1–3
African Bar Association, 204
African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance, 216, 221, 223
African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, 202–3, 210–12, 212t, 219–20, 222
African Commission on Human Rights (ACmHPR), 203, 211t, 231–33
African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACtHPR), 199–256
  selection as case study, 12–13, 81–82
  introduction and overview, 4, 199–200
  access to justice cases, 212t, 241–43
  summary of findings, 255–56
  budget, 237t, 239
  caseload, 208–14, 209f, 211–12t
  citation practices, 245–49, 245t, 248t, 264–66, 265t
  costs awards, 230–31
  election management body autonomy cases, 212t, 241–43
  electoral democracy cases, 212t, 241–43
  establishment of, 203–7
  extent of deference shown, 214–29
    in case outcomes, 1–2, 214–16, 215f, 215t
    in interpretations and reasoning, 1–3, 216–25
    in remedies, 225–29, 225t
    on select issues, 241–43
    CCJ and EACJ compared, 261–64, 262t, 270–71, 270t
Facebook posts, 253–54, 254t, 266–67, 267t
formal independence, 77f, 236–40, 237t
free expression cases, 212t, 241–43
high court independence cases, 212t, 241–43
ideational setting, 200–7, 268
judges
  appointments/terms of office, 80f, 237–38, 237t
  immunities/privileges, 237t, 239
  impartiality, 239
  president, 237t, 238
  removal from office, 237t, 238
  remuneration, 239
jurisdiction, 207–8, 240
legal aid scheme, 230–31
legal culture, 206, 268
managerial autonomy, 80f, 207, 237t
member states, 207–8
outreach activities, 251–53
persuasive argumentation, 245t, 245–49, 248t, 264–66, 265t
political fragmentation, 240–43, 242f, 259–61, 260f
political norms, 200–6, 268
public legitimation, 249–55, 254t, 266–67, 267t

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:50:31, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636.010

registrar, 237t, 238
rule of law cases, 212t, 241–43
rules of procedure, 237t, 238–39
seat, 207
state resistance, 243–44
strategic plans, 249–51
strategic space, overview, 261f, 261, 273
support networks, 229–36
channels of access, 230–34
court's pro-litigant approach, 230
participation in litigation, 230–31, 231t, 232–34, 235t
repeat counsel, 231t, 269–71, 270t
CCJ and EACJ compared, 268–71, 270t
influence on judicial deference, 234–35
unanimous decisions, 264
withdrawals of Article 34(6) declaration, 243–44
African Court Protocol, 207–8, 216–19, 225, 230
African Network for Animal Welfare v Tanzania (*Serengeti* case), 104–7, 131–32
African Union, 207, 211t, 237–39
Ajavon (62) v Benin, 221–22, 246–47
Akuffo, Justice Sophia, 250
American Convention on Human Rights, 44
amici curiae, 108, 110, 166; *see also* private actors
Amin, Idi, 87, 201
Amollo, Otiende, 117
Andean Tribunal of Justice (ATJ), 5, 77f, 80f
Anderson, Judge Winston, 185
Anthony & Kisite v Tanzania, 224
Antigua and Barbuda, 142–46n, 145–46n, 182, 184t, 190–91
Anyang' Nyong'o v Kenya, 125–26, 128, 131–32
APDH v Côte d'Ivoire, 216, 221, 227
Arab Investment Court (AIC), 77f, 80f
argumentation *see* persuasive argumentation
Association pour le Progrès et la Défense des Droits des Femmes Maliennes (APDF), 1–3
attitudinal model of decision-making, 57–58
autonomy *see* managerial autonomy

Bahamas, 142–46n, 145–46n
Banjul Charter *see* African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights
Barbados, 142–46n, 145–46n, 159n, 178t, 184t
as respondent, 155, 160, 177–80, 185–86
Beach, Derek, 14–15
Belize, 142–46n, 145–46n, 149–50, 178t, 184t
as respondent, 158–59, 161, 177–79, 183–85
Benelux Court of Justice (BCJ), 77f, 80f
Benin, 208, 211t, 244
as respondent, 221–23, 247
Benvenisti, Eyal, 64
Berry, David S., 157, 159
Bokassa, Jean-Bédel, 201
Bourdieu, Pierre, 58–59
British Empire, 85–87, 140–44
budgets *see* court budgets
Burkina Faso, 208, 211t
as respondent, 219–20, 226–27, 246
Burley, Anne-Marie, 56; *see also* Slaughter, Anne-Marie
Burundi, 44, 85–86, 88–89, 92f, 105t, 127–29
as respondent, 151t, 154–55, 160–61, 164
Byron, Justice Sir Dennis, 194

