

POVERTY AND THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC LEGAL SYSTEM

Duties to the World's Poor

With a focus on how trade, foreign investment, commercial arbitration and financial regulation rules affect impoverished individuals, *Poverty and the International Economic Legal System* examines the relationship between the legal rules of the international economic law system and states' obligations to reduce poverty. The contributors include leading practitioners, practice-oriented scholars and legal theorists who discuss the human aspects of global economic activity without resorting to either overly dogmatic human rights approaches or technocratic economic views. The essays extend beyond development discussions by encouraging further efforts to study, improve and develop legal mechanisms for the benefit of the world's poor and challenging traditionally de-personified legal areas to engage with their real-world impacts.

KRISTA NADAKAVUKAREN SCHEFER holds a Swiss National Research Foundation Professorship at the University of Basel Law School, where she teaches international economic law. She also teaches at the World Trade Institute, University of Bern.





POVERTY AND THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC LEGAL SYSTEM

Duties to the World's Poor

KRISTA NADAKAVUKAREN SCHEFER





> CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107032743

© Cambridge University Press 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed and bound in the United Kingdom by the MPG Books Group

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Poverty and the international economic legal system: duties to the world's poor /

[edited by] Krista Nadakavukaren Schefer.

pages cm Includes bibliographical references and index. ISBN 978-1-107-03274-3

Law and economics. 2. Poverty. 3. International law – Economic aspects.
 4. Poor laws. 5. Sociological jurisprudence. I. Nadakavukaren Schefer, Krista, editor of compilation.

K487.E3P68 2013 344.03'25 – dc23 2012036796

ISBN 978-1-107-03274-3 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



For my parents, who taught me to value giving and wanting to make this world a better place for those who have less than I





CONTENTS

List of contributors	xi
Preface xxiii	
Acknowledgements	xl
List of abbreviations	xli

PART I Poverty and international law: setting out the framework

- 1 Poverty, obligations, and the international economic legal system: what are our duties to the global poor? 3
 KRISTA NADAKAVUKAREN SCHEFER
- 2 Anti-poverty v. the international economic legal order? A legal cultural critique 16 COLIN B. PICKER

PART II IEL institutions and poverty

A Trade

- 3 Introductory note: trade and poverty 41 GABRIELLE MARCEAU
- 4 Poverty, redistribution, and international trade regulation 48
 THOMAS COTTIER
- 5 Trade liberalization and poverty reduction: complimentary or contradictory aims? 66
 BRYAN MERCURIO
- 6 God, the WTO and hunger 79
 CHRISTIAN HÄBERLI

vii



viii	CONTENTS
7	Does free trade matter for poverty reduction? The case of ASEAN 107
	PASHA L. HSIEH
8	Poverty alleviation through paperless trade 121
9	Introductory note: arbitration, insurance, investment, corruption, and poverty 137
	J. J. GASS
10	International commercial arbitration and poverty, not obvious but (maybe) possible 144
	CHRISTOPHER KEE
11	Foreign direct investment and the alleviation of poverty: is investment arbitration falling short of its goals? 159
	MARIEL DIMSEY
12	The "corruption objection" to jurisdiction in investment arbitration: does it really protect the poor?
	STEPHAN WILSKE AND WILLA OBEL
13	Investment guarantees and international obligations to reduce poverty: a human rights perspective 189 MARKUS KRAJEWSKI
14	Access to justice in dispute resolution: financial assistance in international arbitration 211 BROOKS W. DALY AND SARAH MELIKIAN
15	From problem to potential: the need to go beyond
13	investor-state disputes and integrate civil society, investors and state at the local level 225
	MARIANA HERNANDEZ CRESPO
16	The Millennium Challenge Corporation, law, and poverty reduction 241 stuart kerr



•
1Y
IA

C International financial regulation	on
--------------------------------------	----

- 17 Introductory note: reflections on law and poverty 251
 GAVIN BINGHAM
- 18 Ambitious goals, limited tools? The IMF and poverty reduction 256
 BEN THIRKELL-WHITE
- The direct contribution of the international financial system to global poverty 278
 ROSS P. BUCKLEY
- The World Bank: fighting poverty ideology versus accountability
 MARK S. ELLIS
- 21 Life, debt, and human rights: contextualizing the international regime for sovereign debt relief 307

 CELINE TAN
- 22 Sovereign debt, odious debt, and the poverty of nations 325
- 23 Poverty and corruption 335
 MARK PIETH

PART III IEL and poverty: concerns of particularly vulnerable populations

- 24 International economic law, women, and poverty 341 BARNALI CHOUDHURY
- The book famine: international copyright rules as barriers to knowledge for impoverished persons with disabilities 358
 CAROLINE HESS-KLEIN
- 26 Caring for its children: how the European Union uses free movement law to tackle child poverty and social exclusion 377
 ALINE DOUSSIN



X CONTENTS

PART IV Challenging our assumptions: is there a duty to reduce poverty?

- 27 Positive or negative, legal or moral: what duties to reduce poverty? 391
 - STEPHANIE B. LEINHARDT AND KRISTA NADAKAVUKAREN SCHEFER
- 28 Human rights obligations to the poor 395 MONICA HAKIMI
- 29 The allocation of anti-poverty rights duties: our rights, but whose duties? 408

 SAMANTHA BESSON

Epilogue 432

KRISTA NADAKAVUKAREN SCHEFER

Index 433



CONTRIBUTORS

The authors of this volume, all specialists in their respective areas of IEL, have written their chapters specifically for this book. Addressing poverty as they have done, with differing views and differing approaches to the problem, is an innovative – even courageous – step to begin a process of systematically analysing and using the legal tools of the international economic law system for the benefit of the world's financially disadvantaged inhabitants.

