

# *Contents*

<i>Table of Cases</i>	xv
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxiii

<b>1. Introduction</b>	1
<b>2. Investor–State Arbitration and the Argentine Cases: an Overview</b>	6
I. The protection of foreign investment in the past	7
II. Diplomatic protection and the traditional role of the individual in international dispute resolution	11
III. The modern system of the protection of foreign investment	14
IV. The 2001–3 Argentine financial crisis	18
1. The privatization of public utilities in the late 1980s	18
2. The 2001–3 crisis and its precursors	20
3. Argentina's measures in response to the crisis	21
V. The jurisprudence arising from the Argentine financial crisis	22
<b>3. Proportionality as a General Principle of Law</b>	28
I. The principle of proportionality in domestic legal systems	34
1. The principle of proportionality in German law	35
a) Proportionality in German administrative law before World War I	35
b) Proportionality in German constitutional law	37
c) Robert Alexy on principles and proportionality	40
2. The establishment of the principle of proportionality in various constitutional orders	42
a) The jurisprudence of the Canadian Supreme Court	43
b) The jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court of South Africa	45
c) The jurisprudence of the Israeli Supreme Court	46
3. The principle of proportionality, balancing, and similar concepts in US constitutional law	50
a) The relevance of the debate on proportionality balancing in the US	51
b) The dormant commerce clause	52
c) The equal protection clause and its different levels of scrutiny	53
d) Balancing and the First Amendment to the US Constitution	54
e) The struggle of Justice Breyer for an explicit endorsement of the principle of proportionality by the US Supreme Court	58
4. Summary of the comparative analysis	61
II. The 'dark sides' of proportionality	62
1. Judicial lawmaking	63
2. Threat to the rule of law	65
3. Arbitrariness and the lack of a unitary value system	66

III. Transposability of proportionality to the international level	67
1. Proportionality in several subsystems of international law	68
a) Proportionality and the law of the European Union	68
b) Proportionality in the jurisprudence of the WTO adjudicatory bodies	70
c) Proportionality in the jurisprudence of the ECtHR	74
d) The principle of proportionality in other areas of international law	78
2. Proportionality as a 'principle'	79
3. Why general principles if there is a treaty?	80
IV. Conclusion	82
<b>4. Proportionality and the Concept of Systemic Integration</b>	<b>84</b>
I. Article 31 VCLT and systemic integration: a short overview	86
II. The relationship between Article 31(3)(c) VCLT and other means of treaty interpretation	91
III. The content and scope of Article 31(3)(c) VCLT	92
1. The notion of 'self-contained regimes' and its (ir)relevance for investor-State arbitration	93
a) International investment agreements as self-contained regimes?	93
b) The ICSID Convention as a self-contained regime?	98
2. The different elements of Article 31(3)(c) VCLT	99
a) 'Rules of international law'	99
(1) All sources of international law matter	99
(2) Proportionality as a 'rule'	100
(3) The value glue of the international community	101
(i) The value system of the Charter of the United Nations	102
(ii) Human rights in treaties, custom, and general principles	103
(iii) Hierarchical structures in international law	106
b) Which 'parties'?	111
c) Which rules are 'applicable'?	113
(1) Temporal issues	113
(2) Normative issues	114
d) Which rules are 'relevant'?	118
IV. Conclusion	120
<b>5. Proportionality and Expropriation</b>	<b>122</b>
I. Direct versus indirect expropriations	123
II. The different approaches towards the identification of an indirect expropriation	125
1. Sole effects doctrine	126
2. Police powers doctrine	127
3. Mitigated police powers doctrine	129
III. Policy rationales for proportionality balancing in the context of indirect expropriations	132
1. The balance between private property rights and the public interest in the provisions on expropriation in the German Basic Law and the ECHR	132
2. Possible reasons for a different balance in international investment law	135