Campbell, Yonique, 147
Caribbean Community (CARICOM)
Competition Commission, 169
Council of Ministers, 169
establishment of, 142–43
founding of CCJ, 143–45
as respondent, 107
right to free movement, 180–86, 184t
support of CCJ, 169–70
tensions with CCJ, 145–46

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:50:31, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636.010

Caribbean Court of Justice (CCJ), 139–98
selection as case study, 12–13, 81–82
introduction and overview, 4, 139–40
summary of findings, 196–98
annual reports/strategic plans, 191–92
budget, 172t, 174–75
caseload, 148–50, 149f
citation practices, 187–88, 189t, 264–66, 265t
correlative rights doctrine, 163
costs awards, 163–65
educational arm, 168
establishment of, 143–45, 147–48
extent of deference shown, 150–62
in case outcomes, 151t, 151–52
in interpretations and reasoning, 152–59
in remedies, 159
on select issues, 178–86
ACtHPR and EACJ compared, 261–64, 262t, 270–71, 270t
Facebook posts, 195–96, 196t, 266–67, 267t
formal independence, 77f, 78, 171–76, 172t
free movement cases, 155–59, 159n, 160–61, 177–86, 178t
ideational setting, 140–47, 268
judges
appointments/terms of office, 74–75, 78, 80f, 171–73, 172t
immunities/privileges, 172t, 175
president, 172t
removal from office, 172t, 173
remuneration, 175
votes and opinions, 187
jurisdiction, 145–48, 186–87, 190–91, 195–96
legal culture, 146–47, 268
managerial autonomy, 78, 80f, 172t, 174–75
member states, 139
outreach activities, 192–95
persuasive argumentation, 187–90, 188–89t, 264–66, 265t
political fragmentation, 177–86, 178t, 179f, 184t, 259–61, 260f
political norms, 140–46, 268
public legitimation, 190–96, 196t, 266–67, 267t
registrar, 172t, 174
rules of procedure, 172t, 174
seat, 147, 193
state resistance, 186–87, 190–91
strategic space, overview, 261f, 261, 272–73
support networks, 162–70
channels of access, 163, 165
court's pro-litigant approach, 163–65
participation in litigation, 165–70, 167t
repeat counsel, 165–68, 167t
ACtHPR and EACJ compared, 268–71, 270t
influence on judicial deference, 166–68, 167t
unanimous decisions, 264
Caribbean Free Trade Association (CARIFTA), 143
Carter, Jimmy, 201–2
case outcomes, 29, 33–34; *see also case studies*
case studies *see* African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACtHPR); Caribbean Court of Justice (CCJ); East African Court of Justice (EACJ)
Caserta, Salvatore, 159, 170
Central African Economic and Monetary Community Court of Justice (CEMAC CJ), 77f, 80f
Central African Republic, 201
Central American Court of Justice (CACJ), 77f, 78, 80f
Chenwi, Lilian, 218
Chile, 58
citation practices, 47–48; *see also case studies*
Colombia, 44
colonial legacies, 59–60, 85–91, 140–47, 200–7

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:50:31, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636.010

Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa Court of Justice (COMESA CJ), 77, 77f, 80f
confidential deliberations, 72, 74–75
communications *see* persuasive argumentation
consequential orders, 31–34
Côte d'Ivoire, 208, 211t, 244
  as respondent, 216, 221, 227
Council of Europe, 44, 49
court budgets, 71, 74–75, 76t, 78; *see also case studies*
court curbing mechanisms, 64–65
Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)
  decision-making, 5
  deference shown, 34
  formal independence, 77f
  influence of public opinion, 50
  judicial appointments/terms of office, 74–75, 80f
  jurisprudence as influential, 188
  managerial autonomy, 80f
  political fragmentation, 41
  support networks, 56, 168; *see also* European Court of Justice (ECJ)
court president/chair, 71–72, 74–75, 76t, 77; *see also case studies*
court registrars/secretariats, 71–72, 74–75, 76t, 78; *see also case studies*
customary law, 89–90, 146–47, 206