Contributors

SAMANTHA BESSON is Chair of Public International Law and European Law at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland) and Co-Director of the European Law Institute of the Universities of Bern, Fribourg and Neuchâtel (Switzerland).

Her publications and research interests lie in European and international law and legal and political philosophy, and in particular in human rights law and theory.

Since 2008, Samantha Besson has been the Coordinator of the Seminar of Advanced Studies for Practitioners organized every year by The Hague Academy of International Law and a Member of the Swiss Federal Commission against Racism.

Professor Besson holds a degree in Swiss and European Law (University of Fribourg and Vienna), a Magister Juris in European and Comparative Law (University of Oxford), a PhD in Law (University of Fribourg) and a Habilitation in Legal Theory and Comparative, European and International Constitutional Law (University of Bern).

T. R. GAVIN BINGHAM was the Secretary General of the Central Bank Governance Forum at the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) until his retirement in 2011. In this role, he coordinated all BIS activities relating to the promotion of good governance of central banks as public policy



xii

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

institutions. He was also responsible for fostering international economic policy consultation and cooperation among central banks and finance ministries.

Dr. Bingham was also Secretary General of the Group of Ten, helped develop strategies for strengthening emerging market financial systems in the wake of the Asian crisis, and was instrumental in establishing the Financial Stability Forum, the Group of Twenty, and the IMF's New Arrangements to Borrow financing.

Prior to joining the BIS, Dr. Bingham worked at the Bank of Finland and served as a consultant to a number of international institutions. He studied economics, politics, and philosophy at Yale and Oxford Universities.

ROSS BUCKLEY is Professor of International Finance Law at the University of New South Wales. He is Founding Series Editor of the *Global Trade Law Series*, Kluwer Law International of The Hague and Series Co-Editor of Kluwer's *International Banking and Finance Law Series*. His research focuses on ways to improve the regulation and resilience of national financial systems in interacting with global capital and on ways to improve the global financial system.

Professor Buckley has served as a consultant to the US Securities and Exchange Commission, the Australian Tax Office, the Indonesian Ministry of Finance, the Vietnamese Ministry of Trade, and to banks and finance houses in Australia and the UK. He has also served as an expert witness for the US Department of Justice in US federal court.

BARNALI CHOUDHURY B. Comm., LLB, LLM, PhD, is a Lecturer at Queen Mary University and previously taught in Canada, the United States, and New Zealand. Her book entitled *Public Services and International Trade Liberalization: Human Rights and Gender Implications* was published by Cambridge University Press in 2012.

THOMAS COTTIER is Professor of European and International Economic Law at the University of Bern, where he is also Managing Director of the World Trade Institute and Director of the Institute of European and International Economic Law. He directs the Swiss National Science Foundation research program on trade law and policy located at the WTI.

Professor Cottier has a long-standing involvement in GATT/WTO activities. He served on the Swiss negotiating team of the Uruguay Round from 1986 to 1993, first as Chief Negotiator on dispute settlement and subsidies for Switzerland and subsequently as Chief Negotiator on TRIPs.



LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

xiii

He held several positions in the Swiss External Economic Affairs Department and was the Deputy-Director General of the Swiss Intellectual Property Office. In addition to his conceptual work in the fields of services and intellectual property and legal counselling, he has also served as a member or chair of several GATT and WTO panels.

BROOKS W. DALY is Deputy Secretary-General and Principal Legal Counsel at the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) in The Hague, the Netherlands. In this position, Mr. Daly is responsible for the legal affairs of an intergovernmental organization with 115 Member States, advising governments and other entities participating in international arbitration under PCA auspices on a variety of matters relating to arbitral procedure and international dispute resolution generally. He also speaks frequently on international arbitration topics and lectures at Leiden University School of Law.

Prior to joining the PCA, Mr. Daly was a Counsel at the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) International Court of Arbitration in Paris, France. He has practiced with the firms of Latham & Watkins (Los Angeles) and Brobeck Hale & Dorr (London).

MARIEL DIMSEY is a member of the Secretariat of the International Chamber of Commerce in Paris. Prior to moving to the ICC, Dr. Dimsey worked at Cleary, Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton in Frankfurt.

Dr. Dimsey received an LLM degree from the University of Cologne and a doctorate in law (Dr. iur.) from the University of Basel. A native of Australia, she received her LLB and BA degrees from the University of Queensland, Brisbane. Ms. Dimsey is a member of the Bar in New South Wales, Australia.

ALINE DOUSSIN is a lawyer specialized in international trade, European law and intellectual property law. Ms. Doussin's experience is derived from her time in private practice in Paris and from her former roles as consultant at the World Trade Organisation in Geneva and as an Intellectual Property Manager in Japan Tobacco International (JTI) in Geneva. She also trained in major international law firms in Paris and in the European Commission, Internal Market and Services Directorate-General, Industrial Property Unit.

