

## Contents

	<i>Foreword</i>	<i>page</i> xiii
	<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xv
	<i>Table of Cases</i>	xvii
	<i>Table of Treaties and Other Documents</i>	xxvi
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>Part I Towards the Global Public Interest theory</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>The “internationalization” of international investment law</b>	<b>11</b>
	A. A first glance at Article 42(1) ICSID	12
	1. Context: general principle of Article 42 ICSID is freedom of choice	12
	2. Possible cases in which international law may be applicable under Article 42 ICSID	13
	3. International law as applicable even in case of an exclusive choice of domestic law according to Article 42(1) first sentence ICSID	14
	B. Drafting history of Article 42(1) second sentence ICSID	15
	C. The role of BITs in international investment law	17
	1. BITs as a recent phenomenon	17
	2. Codification and promotion of international law through BITs	18
	D. The relationship of domestic law and international law	19

viii	CONTENTS	
	1. Preliminary remarks	19
	2. The <i>Klöckner-Amco</i> doctrine	21
	3. The dissolution of the <i>Klöckner-Amco</i> doctrine	30
	4. A new doctrine: <i>Wena</i>	33
	5. The Argentine crisis Tribunals and beyond	38
	E. The changing face of international investment law	45
	1. Six preliminary observations	45
	2. “Prominent role”: The “internationalization” of international investment law	46
	3. The “integration” of international investment law	48
	4. Outlook: The public interest challenge	50
	5. Consequences of the above findings: Three hypotheticals	52
3	<b>Public interest and international economic law – current approaches</b>	57
	A. Scholarly approaches towards international legal obligations of MNEs	57
	1. A scholarly attempt to shape the practice: The Norms on the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises with Regard to Human Rights	58
	2. Scholarly approaches towards an international legal personality of MNEs	61
	B. Public interest considerations in recent BIT practice	66
	1. Prelude: The principle of good faith and Article XX GATT	66
	2. Public interest considerations in BITs	69
4	<b>The Global Public Interest theory</b>	77
	A. Setting the stage: International investment law as Global Public Law	77
	1. The Global Administrative Law face of international investment law	78
	2. Constitutional elements in international investment law	85
	3. International investment law as Global Public Law	94

	CONTENTS	ix
B. Comparative insights		99
1. Recall the seven observations on international investment law		99
2. The European law system		101
3. The European Convention on Human Rights system		118
C. The Global Public Interest theory		127
1. Two examples of public interest considerations in international investment case law		127
2. Lessons learned from the comparative insights		146
3. The State as the agent of public interest		149
4. Lessons learned from international investment law as Global Public Law		151
5. The legal translation of Global Public Interest		154
<b>5 How to balance the conflicting interests:</b>		
<b>Proportionality analysis</b>		<b>168</b>
A. Doctrinal avenues of proportionality analysis in international investment law		168
B. Some skepticism regarding proportionality analysis		171
C. Comparative insights		173
1. The German pedigree of proportionality analysis and its reception in other domestic constitutional orders		174
2. Proportionality analysis in the European legal order – ECJ jurisprudence		178
3. Proportionality in the jurisprudence of international Tribunals		179
4. A glimpse into investment arbitration jurisprudence vis-à-vis proportionality		183
D. Elements of proportionality analysis		186
1. Suitability		186
2. Necessity		187
3. Proportionality <i>stricto sensu</i>		188
E. Principles relevant in proportionality analysis		189
1. Standards of review ( <i>Kontrolldichte</i> ), margin of appreciation and standards of scrutiny		189
2. “Praktische Konkordanz”		191
3. Limits to the balancing test ( <i>ius cogens</i> )		192

F. Operationalizing proportionality analysis in international investment law	193
1. Why proportionality analysis?	193
2. Doctrinal structure: Three-tier analysis	195
3. “Obligations” vs. “defenses”	197
4. Factors to be considered while balancing on the proportionality <i>stricto sensu</i> level	198
5. Some doctrinal challenges	202
6. Consequence: Reduced amount of compensation and damages	209
G. Potential safeguards against abuse	213
1. Substantive safeguards: Recap	214
2. Procedural safeguards: Provisional measures	215
H. What this means: Completing the three hypotheticals	217
1. Environment	218
2. Human rights	219
3. Corruption	220

## Part II Global Public Interest in international investment case law

<b>6 International investment law and the environment</b>	225
A. Principles of international environmental law	225
1. The polluter pays principle	226
2. The principle of preventive action	227
3. The precautionary principle	228
4. Common but differentiated responsibility principle	231
B. Do international environmental law treaties bear any relevance for the analysis at hand?	232
C. International investment disputes involving environmental issues	233
1. <i>Santa Elena v. Costa Rica</i>	234
2. <i>Metalclad v. Mexico</i>	237
3. <i>S. D. Myers v. Canada</i>	240
4. <i>Tecmed v. Mexico</i>	245
5. <i>Waste Management v. Mexico</i>	249
6. <i>Methanex v. United States</i>	251
7. <i>Biwater v. Tanzania</i>	252
8. <i>Chemtura v. Canada</i>	255

	CONTENTS	xi
	D. Analysis of the case law	258
	1. Preliminary conclusions	258
	2. The case law on environment in the light of the Global Public Interest theory	267
<b>7</b>	<b>Human rights and investment – friends or foes?</b>	269
	A. Doctrinal approaches in a nutshell	269
	B. Human rights issues in investment disputes	271
	1. Alleged violations of the investor’s human rights	271
	2. Alleged violations of human rights by the investor	276
	(a) General human rights cases	276
	(b) Specific case study: The right to water	288
	C. Analysis of the case law	300
	1. What’s wrong with human rights?	300
	2. Through the back door	303
	3. Growing role of third parties	304
	4. The case law on human rights in the light of the Global Public Interest theory	305
<b>8</b>	<b>Corruption and other irregularities</b>	307
	A. How bad is corruption?	307
	B. Forms of corruption, definitions and international instruments	309
	1. “Hard corruption” and “influence peddling”	309
	2. International instruments	310
	(a) OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions	310
	(b) Criminal Law Convention on Corruption of the Council of Europe	312
	(c) BIT provisions relevant in corruption cases	312
	C. Corruption disputes in international investment law	313
	1. Distinguish two different types of corruption disputes	313
	2. International investment case law pertaining to corruption and other irregularities	314
	(a) <i>Wena v. Egypt</i> and <i>SGS v. Pakistan</i>	314
	(b) <i>World Duty Free v. Republic of Kenya</i>	315
	(c) <i>Inceysa v. El Salvador</i>	321

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-02176-1 - Global Public Interest in International Investment Law

Andreas Kulick

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

xii	CONTENTS	
	(d) <i>Fraport v. Philippines</i>	324
	(e) <i>Kardassopoulos v. Georgia</i>	325
	D. Analysis of the case law	327
	1. Preliminary conclusions	327
	2. Alternative approaches	331
	(a) Modification or adaptation of the main contract	331
	(b) Balancing with the investor's rights on the merits stage	332
9	<b>Concluding remarks</b>	342
	<i>Bibliography</i>	346
	<i>Index</i>	365