Daly, Tom Gerard, 223
de facto (informal) independence
  formal independence distinguished, 37, 66
  judicial deference distinguished, 7, 28
de jure independence *see* formal independence
de novo reviews, 26, 232
declaratory judgments, 31–34
deference, theoretical argument
  definitions and conceptualization, 6, 24–28
  operationalization of, 29–34, 33f
  overview of argument, 7–10, 52–53, 271–73
  research design, 11–16, 29–34, 33f, 67–75, 68t, 74–75, 81–82
  scope of argument, 10–11, 54–55, 273–79
  implications of argument
    international courts, 17–18, 279–84
    international organizations, 18–19, 284–87
  future research, 17–18, 273–75
Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), 88
Deya, Donald, 126
direct effect doctrine, 156–57
dissenting opinions, 48
domestic courts, 112–13, 168–69; *see also* support networks
Dominica, 142–46n, 145–46n, 184t
  as respondent, 158–59
Douglas v Dominica, 158–59
Downs, George W., 64

East African Common Service Organization (EACSO), 86–87
East African Community (EAC), 2–3, 84, 88–89, 92f, 105t
  as respondent, 98–99, 102, 107, 132
East African Community (former), 87–88
East African Community Treaty (EAC Treaty), 88, 91, 93–94, 97–101, 116–18, 125–27
East African Court of Appeal (EACA), 86–88
East African Court of Justice (EACJ)
  selection as case study, 12–13, 81–82
  introduction and overview, 4, 84–85
  summary of findings, 137–38
  budget, 114t, 115, 118–19
  caseload, 91–92, 93t
  citation practices, 129, 130t, 264–66, 265t
  costs awards, 109, 112
  due process claims, 120–24, 121t
  establishment of, 84, 91
  extent of deference shown, 94–107

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:50:31, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636.010

East African Court of Justice (EACJ) (cont.)
in case outcomes, 94–97, 95t, 96f
in interpretations and reasoning, 2–3, 97–102
in remedies, 102–7, 103t, 105t
on select issues, 120–25, 121t
ACtHPR and CCJ compared, 261–64, 262t, 270t, 270–71
Facebook posts, 136–37, 136t, 266–67, 267t
formal independence, 77–78, 77f, 114t, 114–19
freedom of association cases, 2–3, 102, 120–24, 121t
ideational setting, 85–91, 268
interim orders, 125–27
judges
appointments/terms of office, 69, 78, 80f, 114–15, 114t
immunities/privileges, 114t, 115
impartiality, 115
president/principal judge, 114t, 115
removal from office, 114t, 115–18
jurisdiction, 91
legal culture, 89–90, 268
managerial autonomy, 78, 80f, 114t, 115, 118–19
member states, 88
outreach activities, 133
persuasive argumentation, 128–32, 264–66, 265t
political fragmentation, 119–25, 121t, 123f, 259–61, 260f
political norms, 85–89, 268
press freedom cases, 120–24, 121t
press releases, 134–36
public legitimation, 132–37, 136t, 266–67, 267t
registrar, 114t, 115
rules of procedure, 114t, 115
seat, 91
state resistance, 125–27
strategic space, overview, 261, 261f, 272
support networks, 107–13
channels of access, 108–9
court's pro-litigant approach, 108–9
participation in litigation, 110–11t, 110
repeat counsel, 110–12, 110–11t
ACtHPR and CCJ compared, 268–71, 270t
influence on judicial deference, 111–13, 111t
unanimous decisions, 128–29, 264
website, 135
East African High Commission, 86–87
East African Law Society (EALS), 2–3, 102, 104, 107, 110, 117, 126–27, 231t
East African Law Society v Burundi & EAC, 107
East African Law Society v Kenya, 104
East African Law Society v Uganda & EAC, 2–3, 102
Ecker-Ehrhardt, Matthias, 49
Economic Community of West African States Court of Justice (ECOWAS CJ), 77f, 80f
Economic Court of the Commonwealth of Independent States (ECCIS), 77f, 80f
ECOWAS Democracy Protocol, 216, 221
Efrat, Asif, 6, 24–25
Elsig, Manfred, 30
Equatorial Guinea, 201
Eurasian Economic Union Court (EAEU CT), 77f, 80f
European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)
caseload, 209
decision-making, 5
deference shown, 34, 275, 277–79
expulsion of Russia, 44
formal independence, 42–43n, 77f, 78
judicial appointments/terms of office, 69, 78, 80f
managerial autonomy, 80f
public legitimation, 49
European Court of Justice (ECJ), 44, 150; *see also* Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:50:31, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636.010