Having studied at the Sorbonne and Paris Assas, Ms. Doussin holds a maitrise in international law and two postgraduate masters, one in European law and the second in intellectual property law.



xiv

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

MARK ELLIS is Executive Director of the International Bar Association (IBA). Prior to joining the IBA, he spent ten years as the first Executive Director of the Central European and Eurasian Law Initiative, served as Legal Advisor to the Independent International Commission on Kosovo, was appointed by OSCE to advise on the creation of Serbia's War Crimes Tribunal, and was actively involved with the Iraqi High Tribunal. He is presently a member of the Advisory Panel to the Defense Counsel for the ICTY.

Dr. Ellis is a member of the Council Foreign Relations and was also a long-time consultant to the World Bank on investment policies in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, as well as acting as Adjunct Professor at the Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law.

Twice a Fulbright Scholar at the Economic Institute in Zagreb, Croatia, Dr. Ellis earned his JD and economics degrees from Florida State University and his PhD in international criminal law from King's College, London.

JONATHAN GASS is a practicing attorney in the International Arbitration Group at Freshfields in Paris. Mr. Gass's litigation experience includes representation of several sovereign clients and a large number of matters involving financial institutions. He has published and presented on a variety of arbitration-related and other legal topics. Mr. Gass holds an undergraduate degree from Harvard University and a master's degree in Political Science from the University of California at Berkeley. He remained at Berkeley to study law, graduating from Boalt Hall with a JD.

CHRISTIAN HÄBERLI is a Senior Research Fellow at the World Trade Institute of Bern University. He also lectures on many trade-related topics, and is an active WTO panel member in fifteen disputes. His research interest is trade, agriculture, and development issues, market access for developing countries, and dispute settlement and multilateral trade negotiations from a practical viewpoint. His policy-related publications focus on the role of trade and investment in food security.

Prior to his work with the World Trade Institute, Dr. Häberli worked at the Swiss Federal Department for Economic Affairs, where he chaired the Swiss-EC Joint Agriculture Committee as well as the WTO Committee on Agriculture (Regular Session). He has also worked at the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the Swiss Development Cooperation in Nepal.



LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

xv

Dr. Häberli studied law in Geneva and Basel, where he graduated with a PhD on the subject of African Investment Law. He also studied development sciences and obtained a degree at the Institut Universitaire d'Etudes du Développement in Geneva, and has recently completed theological studies at Bern University.

Research for Dr. Häberli's chapter was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation under a grant to the National Centre of Competence in Research – Trade Regulation, based at the University of Bern's World Trade Institute in Bern, Switzerland.

MONICA HAKIMI is Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Michigan Law School, where she teaches and writes on public international law and US foreign relations law. She is particularly interested in the informal and operational aspects of the international legal process and in the ways in which that process adapts to contemporary challenges.

Before moving to the University of Michigan, Ms. Hakimi served as an attorney-adviser in the Office of the Legal Adviser at the US Department of State. There, she counselled policymakers on non-proliferation, the reconstruction of Iraq, international investment disputes, and civil aviation. She also worked on cases before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal, the International Court of Justice, and US federal courts and agencies.

Ms. Hakimi earned her JD from the Yale Law School, and her BA from Duke University. Following law school, Professor Hakimi was a law clerk in the Southern District of New York.

MARIANA HERNÁNDEZ-CRESPO is Associate Professor at the University of St. Thomas School of Law and Founder of the UST International ADR Research Network. Prior to her employment in Minneapolis, she taught classes at the Universidad Metropolitana in Venezuela and at the Law School of University Alfonso X El Sabio in Madrid, Spain. Ms. Hernández-Crespo also worked as an associate at Davis Polk and Wardwell in New York City.

Ms. Hernández-Crespo's current research focuses on alternative dispute resolution, mediation, international and comparative law, and law and development. Earlier, she taught criminal law in Venezuela and founded and led a program for children under state custody.

Ms. Hernández-Crespo holds JD and LLM degrees from Harvard Law School, where she was co-president of the Latin American Law Society. Her first law degree was from the Universidad Catolica Andres Bello (UCAB) in Caracas, Venezuela.



xvi

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

CAROLINE HESS-KLEIN is the Director of the Center Égalité Handicap. Since 2001 she has also been working at the University of Basel as a senior researcher and adjunct law instructor.

Prior to her employment with the center, Dr. Hess-Klein worked at the University of Berne and was the Delegate for the Rights of People with Disabilities to the umbrella Organization of the Swiss Organizations of and for People with Disabilities (DOK).

Dr. Hess-Klein studied law at the Universities of Lausanne and Berne, Switzerland, receiving her doctorate from the University of Berne. She is a member of Pro Mente Sana, an NGO defending the rights of persons with mental disabilities, and sits on the Committee of Besuchsdienst Berne, an organization that supports the reintegration of persons with mental disabilities into the workplace. From 1998 through 2003, Caroline Hess-Klein was on the board of directors of Kinderschutz Schweiz, a Swiss NGO aimed at protecting children from violence.

PASHA L. HSIEH is an Assistant Professor of Law at the Singapore Management University School of Law. Prior to joining academia, he served as a Legal Affairs Officer at the Appellate Body Secretariat of the World Trade Organization and as an associate at Shearman & Sterling LLP.

Mr. Hsieh's research focuses on public international law, WTO law and comparative law. He is particularly interested in the roles of China and ASEAN in international law and cross-Taiwan Strait relations. Mr. Hsieh has been the Managing Editor of the *Chinese (Taiwan) Yearbook of International Law and Affairs.*

Mr. Hsieh earned his Juris Doctor and LLM degrees from the University of Pennsylvania Law School, where he was a Senior Editor of the *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*.

