

OXFORD MONOGRAPHS IN
INTERNATIONAL LAW

General Editor: PROFESSOR VAUGHAN LOWE
*Chichele Professor of Public International Law in the
University of Oxford and Fellow of
All Souls College, Oxford*

*The Fair and Equitable Treatment
Standard in the International Law
of Foreign Investment*

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© I. Tudor, 2008

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

Crown copyright material is reproduced under Class Licence
Number C01P0000148 with the permission of OPSI
and the Queen's Printer for Scotland

Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2008

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Data available

Typeset by Newgen Imaging Systems (P) Ltd., Chennai, India
Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
Biddles Ltd., King's Lynn.

ISBN 978-0-19-923506-3

3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

General Editor's Preface

There are few legal concepts that have had such a dramatic impact upon the world of legal practice as the 'Fair and Equitable Treatment' standard in the field of international investment law. Offering the possibility of redress in circumstances where no remedy is available, and even where no wrong is committed, under any national legal system, the standard has become an enormously potent tool in the legal workshop.

This monograph is a systematic analysis of the standard as it appears in investment treaties and as it is employed in international tribunals. It brings together an already large body of material in this fast-developing field and provides a clear view of the present state of the law. Dr Tudor's appraisal of the concept is careful and subtle. At a time when there is much discussion of the question whether investment treaties favour investors excessively, the conclusion that the Fair and Equitable Treatment provision may contribute to the re-balancing of the investor-State relationship is one that will attract many readers, both academic and practising lawyers, to this important study.

AVL

All Souls College, Oxford
October 2007

Foreword

The book written by Ioana Tudor is the first monograph which is dedicated to an in depth study of the fair and equitable treatment standard, a topic of interest both for academics and practitioners in the field of investment arbitration. It represents a major contribution to the analysis of the nature, meaning and effects of one of the key rules of public international law applied to international investment law. This field of international law cannot be reduced to a mere branch of public international law. Still today, there is a significant number of cases in which either a national law or the law of the host State (including its rules on the conflict of laws), as it may be agreed by the parties, must be applied. Nevertheless, since the *AAPL* award, investors have been entitled to file a claim directly against a State before an ICSID tribunal. An identical possibility was later extended in the framework of other regional or multilateral instruments like the Energy Charter. These procedural novelties led to an overwhelming proportion of treaty-based claims in comparison with contract claims. In this way, private investors became ardent defenders of public international legal rules and principles, originally designed for normalizing the relations between sovereign States.

In the framework of a *treaty claim*, the treaty involved in a majority of cases is the one signed between the home State of the investor and the host State, welcoming the investment; nevertheless, this does not exclude the existence of instruments which are regional or universal in scope. One of the most striking conclusions drawn by Ioana Tudor in this book is that, although being called a 'principle', the fair and equitable treatment is first and foremost of conventional nature, i.e. it belongs to the *lex specialis* constituted by the relevant treaty. But this does not mean that it does not, concurrently, belong to customary international law. This book follows on the interaction between treaty law and international custom while analysing the way in which the FET is applied to concrete cases.

On the treaty front, after a comparative analysis and a classification of almost 400 bilateral investment treaties and nearly all existent regional and multilateral agreements, the author identifies the exact scope and meaning of the fair and equitable treatment principle and emphasizes the necessity of looking carefully at the wording of the treaty provision containing a reference to FET. One must agree with this conclusion. Despite the seven categories of drafting formulations identified in this book, they all share a common substantial vagueness. Ioana Tudor convincingly demonstrates that the minimalist drafting category of FET is also rooted in customary international law. In addition, the very concepts of 'fairness' and 'equity', which are at the basis of the FET, are, as such, almost meta-juridical concepts. They articulate law and ethics at the international level; however not all States share the same definition of these

notions since they are as philosophical in nature as they are sociological; they refer to what a determined society considers as being reasonable and rational at a certain moment in time.