European Free Trade Agreement Court of Justice (EFTA CJ), 77f, 80f
exit (state resistance), 36
expansive interpretation, 30–31

Facebook posts, 16; *see also case studies*
Fahner, Johannes Hendrik, 26
formal independence
  as concept, 37, 63, 66
  average over time, 75–76
  desirability of, 63–64
  and effectiveness, 37–38, 63–64
  extent of, scholarly debate, 64–66
  impact on strategic space, 37–40, 42–43, 43f, 52–53
  informal/de facto independence distinguished, 37, 66
  and insulation of judges, 72–75, 76t
  and judicial appointments/terms of office, 69–71, 74–75, 76t, 77f, 77–81, 80f
  and legitimacy, 39–40, 64
  and managerial autonomy, 71–72, 74–75, 76t, 77–78, 80f
  measurement of, methodology adopted, 67–75, 68t, 74–75
  permissive discretion argument, 65–66
  political constraint argument, 64–65
  trusteeship argument, 65; *see also case studies*
fragmentation *see* political fragmentation
France, 44, 57–58
Franck, Thomas M., 46
Freedom House data, 16, 178, 259

The Gambia, 208
gap-filling approach, 30–31
Gathii, James Thuo, 14, 98
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), 275–76
Germany, 57–58
Ghana, 201, 208, 211t
Gilbert & Others v Barbados, 180
Grenada, 142–46n, 144, 145–46n, 184t, 190–91
Guillaume, Gilbert, 63
Guinea Bissau, 208
Guyana, 142–46n, 144, 145–46n, 146, 183, 184t, 186
  as respondent, 152–54, 160

Haiti, 142–46n, 145–46n, 146
Heinrich, Andrew, 14
Heyns, Christof, 217
hierarchies, 17–18, 282–84
Hilbink, Lisa, 58
Hönnige, Christoph, 57–58
Hummingbird Rice Mills Ltd v *Suriname & CARICOM*, 164

ideational context, 57–60; *see also case studies*
independence *see* formal independence; informal (de facto) independence
Independent Medical Legal Unit v Kenya, 99–100
inequalities, 17–18, 282–84
informal (de facto) independence
  formal independence distinguished, 37, 66
  judicial deference distinguished, 7, 28
Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR)
  caseload, 210
  decision-making, 5
  formal independence, 77f
  judicial appointments/terms of office, 80f
  managerial autonomy, 80f
  opinion clarity, 46
  public legitimation, 49
  withdrawals from, 44
International Commission of Jurists, 204–5
International Court of Justice (ICJ)
  decision-making, 5
  deference shown, 34
  formal independence, 77f, 78
  judicial appointments/terms of office, 78, 80f
  managerial autonomy, 80f
  withdrawals from, 44

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:50:31, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636.010

international courts, defined, 22
International Criminal Court (ICC), 44, 49, 77f, 80f
International Criminal Tribunal of Rwanda (ICTR), 77f, 80f
International Criminal Tribunal of the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), 77f, 80f
international organizations (IOs), 18–19, 284–87
International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS), 77f, 78, 80f

Jamaica, 142, 142–46n, 145–46n, 146–47, 155n, 184t
Jawara, Dawda, 202
joint decision trap, 41
judges
  appointment and terms of office, 69–70, 74–75, 76t, 77–81, 80f
  external communications, 47, 50
  immunities and privileges, 72–75
  interpretations and reasoning. *See* legal interpretation and reasoning
  judicial activism, 27
  oath of office, 69, 71, 74–75
  off-the-bench activities, 56
  president/chair of court, 71–72, 74–75, 76t, 77
  reappointment, 69–70, 74–75
  relationships with states, 10
  removal from office, 69–71, 74–75, 76t, 77–78
  secrecy/confidentiality of deliberation, 72, 74–75, 76t
  unanimous judgments and, 48; *see also case studies*
judicial activism/restraint, 6–7, 27–28, 38
judicial deference *see* deference
judicial independence *see* formal independence; informal (de facto) independence
judicial politics, 17–18, 279–80, 282–84; *see also* ideational context; political fragmentation
judicial remedies *see* remedies