CHRISTOPHER KEE is Senior Lecturer of Law at Aberdeen University and Honorary Fellow at Deakin University Law School, as well as a barrister and solicitor of the High Court of Australia and the Supreme Courts of Victoria and New South Wales, specializing in international arbitration and international sales law.

Before moving to Aberdeen, Dr. Kee was a member of the Australian Centre for International Commercial Arbitration (ACICA) Rules Committee from 2004 to 2007 and (ad hoc) from 2010, and is a founding executive member and former Co-Chair of the Australasian Forum for International Arbitration. He was Senior Researcher on the Global Sales Law Project at the University of Basel until 2011, and was an Adjunct Professor at the City University of Hong Kong.



LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

xvii

Dr. Kee received his LLB and BA degrees from Deakin University, his graduate diploma from the University of Queensland, and his doctorate of laws from the University of Basel.

STUART KERR is the Legal and Regulatory Director of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, an independent US Government foreign assistance agency founded in 2004. MCC makes very large grants to a limited number of developing countries that perform better than their peers in three broad areas: Ruling Justly, Investing in People, and Economic Freedom. He was previously Senior Counsel for Europe and Eurasia at the US Department of Commerce's Commercial Law Development Program. He also served for many years as the executive director of the International Law Institute, an international NGO serving over 175 countries.

Mr. Kerr received his law degree from Georgetown University and his BA from Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut.

MARKUS KRAJEWSKI is Professor for Public Law and Public International Law at the Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nuremberg. He is also a member of the World Trade Institute's international faculty, and in 2009/2010, he was in charge of a project on the development of teaching and research capacities regarding WTO law of the Faculty of Law in Ethiopia at the Addis Ababa University.

Professor Krajewski's research activities cover international economic law, especially WTO law and international investment law, the law of peacekeeping, the law of European external relations and the European law of public services. He often advises international organizations and non-governmental organizations on these questions.

Dr. Krajewski studied Law, Economics and Political Science at the University of Hamburg and International Relations at the Florida State University in Tallahassee, United States of America. After his first state law examination (*Staatsexamen*), he worked as a research fellow at the University of Hamburg's Institute of International Affairs, and completed his practical legal training (*Refendariat*) at the Hanseatic Higher Regional Court (*Hanseatisches Oberlandesgericht*).

EMMANUEL LARYEA is a Senior Lecturer at the Faculty of Law, Monash University, Australia; and a Fellow of the Tim Fischer Centre for Global Trade and Finance, Bond University, Australia. He taught at the University of Ghana, Bond University, and Lancaster University, England, before joining Monash in 2001.



xviii

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Besides teaching, Dr. Laryea practiced law with a commercial law firm in Ghana.

Dr. Laryea obtained his LLB at the University of Ghana, LLM at the University of Glasgow, and PhD at Bond University.

STEPHANIE B. LEINHARDT is a doctoral candidate in law at the University of Basel. She holds degrees in law from the University of Basel, the Albert-Ludwigs University in Freiburg, as well as from the Université de Strasbourg, and spent a semester at the Université Panthéon-Assas in Paris. She is currently working as a research assistant while writing her doctoral thesis in the area of international environmental law and human rights law, focusing on the duties and responsibilities of states and non-state actors.

GABRIELLE MARCEAU is Counsellor in the Legal Affairs Division of the WTO, where her main function is to advise panellists in WTO disputes. For the five years prior to her appointment in that division, she was part of the Cabinet of the WTO Director General Pascal Lamy. Dr. Marceau is also Associate Professor at the Law Faculty of the University of Geneva and at the Graduate Institute of International Affairs and Development (HEID), where she teaches WTO law.

Before joining the GATT/WTO, Gabrielle Marceau worked in private practice in Canada, mainly in the sectors of labour law and insurance law. Dr. Marceau has published extensively, namely in WTO-related matters.

SARAH MELIKIAN is former Assistant Legal Counsel at the Permanent Court of Arbitration. (PCA) in the Hague, the Netherlands, where she provided legal and administrative support to arbitral tribunals and parties in proceedings administered by the PCA. She currently practices with an international law firm in New York City.

BRYAN MERCURIO is a Professor of Law and the Associate Dean (Research) at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Specializing in international economic law, Professor Mercurio is a frequent commentator and speaker and advisor for law firms, NGOs, and Members of both the Australian and New Zealand Parliament on a wide range of trade matters.

Prior to joining the faculty, Professor Mercurio spent five years at the University of New South Wales (UNSW), Faculty of Law, where he was Director of the International Trade and Development Project at the Gilbert & Tobin Centre of Public Law. Before entering academia, he worked for, among others, the Government of Canada and practiced international commercial law and international trade law in Australia.



LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

xix

Besides his teaching in Hong Kong, Professor Mercurio is currently a Senior Fellow of the Tim Fischer Centre for Global Trade & Finance, a Senior Visiting Fellow at the Faculty of Law at UNSW, a founding member of the Asian International Economic Law Network, an Associate Member of the Asian WTO Research Network, and a member of the Founding Committee and Executive Board of the Society of International Economic Law (SIEL).

KRISTA NADAKAVUKAREN SCHEFER is Professor of International Economic Law at the University of Basel. Teaching a wide variety of courses, her research interests lie mainly in the intersection of the international economic law regime and other international law. She is also involved in a research project with the World Trade Institute, where she is a Senior Research Fellow.

