



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Dispute settlement in international space law : a multi-door courthouse for outer space**

Goh, G.M.

### **Citation**

Goh, G. M. (2007, April 19). *Dispute settlement in international space law : a multi-door courthouse for outer space*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/11860>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/11860>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



# Dispute Settlement in International Space Law





Van dit proefschrift is een handelseditie verschenen bij  
Martinus Nijhoff Publishers ISBN 978 90 04 15545 9





# Dispute Settlement in International Space Law

A Multi-Door Courthouse for Outer Space

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van Doctor  
aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus  
Professor Dr. Douwe D. Breimer,  
hoogleraar in de faculteit der Rechtsgeleerdheid,  
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties  
te verdedigen op 19 April 2007  
te klokke 15:00 uur  
door

Gérardine Meishan Goh

geboren te Singapore in 1979





**Promotiecommissie:**

*Promoter:*

**Professor Dr. Peter P.C. Haanappel** (Leiden University, Netherlands)

*Supervisor:*

**Dr. Frans G. von der Dunk** (Leiden University, Netherlands)

*Referant:*

**Professor Dr. Stephan Hobe** (University of Cologne, Germany)

*Other Members:*

**Professor Dr. H.J. Snijders** (Leiden University, Netherlands)

**Professor Dr. P. Achilleas** (University of Paris XI, France)

**Professor Aw. Dr. E. Back Impallomeni** (University of Padua, Italy)



*To my parents*

*Lilian Heok Lung Tan & Joachim Soon Chye Goh*

*For their love, example and incandescence.*

*You'll wait a long, long time for anything much  
To happen in heaven beyond the floats of cloud  
And the Northern Lights that run like tingling nerves.  
The sun and moon get crossed, but they never touch,  
Nor strike out fire from each other nor crash out loud.  
The planets seem to interfere in their curves -  
But nothing ever happens, no harm is done.  
We may as well go patiently on with our life,  
And look elsewhere than to stars and moon and sun  
For the shocks and changes we need to keep us sane.  
It is true the longest drought will end in rain,  
The longest peace in China will end in strife.  
Still it wouldn't reward the watcher to stay awake  
In hopes of seeing the calm of heaven break  
On his particular time and personal sight.  
That calm seems certainly safe to last to-night.*

*Robert Frost  
On Looking Up by Chance at the Constellations*

## Acknowledgments

The manuscript that led to this book was written in fulfillment of the requirements of the Doctoral degree at the International Institute of Air & Space Law, Faculty of Law, Leiden University, the Netherlands. Thanks are due also to Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Leiden, the Netherlands, for the care bestowed on the publication of this book.

End to end, this book is the result of two solid years of actual research and writing. It would not have seen the light of day without the following seven people.

Professor Dr. Isabella Diederiks-Verschoor provided inspiration and a library of resources, as well as her hospitality and kindness to a young student. To my grandmother, with all my gratitude and deepest respect.

Mw. Tanja Masson-Zwaan has for many years and across many continents been a close mentor and personal friend. She also very kindly provided the *Samenvatting* - the Dutch translation of the summary. To my first professor in space law, heartfelt thanks.

Sr. Daniel Escolar Blasco is a friend whose support made surviving the Leiden experience feasible. To Dani, for many insights into faith, fun and friendship, muchas gracias.

My parents and my sister Christina Wanzhen have always been generous in their unfailing love, unquestioning support and unending faith. Dr. Bobby Kazeminejad shared in reams of email and instant messaging, moments of frustration and laughter, weeks of air and rail travel, months of formatting and editing, years of patience and understanding, and a lifetime of lessons in love and life. To my parents, my sister, my Bobby, no amount of thanks will ever come close to being sufficient.