Kamotho, Joseph, 117–18
Katabazi v EAC & Uganda, 98–99
Kayobera, Justice Nestor, 119
Kelemen, R. Daniel, 49–50
Kenya, 84–89, 92f, 105t, 116–18, 125–26, 128, 211t
  as respondent, 99–100, 104, 125–26, 128, 131–32
Keohane, Robert O., 69–70
Kmiec, Keenan D., 27
Kodjo, General Edem, 202
Konaté v Burkina Faso, 219–20, 227, 246

language of judgments, 46–47
legal counsel, 110–11t, 110–12, 165–68, 167t, 231t, 269–71, 270t; *see also* support networks
legal culture, 57–60; *see also case studies*
legal interpretation and reasoning, 6–7, 29–31, 33–34; *see also case studies*
legal pluralism, 89–90, 146–47, 203–6
legitimacy *see* public legitimation

Madsen, Mikael Rask, 159, 209, 277–78
majoritarian activism, 41–42
Makunya, Trésor Muhindo, 219
Malawi, 86, 208, 211t
Mali, 211t, 227
  as respondent, 1–3
managerial autonomy, 71–72, 74–75, 76t, 80f, 114t; *see also case studies*
mandatory orders, 31–34
Mattli, Walter, 56
Mbaye, Kéba, 202
Mbori, Harrison, 227–28
Mercosur Permanent Review Tribunal (Mercosur PRT), 77f, 77–78, 80f
Montserrat, 142–46n, 145–46n
Moravcsik, Andrew, 69–70
Mtikila v Tanzania, 217–18, 220–21, 223–24, 227
Mujuzi, Jamil Ddamulira, 219
Museveni, Yoweri, 2
Myrie v Barbados, 155–57, 159n, 160, 177–80, 178t, 185–86

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:50:31, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636.010

national courts, 112–13, 168–69; *see also support networks*
Newman, Abraham L., 6, 24–25
Nguema, Marcia, 201
Niger, 208
Nigeria, 201, 211t
Niyungeko, Justice Gérard, 218, 249–50, 252
Nkurunziza, Pierre, 127
nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), 110–12, 111t, 166n, 230–31, 234–36, 270t, 270–71; *see also* private actors

Ojienda, Tom, 117
ole Keiwua, Justice Moijo, 118
Oré, Justice Sylvain, 250–53
Organization for the Harmonization of Business Law in Africa Common Court of Justice and Arbitration (OHADA CCJA), 77f, 80f
Organization of African Unity (OAU), 200–2
Organization of American States, 49
Ouguergouz, Justice Fatsah, 214, 218

Pan African Lawyers Union (PALU), 110, 231t
past resistance *see* state resistance
Pauwelyn, Joost, 30
Payne, Anthony J., 141
Pedersen, Rasmus Brun, 14–15
persuasive argumentation, 45–48, 53f; *see also case studies*
Philippines, 44
political fragmentation, 40–45, 43f, 53f; *see also case studies*
political norms, 57–60; *see also case studies*
Pollard, Duke E., 153–54
Pratt, Tyler, 24
preference heterogeneity *see* political fragmentation
principal-agent (PA) theory, 64–65, 284–85
private actors, 108–12, 110–11t, 163–68, 167t, 229–31, 233–36, 269–70; *see also* support networks
Privy Council, 86, 144–45, 145–46n
public legitimation, 45, 49–51, 53f, 64; *see also case studies*
public support, 49–50
purposive interpretation, 30–31

Rachovitsa, Adamantia, 14
Rajabu v Tanzania, 246–47
Ramadhani, Justice Augustino, 253
Ramphal, Sir Shridath, 143–44
Rashidi v Tanzania, 246
registrars of court, 71–72, 74–75, 76t, 78; *see also case studies*
remedies, 29, 31–34; *see also case studies*
reparations, 31–34
resistance *see* state resistance
restrictive interpretation, 30
Revised Treaty of Chaguaramas (RTC), 145, 147–49, 152–57, 163, 169, 181–82
Risse, Thomas, 45
rules of procedure (ROP), 71–72, 74–75, 76t; *see also case studies*
Russia, 44
Rwanda, 85–86, 88–89, 92f, 208, 210, 243–44
  as respondent, 220, 243–44