Professor Nadakavukaren Schefer received her bachelor's degree from the University of Chicago, her JD from Georgetown University Law School, and her doctorate and habilitation from the University of Bern.

WILLA OBEL was a Fellow at the Robert Bosch Foundation Fellowship Program for 2011–2012. She spent the year in Germany working in the public and private sectors, focussed on investor-state arbitration. She obtained her JD from the American University, Washington College of Law, and practices in the Washington, DC area.

COLIN PICKER is Associate Professor at the Law Faculty of the University of New South Wales. Before taking his position at UNSW, he was the Daniel L. Brenner/UMKC Scholar and Professor of Law at the University of Missouri Kansas City School of Law in the United States. His fields of research include international law, international economic law and comparative law. His work of recent years has involved efforts to bring these three fields together in an ongoing comparative law examination of international law. His research undertaken for this book is part of a larger study by the author on legal culture and IEL that will be part of the author's PhD.

In addition to publishing numerous articles and book chapters covering international, international economic, and comparative law fields, Mr. Picker was one of the two co-founders of the Society of International Economic Law, and is today Executive Vice President of that society. He was also on the Executive Board of the American Society of Comparative Law.



XX

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Professor Picker is a graduate of the Yale Law School, and following a judicial clerkship on the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals was an associate attorney in the International Group of Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering in Washington, DC.

MARK PIETH is Professor of Criminal Law and Criminology at the University of Basel, Switzerland. Professor Pieth has chaired the OECD Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions for over 20 years, and is also participating in the Wolfsberg AML Banking Initiative as a facilitator. In spring 2004, he was appointed by the UN Secretary-General to the Independent Inquiry Committee into the Iraq Oil-for-Food Programme and, following that, was made a member of the Integrity Advisory Board of the World Bank Group (IAB), advising the President of the Bank and the Audit Committee on integrity issues.

Before his academic career, Professor Pieth worked at the Swiss Federal Office of Justice, where he drafted legislation against money laundering, organized crime, drug abuse, corruption, and the confiscation of assets.

Professor Pieth continues to consult corporations, international organizations, and foreign governments on issues related to governance and to publish extensively in the field of economic and organized crime, money laundering, corruption, sanctioning, and criminal procedure.

Dr. Celine Tan is Assistant Professor at the School of Law, University of Warwick where she received her doctorate. Prior to Warwick, she lectured at the School of Law, University of Birmingham. She has also worked as a consultant researcher with the Third World Network, a research and advocacy organization based in Malaysia and Switzerland and with international organizations and other NGOs in Europe, Africa, and Asia on issues relating to social and economic development and human rights.

BEN THIRKELL-WHITE is a Senior Lecturer in International Relations at Victoria University of Wellington. His research is focused on global financial governance with a particular emphasis on development finance.

Dr. Thirkell-White qualified as a UK solicitor, working for Addleshaw Goddard in Leeds, before completing a PhD at the University of Leeds. He has since taught at the Universities of Bristol, Sheffield, and St Andrews.

STEPHAN WILSKE is a partner at Gleiss Lutz in Stuttgart, where his practice is focussed on international arbitration (counsel and arbitrator) and litigation in the field of commercial, corporate, as well as public international law. He is also an international advisor to the Korean Institute of Technology and the Law (KITAL), an Advisory Committee member of



LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

xxi

the Swiss Arbitration Academy (SAA), Senior Committee Member of the *Contemporary Asia Arbitration Journal* and International Correspondent (Germany) of the *Revista Româna de Arbitraj* (Romanian Arbitration Review).

Beyond his practice, Dr. Wilske lectures on international arbitration at Speyer University, the Düsseldorf International Arbitration School, and the University of Heidelberg. In Spring 2010 he was a Visiting Professor at National Taiwan University, College of Law.

He studied at the universities of Tübingen, Aix-en-Provence (Maîtrise en Droit), and Chicago (LLM). He was admitted in New York (1997), Germany (1987), to the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (2007), the US Supreme Court (2009), and the US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (2010).

YVONNE WONG is Professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of New South Wales. A practitioner as well as a scholar, she has been engaged in sub-prime mortgage litigation in private practice in San Francisco and has worked with investment banks, international organizations, government institutions, and NGOs in Australia, Samoa, Cambodia, the United Kingdom, Japan, and the United States.

As a scholar, Dr. Wong's research interests center on how laws, customs, and politics shape and direct global interactions, the role of race and gender in the international arena, and the causes, consequences, and solutions for transnational injustices.

Dr. Wong completed her JSD and LLM at Berkeley Law School; her BCom/LLB at the University of Sydney, Australia; and her Certificate in Chinese Laws and Chinese Legal Systems at East China University of Law and Politics, Shanghai.





PREFACE

The international economic law (IEL) system, composed of a loose network of trade, investment, and financial agreements, institutions, and practices, is rapidly evolving. From the solidification of the law of international trade from a forum of negotiations to one with approximately 150 binding decisions, to the widely commented-upon proliferation of arbitration-based resolutions of investment disputes between states and individual investors, to the increasing attempts to develop binding legal rules governing international financial markets, each of these areas of international economic law is changing how states and economic actors interact as well as how they respond to the problems posed by political and social pressures. Much scholarly attention has been given to these developments, examining the mechanics and effects of such impacts. One area that has received too little attention by the IEL field, however, is poverty.