G erardine Meishan Goh  
Leiden, 2006



# Summary Table of Contents

Table of Cases		xv
Introduction		1
Part One:	Exploration	
Chapter 1	Dispute Settlement in International Space Law	17
Chapter 2	Applicability of International Dispute Settlement Mechanisms to Space Law	79
Part Two:	Evolution	
Chapter 3	Need for a Sectorialized Space Law Dispute Settlement Mechanism	139
Chapter 4	Recent Developments in Comparable Fields of International Law	193
Part Three:	Evocation	
Chapter 5	Proposal: The Multi-Door Courthouse for Outer Space	243
Chapter 6	Development of the Law: Implementing the Multi-Door Courthouse for Outer Space	339
Chapter 7	Conclusion: Shaping the Future of International Dispute Settlement	359
Appendix A	Proposed Protocol for the Multi-Door Courthouse for Outer Space to the 1967 Outer Space Treaty	365
Appendix B	Proposed Model Clauses for the Submission of Disputes to the Multi-Door Courthouse for Outer Space	375
Appendix C	Bibliography	377
Index		401
<i>Samenvatting</i>	Abstract in Dutch	407
<i>Curriculum Vitae</i>		423



# Contents

Table of Cases . . . . .	xv
Introduction . . . . .	1

## Part One: Exploration

<b>1</b>	<b>Dispute Settlement in International Space Law</b>	<b>17</b>
1.1	Assessment of Existing Procedures . . . . .	23
1.1.1	The 1967 Outer Space Treaty and the UN Charter . . .	24
1.1.2	The 1972 Liability Convention . . . . .	32
1.1.3	The 1979 Moon Agreement . . . . .	39
1.1.4	United Nations General Assembly Resolutions . . . . .	42
1.1.5	Multilateral Agreements and Organizations . . . . .	46
1.1.6	Bilateral & Project-Based Agreements . . . . .	53
1.2	Recent Efforts in the Development of an International Instru- ment for the Settlement of Disputes in Space Law . . . . .	63
1.2.1	The United Nations . . . . .	63
1.2.2	The International Law Association: the 1998 Final Draft Convention on the Settlement of Disputes Related to Space Activities . . . . .	64
1.2.3	The International Institute of Space Law . . . . .	69
1.2.4	Other Organizations . . . . .	72
1.3	Conclusion . . . . .	75
<b>2</b>	<b>Applicability of International Dispute Settlement Mechanisms to Space Law</b>	<b>79</b>
2.1	The Elements of International Dispute Settlement . . . . .	82
2.1.1	Justiciability: Legal & Non-Legal Disputes . . . . .	83
2.1.2	The Public <i>versus</i> Private International Law Dichotomy	87
2.1.3	Consensual Nature of International Dispute Settlement and Party <i>Bona Fides</i> . . . . .	88

2.2	The Present Basic Framework of International Dispute Settlement: Principles, Methods and Applicability . . . . .	91
2.2.1	Consultations . . . . .	92
2.2.2	Negotiation . . . . .	94
2.2.3	Inquiry and Fact Finding . . . . .	98
2.2.4	Mediation and Good Offices . . . . .	101
2.2.5	Conciliation . . . . .	105
2.2.6	Arbitration . . . . .	110
2.2.7	Claims & Compensation Commissions . . . . .	118
2.2.8	Judicial Settlement . . . . .	122
2.3	Conclusion . . . . .	133

## Part Two: Evolution

<b>3</b>	<b>Need for a Sectorialized Space Law Dispute Settlement Mechanism</b>	<b>139</b>
3.1	The Unique Paradigm of Activities in Outer Space . . . . .	141
3.1.1	Military Use of Outer Space & Dual-Use Technology . . . . .	142
3.1.2	International Cooperation . . . . .	149
3.1.3	Space Science & Technology . . . . .	152
3.1.4	Commercialization of Outer Space . . . . .	157
3.1.5	Proliferation of Actors . . . . .	162
3.2	The Urgent Need for a Sectorialized Dispute Settlement Mechanism . . . . .	166
3.2.1	The Case for a Compulsory Permanent Mechanism . . . . .	169
3.2.2	Adapting to the Evolving Landscape in Space Law . . . . .	173
3.2.3	Recognition of Public and Private Interests . . . . .	175
3.2.4	The Enforcement of the Rule of Law in Outer Space . . . . .	176
3.3	Special Requirements for a Dispute Settlement Mechanism for Outer Space . . . . .	181
3.3.1	Declaration & Creation of Law . . . . .	182
3.3.2	Jurisdiction . . . . .	183
3.3.3	<i>Locus Standi</i> for Various Parties . . . . .	185
3.3.4	Flexibility . . . . .	188
3.3.5	Technical & Economic Competencies . . . . .	189
3.3.6	Efficiency & Rapid Provisional Measures . . . . .	190
3.3.7	Practicality of Judgements and Awards . . . . .	191
3.4	Conclusion . . . . .	191