3. Recent efforts to readjust the balance between private property rights and the public interest in international investment law	136
IV. Harmonizing two areas of international law or comparing apples and oranges? A critical analysis of the <i>Tecmed</i> approach	141
1. The <i>Tecmed</i> approach and the fragmentation of international law	142
2. The reasoning of the <i>Tecmed</i> tribunal regarding indirect expropriation	143
3. The <i>Tecmed</i> approach and the underlying jurisprudence of the ECtHR	144
a) Jurisprudence of the ECtHR on the lawfulness of expropriations	146
b) Jurisprudence of the ECtHR on interferences with the right to property other than expropriatory acts	148
V. Identifying indirect expropriation in accordance with Article 31 VCLT	151
1. The ordinary meaning and context of the treaty term	151
2. Special case: clarification of the notion of 'indirect expropriation' in an IIA	153
3. The object and purpose of the relevant investment treaty	157
4. Subsequent agreement and practice	162
a) Subsequent agreements	163
b) Subsequent practice	168
c) Summary	170
5. Systemic integration	171
a) Defining indirect expropriation through custom and creating custom through treaties?	171
b) Introducing proportionality balancing into the concept of indirect expropriation through general principles of law?	177
VI. Conclusion	179
<b>6. Proportionality and the FET Standard</b>	182
I. Some basic features of the FET standard	183
1. FET and the international minimum standard of treatment	183
2. FET and legitimate expectations	186
II. The FET standard and the Argentine financial crisis	187
1. Overview of the relevant jurisprudence	187
2. Public interest considerations	190
III. The case for the application of the principle of proportionality in deciding on a breach of the FET standard	193
1. Status quo: some, but no broad endorsement of proportionality by tribunals	193
2. Incorporating proportionality analysis through Article 31(3)(c) VCLT	194
3. Refining but not contradicting existing jurisprudence	198
IV. Legitimate expectations: absolute protection or subject to proportionality balancing?	199
V. <i>Occidental v Ecuador</i> : proportionality as a restraint for States in exercising their contractual rights?	202
VI. Conclusion	208



<b>7. Proportionality and NPM Clauses: Article XI of the Argentina–US BIT</b>	<b>211</b>
I. Arbitral jurisprudence on Article XI of the Argentina–US BIT	212
II. The relationship between Article XI and the customary international law defence of necessity	217
III. Is Article XI of the Argentina–US BIT self-judging?	222
1. Ordinary meaning, context, object, and purpose, and some systemic integration	222
2. Self-judging exceptions to IIA protections: an emerging rule of customary international law?	224
3. Lessons from <i>Nicaragua v United States</i>	227
IV. The nexus requirement: ‘only way’, ‘margin of appreciation’, or proportionality analysis?	229
1. Equating ‘necessary’ in Article XI of the Argentina–US BIT with the ‘only way’ requirement of Article 25 ASR?	230
2. Transferring the margin of appreciation doctrine of the ECtHR to Article XI of the Argentina–US BIT?	232
3. Proportionality in the context of Article XI of the Argentina–US BIT	237
V. The consequences of Article XI	243
VI. Conclusion	250
<b>8. Proportionality and the Customary International Law Defence of Necessity</b>	<b>253</b>
I. The applicability of Article 25 ASR in investor–State arbitration	255
1. Inapplicability of the necessity defense according to Article 25(2)(a) ASR?	255
2. Inapplicability of Article 25 due to NPM clauses as <i>leges speciales</i> ?	257
3. Inapplicability of Article 25 due to the involvement of non-State actors?	259
II. The status quo: practical unavailability of necessity in investor–State arbitration	264
1. Grave and imminent peril for an essential interest	265
2. No serious impairment of another essential interest	270
3. The ‘only way’ requirement	273
4. The non-contribution requirement	275
III. The principle of proportionality: the only way forward?	280
1. Modifying the ILC codification: replacing the ‘only way’ requirement with the principle of proportionality?	281
2. Necessity and the principle of proportionality: custom versus general principles?	286
IV. Consequences of a successful plea of necessity	289
1. A duty to compensate?	290
2. The relevant standard of compensation	296
V. Conclusion	298
<b>9. Summary and Concluding Remarks</b>	<b>301</b>
<i>Bibliography</i>	307
<i>Index</i>	323