In the wider international system, there is a new appreciation of the significance of poverty not just on those directly suffering from its effects, but on the entire world community. Poverty's central role in the Millennium Development Goals has been joined by statements by heads of states, international institutions (including the economic institutions), non-governmental organizations, religious foundations, and privately funded efforts of the need to eliminate absolute poverty and to reduce poverty. As the concept of poverty has been expanded from one focusing on income to one examining capabilities, the result has been that poverty has become a topic related to nearly every field of international relations – war, environment, migration, health, and economics among others.

In October 2011, the University of Basel hosted a conference as a first step toward establishing a research agenda on the specific topic of poverty's relationship to the laws of trade, investment, and finance. The conference, *Poverty and the International Economic Law System: Duties*

xxiii

¹ See "Conference on Poverty and the International Economic Law System," http://iel.ius. unibas.ch/wordpress.



XXİV PREFACE

to the World's Poor, addressed the linkage between poverty and trade, poverty and commercial arbitration and investment law, as well as poverty and financial regulation. Speakers also investigated how international economic law rules impacted individuals in groups that are particularly susceptible to poverty and, significantly, asked whether there are, in fact, any international legal duties requiring states to act positively to reduce poverty. This volume is the result of that conference, although the papers have been significantly revised and new ones added.

The volume

International economic law and poverty reduction

Clearly an implied goal of the trade law regime, poverty reduction within the legal rules of the multilateral and regional trade frameworks is almost exclusively an interest pursued through hortatory provisions or permissions for voluntary actions aimed at development rather than at poverty. Arguably not even an aim of the complex network of agreements for the protection of foreign investments, poverty considerations play a minor role in the current investment law framework and, not surprisingly, are barely a consideration in commercial arbitration. The role of poverty in the law of financial regulation is more apparent, with many of the international financial institutions' programs directly aiming to reduce poverty. Even there, however, the interests of the poor are frequently forgotten or undermined by the competing interest in upholding the state's sovereignty, as is the case with the laws on debt repayment.

And yet, in each of the areas of IEL, there are rules with significant, often even direct, impacts on the poor. More importantly, perhaps, IEL rules affect states' ability and willingness to address poverty within their own territory, not to mention their readiness to act in (or with effects in) others' jurisdictions.

Our focus

This volume aims to analyze the different legal rules of the international economic system from the perspective of their relationship to states' obligations to reduce poverty. Given the serious human impacts of both absolute and relative poverty, it is important to examine the impacts of trade, investment, and financial regulation rules on subsistence needs and these rules' effects on how states may and do respond to increasing inequalities of wealth in their societies. While the impacts on the one



PREFACE XXV

may be positive, impacts on the other may be negative, neutral, or simply different.

Our book's focus on the legally binding rules of the system is also important. We are asking not only what impacts does international economic activity have on levels of poverty, but are these impacts *due to the rules* of the trade regimes, investment agreements, or financial architecture? Are the rules, in other words, themselves a problem or is it the interpretation of the rules that is the problem? Or is the problem due to governments' undeniably political implementation of the rules? Of course, the problem may be a combination of these possibilities. Whatever the answer, ultimately we hope to shed light on whether the world needs a new framework of international economic rules if we want to be serious about reducing global poverty.

Convinced that the first step to addressing a problem is recognition that there is a problem to address, the contributions in Parts II to IV examine how the international laws of trade, investment, arbitration, and finance impact on states' abilities to fulfill their duty to reduce poverty. Taking a capabilities approach to the examination, the chapters of Part V address IEL's effects on populations that are particularly susceptible to poverty or its effects. Finally, the contributions in Part VI take a step back to question whether states actually have such duties and, if so, what the character of such duties is. The authors ask the very significant question, do states in fact have legal duties to relieve the effects of poverty and, if so, are there positive duties toward individuals?

Background considerations

Integral to the current project are three particular background questions. One is what forms of "poverty" will be considered. The second is what is the role of positive duties in addressing the international legal concern for poverty. Third is the question of the geographical scope of states' legal obligations to act. The following provides a brief introduction to these topics.

Forms of poverty

"Poverty" is a term used to indicate a general lack of resources.² Among the ways this lack of resources can be regarded are: absolutely and relatively.

2 B. Geremek, *Poverty: A History* (Oxford/Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1994/1997 ppb), p. 7. (Stemming from the Latin "paupertas," the word referred to the condition characterizing the life of the poor person – an absence of that which one wants or needs, a state of unproductivity. As a description of the lives of persons, the use of "poverty"



XXVİ PREFACE

Absolute poverty is a lack of resources sufficient to sustain life. Relative poverty refers to an inequality in resource distribution, and is commonly defined as living with less than X percent of the mean (or median) income of a community.³ These two aspects are independent of each other, and while societies with high levels of absolute poverty often display highly unequal patterns of asset ownership, either aspect can be present without the other.

Recognizing both aspects of poverty is important for studies such as those in this volume that analyze a legal system's impacts on "poverty." With the importance of absolute poverty as a problem for global concern, the significance is clear. The international economic system, as one aiming to improve standards of living through the use of resources, must take into account its impacts on the weakest.

Conceivably not as urgent, attention to relative poverty is as important for the IEL system, both conceptually and practically. On a conceptual level, attention to inequality implies a broader scope for investigation, requiring us to consider how the legal tools of economic regulation might entrench existing preferences or worsen existing disadvantages faced by the persons engaged in or affected by global commercial activities. For international economic law in particular, with its concern for discrimination and its commitment to equal access to markets for producers, scrutiny of the system's rules on resource inequalities among individuals poses an important test of the consistency of its norms with the societal norms of its members' communities.