<b>4</b>	<b>Recent Developments in Comparable Fields of International Law</b>	<b>193</b>
4.1	Institutional Treaty Compliance Régimes: International Environmental Law . . . . .	194
4.2	Inspection Panels and Private Investment: International Trade and Financial Institutions . . . . .	206
4.2.1	International Commercial Arbitration: UNCITRAL . . . . .	207
4.2.2	The General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs - GATT . . . . .	209
4.2.3	The World Trade Organization - WTO . . . . .	210
4.2.4	The World Bank Inspection Panels . . . . .	216
4.3	Grassroots Enforcement of State Obligations: Regional Human Rights Institutions . . . . .	219
4.3.1	Gaps in the Regional Framework: the Arab, Asian and Southeast Asian States . . . . .	221
4.3.2	Established Regional Human Rights Institutions: the European, Inter-American and African Systems . . . . .	223
4.3.3	Significance of the Establishment of Regional Human Rights Institutions . . . . .	225
4.4	The World's Common Spaces: The Antarctic System and the Law of the Sea . . . . .	228
4.4.1	The Antarctic Mineral Resource Convention . . . . .	228
4.4.2	UNCLOS & the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea . . . . .	232
4.5	Direct Alternatives to the Use of Force: Good Offices of the UN Secretary-General . . . . .	237
4.6	Conclusion . . . . .	239

### Part Three: Evocation

<b>5</b>	<b>Proposal: The Multi-Door Courthouse for Outer Space</b>	<b>243</b>
5.1	The Dispute Resolution Movement and the Birth of the Multi-Door Courthouse System . . . . .	246
5.1.1	Primary Methods, Hybrid Processes and the Gradated Scale of Dispute Settlement . . . . .	251
5.1.2	The Beginnings of the Multi-Door Courthouse . . . . .	267
5.2	Proposal - The Multi-Door Courthouse System: A Viable Dispute Settlement Mechanism for Outer Space Disputes . . . . .	270
5.2.1	The Proposed Structure of the Multi-Door Courthouse System for Outer Space Disputes . . . . .	275
5.2.2	The Case for the Use of the Multi-Door Courthouse System for Outer Space Disputes . . . . .	286
5.3	Detailed Issues of the Multi-Door Courthouse System . . . . .	296

5.3.1	Classification of Disputes . . . . .	297
5.3.2	Means of Choice . . . . .	308
5.3.3	Resolution of Dispute and Enforcement through Super- vision . . . . .	316
5.3.4	Conflict Avoidance and Dispute Systems Design . . . . .	323
5.3.5	Administration of the Multi-Door Courthouse . . . . .	328
5.3.6	Ongoing Review of the Multi-Door Courthouse System . . . . .	333
5.4	Conclusion . . . . .	336
<b>6</b>	<b>Development of the Law: Implementing the Multi-Door Courthouse for Outer Space</b>	<b>339</b>
6.1	How To Get There: The Development of Dispute Settlement in International Space Law . . . . .	344
6.2	A Protocol for the Multi-Door Courthouse for Outer Space . . . . .	347
6.3	Suggested Model Clauses . . . . .	348
6.4	Grounds for Optimism . . . . .	351
6.5	Promoting the Accession of Parties . . . . .	352
6.6	Conclusion . . . . .	356
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion: Shaping the Future of International Dispute Settlement</b>	<b>359</b>
<b>Appendices</b>		
A	Proposed Protocol for the Multi-Door Courthouse for Outer Space to the 1967 Outer Space Treaty . . . . .	365
B	Proposed Model Clauses for the Submission of Disputes to the Multi-Door Courthouse for Outer Space . . . . .	375
C	Bibliography . . . . .	377
	Index . . . . .	401
	<i>Samenvatting</i> : Abstract in Dutch . . . . .	406
	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> . . . . .	417