Saint Kitts and Nevis, 145–46n, 182, 184t
Saint Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, 142–46n
Saint Lucia, 142–46n, 145–46n, 146, 184t
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, 142–46n, 145–46n, 184t
Saunders, Justice Adrian, 193–94
Schlesinger, Arthur, 27
secret deliberations, 72, 74–75, 76t
secretariats, 71–72, 74–75
Serengeti case, 104–6, 131–32
Shirlow, Esmé, 25–26, 102
Slaughter, Anne-Marie, 69–70; *see also* Burley, Anne-Marie

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:50:31, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636.010

social media, 16; *see also case studies*
South Sudan, 88–89, 92f, 93
Southern African Development Community (SADC) Tribunal, 44, 240
state authority, deference and, 6, 24–27
state resistance, 36, 38–42, 51–53; *see also case studies*
states' preferences, heterogeneity of *see* political fragmentation
Stiansen, Øyvind, 39
strategic space
  concept of, 3, 35–36
  intervening factors, 45; *see also* past resistance; persuasive argumentation; public legitimation
  structural factors, 36; *see also* formal independence; political fragmentation
  visualization of, 42, 43f, 52–53, 261f, 261
substate actors (national courts), 112–13, 168–69; *see also* support networks
support networks, 55–57; *see also case studies*
supranational actors, 113, 169–70, 231–33
Suriname, 142–46n, 145–46n, 146, 184t
  as respondent, 164
Suy Bi Gohore Emile & Others v Côte d'Ivoire, 221

Talon, Patrice, 221
Tanganyika, 85–87
Tanzania, 84, 87–89, 91, 92f, 105t, 201, 207–8, 210, 211t, 227, 244
  as respondent, 104–6, 217–18, 220–21, 224, 227–28, 246; *see also* Tanganyika; Zanzibar
Thomas v Tanzania, 228, 246
Tomlinson v Belize & Trinidad and Tobago, 158–59, 161, 177–79, 178t, 183–85
Touré, Amadou Toumani, 1
treaty interpretation *see* legal interpretation and reasoning
Treaty of Chaguaramas (TOC), 143, 181; *see also* Revised Treaty of Chaguaramas (RTC)
Tribunal of the Southern African Development Community (SADCT), 77n
Trinidad and Tobago, 142–43, 142–46n, 145–46n, 147, 149–50, 178t, 183, 184t
  as respondent, 158–59, 161, 177–79, 183–85
Trinidad Cement Limited v Caribbean Community, 154–55, 160–61, 186
Trinidad Cement Limited v Competition Commission, 164
Trinidad Cement Limited v Guyana, 152–54, 160
Tunisia, 211t

Uganda, 84–89, 92f, 105t, 128, 201
  as respondent, 2–3, 98–99, 102
Ugirashebuja, Justice Emmanuel, 119, 134–35
Umuhoza v Rwanda, 220, 243–44
unanimous decisions, 48, 128–29, 187
United Nations (UN), 63
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 90, 168–69
United States, 27–28, 44, 201–2
  Supreme Court, 27, 57

validation of decisions, 25–26
Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) data, 16, 120, 241
Venezuela, 44
Viljoen, Frans, 214, 217, 231
Voeten, Erik, 39, 58, 70
voice (state resistance), 36
Voigt, Stefan, 67n

West Indian Commission (WIC), 143–45, 181
West Indies Federation (WIF), 142–43, 183

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:50:31, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636.010

Western African Economic and Monetary Union Court of Justice (WAEMU CJ), 77f, 80f
Wheatle, Se-shauna, 147
Wiebusch, Micha, 223
work-to-rule approach, 30–31
World Trade Organization Appellate Body (WTO AB), 27–28, 69, 77f, 80f, 275–77
XYZ (10) v Benin, 222
XYZ (59) v Benin, 221

Zambia, 86
Zanzibar, 85–87
Zimbabwe, 44
Zongo v Burkina Faso, 226, 246
Zziwa v EAC, 132

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:50:31, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636.010

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:50:31, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636.010