The practical reasons for addressing IEL's effects on relative poverty are just as important: economic inequalities within a society and across societies can lead to a rejection of rules or institutions that are seen to be causing such differentials. With the documented sharpening of the wealth gap,⁴ the IEL system's rules are under increasing attack by those who see

was sometimes associated with baseness and begging as well as the simple lack of material wealth. This connotation has dwindled, although poverty itself continues to be thought of as "an unambiguously bad thing," as something that degrades the individual.) For a fascinating account of how the poor define themselves, see D. Narayan, R. Patel, K. Schafft, A. Rademacher, and S. Koch-Schulte, *Voices of the Poor: Can Anyone Hear Us?* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000) (published for the World Bank), ch. 2, http://go.worldbank.org/6Z9P1DKL51.

- 3 The exact percentage used as the benchmark varies. Most OECD and the EU members use a standard of "less than sixty percent" of the average income while the United States uses a "less than fifty percent" measure.
- 4 See M. E. Salomon, "Why Should it Matter that Others Have More? Poverty, Inequality, and the Potential of International Human Rights Law," Rev. Int'l Studies, 37 (2011),



PREFACE XXVII

them as the cause. Unless the system can demonstrate a commitment to reducing gross inequalities, its legitimacy – and thus its effectiveness – will be threatened. An analysis of the rules to detect such results is a first step in determining whether the charges are justified and what could be done to readjust them to be more palatable.

A second practical consideration for emphasizing relative poverty is political. While absolute poverty is found only exceptionally in industrialized countries, relative poverty is prevalent and obvious. The widely reported-upon gap between rich and poor in OECD Member States is something that trade policymakers in those countries cannot ignore. Domestic political pressures, if not international law, will bring questions of how the trade, investment, and financial treaties' affect relative poverty to the forefront of the IEL policy negotiations. The system cannot afford to ignore such pressures if it expects to enjoy legitimacy among publics.

Positive duties

The second element of the authors' engagement in the poverty-IEL relationship is that of the extent the legal duties of trade, investment, and finance correspond to or conflict with state duties to actively engage in poverty reduction. Because poverty leaves individuals in a situation of reduced capacity to fulfill their potential, in many cases duties on states to reduce poverty will be obligations to act rather than to avoid acting.⁵

The ethical argument for a general duty to actively help persons in need of assistance is not difficult in itself. Set out in the holy books of every major world religion as well as recurring through centuries of philosophical thought, the idea of a moral obligation to aid – of "beneficence" – is firmly established. While questions of who should have such duty in a particular case and to what degree the duty demands sacrifice by the duty-bearer cause controversies, the underlying idea is rarely questioned.⁶

- 2137, 2138 at n. 7 (describing the results of different studies on levels of inequality over time).
- 5 Pogge's position on obligations to alleviate poverty is based on his view that states have violated their negative duties to not cause poverty. E.g. T. Pogge, *World Poverty and Human Rights* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002). Pogge distinguishes this position from his "moral sympathies" for seeing poverty as a condition giving rise to positive duties. See T. Pogge, "Severe Poverty as a Human Rights Violation" in T. Pogge (ed.), *Freedom from Poverty as a Human Right: Who Owes What to the Very Poor?* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 18–25.
- 6 See S. Gosepath, "Poverty and responsibility" in E. Mack, M. Schramm, S. Klassen, and T. Pogge (eds.), *Absolute Poverty and Global Justice* (Surrey/Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), p. 114.



XXVIII PREFACE

On the legal plane, however, a claim of positive duties to reduce poverty is highly contestable. While the Millennium Development Goals focus on "poverty," the binding international instruments from which anti-poverty duties can be extracted do not use the term "poverty" itself. As a result, "international poverty law" is based on a collection of rights emerging from numerous legal and soft-law instruments.⁸

As an issue of basic human rights, the character of absolute poverty as a phenomenon largely outside of the control of the individual living with it makes the state's duties to protect and to fulfill them of particular significance. For the majority of those living at the financial margins who were born into poverty, or who slipped into poverty as a result of natural occurrences or war, positive actions by an external provider will be the only way to secure the resources necessary to escape financial deprivation.⁹

Extraterritoriality

There is a final difficult issue to be noted – the determination of the geographic extent of a duty to alleviate poverty. Can charity be required beyond a state's own citizens, to those on the other side of the globe? The question of the extraterritorial reach of positive duties is important for any legal study of global poverty.