## Table of Cases

- Admissions Case*, (1948) ICJ Rep. 57
- Aegean Sea Continental Shelf Case* (Greece v. Turkey) (Interim Protection), (1978) ICJ Rep. 3
- Air Transport Agreement* arbitration (USA v. France) (1963) 38 ILR 182
- Antarctica Cases* (UK v. Argentina; UK v. Chile) [1956] ICJ Rep. 12
- Applicability of the Obligation to Arbitrate under Section 21 of the United Nations Headquarters Agreement of 26 June 1947*, (1988) ICJ Rep. 12 (Advisory Opinion)
- Asylum Case* (Colombia v. Peru) (1950) ICJ Rep. 266
- Award on Agreed Terms, No. 483-CLTDs/86/B38/B76/B77-FT, (22 June 1990) (Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal)
- BP v. Libya*, (1973) 53 ILR 297
- Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Co. Ltd., 2nd Phase*, Judgment, (1970) ICJ Rep. 3
- Beagle Channel cases* (Chile v. Argentina) (1977) 17 ILM 634, 738 and (1985) 24 ILM 1
- Beer & Regan v. Germany* (Application no. 28934/95), February 18, 1999, (European Court of Human Rights)
- Breard v. Greene* (1998) [118 S Ct 1352, 140 L Ed. 2d 529]
- British Claims in the Spanish Zone of Morocco*(1925) 2 UNRIAA 615 (Arbitral Case)
- Case concerning the Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide* (Preliminary Objections), (1996) ICJ Rep. 595
- Case concerning certain German interests in Polish Upper Silesia* (Merits), (1926) 7 PCIJ Judgments 3
- Case concerning the Factory at Chorzów (Claim for Indemnity) (Merits)* (A/17 1928) 1 WCR 646
- Certain Phosphate Lands in Nauru, (Nauru v. Australia)*, Preliminary Objections, Judgment, (1992) ICJ Rep. 240
- Channel Continental Shelf* arbitration (France v. United Kingdom), (1979) 54 ILR 6; 18 ILM 397
- Continental Shelf (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya/Malta)*, Judgment, (1985) ICJ Rep. 13
- Corfu Channel case* (Preliminary Objections), (1948) ICJ Rep. 15
- East Timor case* (Portugal v. Australia)(1995) ICJ Rep. 90
- Effect of Awards of Compensation Made by the United Nations Administrative Tribunal*, (1954) ICJ Rep. 47
- Filartiga v. Pena-Irala*, (1980) 630 F.2d 876, 2nd Cir. (Domestic U.S. Case)
- Fisheries Jurisdiction Case* (U.K. v. Ireland) (Merits), (1974) ICJ Rep. 3
- Florida Coalition for Peace and Justice v. George Herbert Walker Bush*, No. 89-2682 (filed 28 September 1989) (United States Domestic Case)
- Foreign Military Sales case*, Case No. B1 (Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal)
- Frontier Dispute case*, (1986) ICJ Rep. 554
- Gabcikovo-Nagymaros Project* (Hungary v. Slovakia) case, Order of 20 December 1994, (1994) ICJ Rep. 151
- Gulf of Maine Case*, (1984) ICJ Rep. 246
- Haya de la Torre case* (Colombia v. Peru) (Judgment) (1951) ICJ Rep. 71
- Hilaire and Thomas* [Privy Council Appeal No. 60 of 1998, *Thomas and Hilaire*, (27 January 1998)]
- Interhandel Case*, (1959) ICJ Rep. 27
- Interpretation of Peace Treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania*, First Phase, (1950) ICJ Rep. 65; Second Phase (1950) ICJ Rep. 221
- Ireland v. United Kingdom*, (1978) ECHR Ser. A vol. 25 at 62 (European Court of Human Rights)
- Islamic Republic of Iran v. The United States of America*, DEC 62-A21-FT, reprinted in 14 Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal Reports, (4 May 1987) 324
- Islamic Republic of Iran v. United States of America*, DEC 12-A1-FT (Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal)