Today's international legal system remains centered around the state as a discrete political entity. Accepted international law grants states full jurisdiction within their borders, permitting them to be politically selfcontained. Removed from the threat of intervention by others, states

- 7 Lucy Williams suggested this term to refer to "global poverty reduction and to transnational, multi-disciplinary legal research and dialogue dedicated to that goal." L. Williams, "Towards an emerging international poverty law" in L. Williams (ed.), *International Poverty Law: An Emerging Discourse* (London/New York: Zed Books, 2006), p. 1.
- 8 The most significant of these instruments are the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (particularly Art. 25) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (e.g. Art. 11). See G. Amitsis, "Developing universal anti-poverty regimes: the role of the United Nations in the establishment of international poverty law" in Williams, *International Poverty Law*, p. 215 (indicating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as the "cornerstone of international anti-poverty law").
- 9 Literature postulating the existence of "poverty traps" supports this view. For an overview of the literature, see, e.g. C. Azariadis, "The Theory of Poverty Traps: What Have We Learned?" in S. Bowles, S. Durlauf, and K. Hoff (eds.), *Poverty Traps* (Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 17–40; and R. J. Sampson and J. D. Morenoff, "Durable Inequality: Spatial Dynamics, Social Processes, and the Persistence of Poverty in Chicago Neighborhoods" in Bowles et al., *Poverty Traps*, pp. 189–92 (noting consequences of wealth inequality include: the breakdown of "collective efficacy" and the development of "subcultures of moral and legal cynicism;" each leads to the perpetuation of poverty within a community).



PREFACE XXIX

under the traditional view correspondingly lack jurisdiction beyond their borders. Until the latter years of the twentieth century, the sovereignty model of international law meant that not only did states not need to assist suffering foreign populations without the request of the ruling government, they were not permitted to aid absent a request from the foreign sovereign. This idea held whether the suffering was due to poor governance, financial breakdown, or natural catastrophe.

Typified by the emergence of the doctrine of "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P), ¹⁰ however, competing views of international law have been gaining influence. ¹¹ Now, despite the continuing emphasis on state sovereignty, an active debate is transforming the Westphalian legal framework to a more cosmopolitan view. Under such a view, legal rights of individuals would be valid globally, indicating that states' duties to ensure the protection of such rights would apply extraterritorially if the responsible government were unable or unwilling to act. ¹²

- 10 The concept of the Responsibility to Protect was proffered by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty in its report, "The Responsibility to Protect" (December 2001). Many of the ideas were subsequently adopted by the UN Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change in their Report, "A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility," A/59/565 (December 2, 2004). The General Assembly adopted the Responsibility to Protect as set out in its adoption of the 2005 World Summit's Outcome Document, where paras. 138 and 139 set forth the international community's duty to lend assistance to states whose populations are experiencing or threatened with massive human rights violations.
- 11 The obligation to cooperate is another example of an outward-activity orientation in international law. Such a duty clearly may arise from treaties (environmental and criminal law treaties are particularly frequent sources of cooperation obligations) and Security Council Resolutions as well as from the UN Charter. Whether such an obligation exists where there is no specific provision providing for it is debated. See P. Alston, "Ships Passing in the Night: The Current State of the Human Rights and Development Debate Seen Through the Lens of the Millennium Development Goals," Hum. Rts. Q., 27 (2005), 755, 771, 775 (pointing to a customary law norm of cooperation); D. M. Ong, "Joint Development of Common Offshore Oil and Gas Deposits: 'Mere' State Practice or Customary International Law?" Am. J. Int'l L., 93 (1999), 771, 780-95 (setting forth treaty provisions and evidence of customary duties of cooperation); and G. Sluiter, "Using the Genocide Convention to Strengthen Cooperation with the ICC in the Al Bashir Case," J. Int. Criminal Justice, 8(2) (2010), 365. But see S. Fukuda-Parr, "International Obligations for Economic and Social Rights: The Case of the Millennium Development Goal Eight" in S. Hertel and L. Minkler (eds.), Economic Rights: Conceptual, Measurement, and Policy Issues (Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 285 (arguing that "the idea of development cooperation is still rooted in the logic of charity, rather than the logic of shared responsibilities").
- 12 Within the specific framework of R2P, it is "the international community" that would have duties to protect foreign populations. Who the precise duty-bearers would be is debated. See, e.g. A. Peters, "The Security Council's Responsibility to Protect," *Int'l Orgs. L. Rev.*, 8 (2011), 1.



XXX PREFACE

Extending the sovereignty as responsibility concept to include poverty reduction would put upon states a duty to take steps to ensure that individuals around the world are given the resources and support they need to escape from their manifold deprivations. Accepting the responsibility – whether moral or legal – does not imply accepting a duty to act in a particular way. Poverty is a multifaceted phenomenon – as varied in its causes as in its effects – suggesting that there is no right way to fight it. That fact does not reduce the imperative to address it. If anything, it emphasizes the need to address it on many levels and from many angles.

The contributions

The contributions of this volume look at the poverty-international economic law relationship from objective and normative perspectives: the authors ask what the international economic legal system does, does not, or could do, to help the poor. The focus on the legal rules rather than solely on the practical effects of international economic activities allows the reader to judge for her/himself whether the rules are sufficient as they are or whether states must change the legal framework if significant long-lasting poverty reduction is to be achieved.

Part I

Part I of this volume introduces the topic of poverty and international economic law by giving the reader an overview of both poverty and the international legal discussions relevant to states' positive duties to reduce poverty.

Chapter 1 provides a brief overview of the themes examined in the rest of the volume after setting out the significance of poverty as an area of international legal attention. As the international law of poverty is heavily oriented around human rights, the major provisions are set forth along with their implications for states.

Chapter 2, written by COLIN PICKER, complements this introduction by reminding the reader that the expectations, behaviors, and actions of individuals in a particular legal system can differ dramatically from those same elements in a different legal system. This "legal culture" of IEL, in turn, affects its potential for reducing poverty. Picker sets out a detailed analysis of how the study of IEL's effects on poverty differs from studies on IEL and development – a key distinction for this volume. Picker then gives insights on four elements of particular importance to explain the lack of