- Kasikili/Sedudu Island Case* (Botswana v. Namibia), (2 March 1999) CR 99/11 at 49
- Lac Lacnoux* (France v. Spain) (1957) 24 ILR 101
- Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*, Advisory Opinion [1996] ICJ Rep. 70
- The M/V Saiga* (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines v. Guinea)
- See [http://www.un.org/Depts/los/judg\\_1.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/judg_1.htm), (Last accessed: 10 January 2006) (ITLOS)
- Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions (Greece v. U.K.)*, (1924) PCIJ Ser. A, No. 2, 11
- Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua*, (Merits) [1986] ICJ Rep. at para. 188
- Monetary Gold Removed from Rome case* (1943), (1954) ICJ Rep. 32
- Nationality Decrees in Tunis and Morocco (France v. U.K.)*, (1923) PCIJ ser. B. No. 4 (Advisory Opinion of 7 February 1923)
- Nicaragua v. United States* (Jurisdiction and Admissibility) (1984) ICJ Rep. 392
- North Sea Continental Shelf Cases*, (*Germany v Denmark*, *Germany v The Netherlands*) [1969] ICJ Rep. 3
- Northern Cameroons case* (Cameroons v. United Kingdom) (1963) ICJ Rep. 15
- Norwegian Loans Case* (1968) ICJ Rep. 97
- Nottebohm case*, (1953) ICJ Rep. 111
- Nuclear Tests cases* (Australia v. France; New Zealand v. France) Judgement (1974) ICJ Rep. 253
- Passage through the Great Belt (Finland v. Denmark)*, Provisional Measures, (29 July 1991) (1991) ICJ Rep. 12
- Peace Treaties* Advisory Opinion, (1950) ICJ Rep. 65
- Postal Services in Danzig case*, (1925) PCIJ Rep. Series B. No. 11
- Rainbow Warrior case* (New Zealand v. France) (1990) 82 ILR 499
- Rann of Kutch arbitration* (India v. Pakistan) (1968) 7 ILM 633, 50 ILR 2
- Reparations Case*, (1949) ICJ Rep. 174
- Saudi Arabia v. Aramco*, (1958) 27 ILR 117
- South West Africa Cases* (Ethiopia, Liberia v. South Africa) (Preliminary Objections), (1962) ICJ Rep. 319
- South West Africa cases* (Second Phase) (1966) ICJ Rep. 6
- Saudi Arabia v. Aramco*, (1958) 27 ILR 117
- Taba arbitration* (Egypt v. Israel), (1988) 80 ILR 224
- Texaco v. Libya*, (1977) 53 ILR 389
- Trail Smelter Award*, U.S. v. Canada, (1935) 3 UN Reports of International Arbitral Awards 1965
- United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran Case*, *US v. Iran*, (1980) ICJ Rep. 3
- Waite & Kennedy v. Germany* (Application no. 26093/94) (European Court of Human Rights)
- Western Sahara Case*, (1975) ICJ Rep. 12
- WTO Appellate Body Report on U.S. - Import Prohibition of Certain Shrimp and Shrimp Products, WT/DS58/AB/R (October 12, 1998), available online at [http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/dispu\\_e/distabase\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/distabase_e.htm) (Last accessed: 10 January 2006)
- WTO: European Communities - Trade Description of Sardines, Report of the WTO Appellate Body, WT/DS231/AB/R (decided September 26, 2002) (adopted October 23, 2002)
- WTO Panel Report, European Communities-Measures Affecting Asbestos and Asbestos-Containing Products, WT/DS/135/R, 18 September 2000; see also Appellate Body Report, European Communities-Measures Affecting Asbestos and Asbestos-Containing Products, WT/DS135/AB/R, 12 March 2001