As far as the FET is concerned, it would be a mistake to look at the relationship between treaty law and customary law in terms of a sterile confrontation. On the contrary, one feeds and contributes to the development and application of the other. Either implicitly or explicitly, the treaty provisions incorporating the FET refer, one way or the other, to general (i.e. customary) international law. As indicated above, a FET clause requires a careful analysis of its wording; but it requests at the same time a careful consideration of the context, both legal and material, of the relevant treaty. At the contentious level, when asked to consider an investor's claim for alleged breach of FET by the host State, arbitrators will refer to FET not only as a norm but also as a 'standard'. Now, what is a standard? I agree with the extensive analysis of this concept made by the author in this book and I believe that it is a legal technique which allows the arbitrator to establish, in a concrete case, what is a 'fair and equitable' treatment provided by the State to the foreign investor. In the actual evaluation of the conduct of the State, arbitrators use this legal technique as a tool for reconciling the legal, philosophical and sociological dimensions of the FET standard. The standard is, at the same time, a benchmark for identifying a rule and the rule itself as it is established by taking into account every pertinent element of fact and law to be selected out of the complex relationship existing at a certain time between the investor and the host State. The author describes in a very clear manner the implications that derive from the standard nature of FET on its content and on its function. In this enlarged context, and contrary to what has been argued by some scholars, it seems difficult to consider the FET as a 'self-contained' principle, the notion of 'self containment' being in any case equivocal and understood differently, depending of the legal tradition concerned.

As illustrated in this book, in applying the FET, the role of the arbitrator is not only central: it is also necessarily creative. The arbitrator must apply the law as it is objectively set out by the dynamic combination of treaty and custom, but also take into account the average values and behaviours of a society at a given moment in time. Thus, the arbitrator becomes the vehicle through which reality is incorporated within the legal norm. The social or economic fact acquires a normative character. Of course, benefiting from such a high degree of autonomy in the exercise of its judicial function, a 'transnational' tribunal is endowed with a heavy burden of responsibility.

Conducting a thorough analysis of the existent case law, this book very well illustrates the art of establishing the right balance between the elements of fact and law to be taken into account when deciding whether the FET has been breached or not. There are different aspects of this art. One concerns the unilateral character of the FET as it sets an obligation for the host State and the way in which it is often balanced by incorporating other considerations into the arbitral

analysis: for instance, the actual economic and even sociological situation of the State or the expectations of the investor as far as they are 'legitimate'.

The above observations are only a rapid survey of some of the legal considerations surrounding the FET, and which are developed at length in this book. The book has the advantage of identifying the relevant and practical issues connected to the FET while presenting an in depth analysis of each one of them. In this way, the author manages to offer a balanced and insightful study of a complex concept, by placing her academic skills at the service of her practitioner acumen.

Moreover, Ioana Tudor has conducted an outstanding study in her book of the various elements that transform the arbitrator into a third player of the game. Just have a look at the painting on the cover of this book: inspired by a series of predecessors, like Giorgione, Caravaggio, Van Gogh, or Cezanne, it shows three characters around a table. Two of them are seated. They most probably represent the parties to an arbitral proceeding. Only the third one, close to the same table, is playing the guitar. He is most probably the arbitrator.

Pierre-Marie Dupuy

Chair in Public International Law, at the European University Institute, Florence and at the Université de Paris II (Panthéon-Assas). International arbitrator.

Preface

The Fair and Equitable Treatment Standard in the International Law of Foreign Investment is mainly the result of the research I carried out between September 2004 and May 2006 in the course of writing my doctorate, at the European University Institute (hereinafter 'EUI') in Florence. The idea behind this work was conceived in the aftermath of the WTO Ministerial Conference that took place in Cancun in September 2003. At this time, I started an internship with the WTO Trade and Investment division in Geneva. I had been admitted to the EUI, in 2002, on the basis of a research proposal that focused on multilateralism: more precisely, on the way in which investment rules could be designed at the multilateral level. Yet, after the first year of research under the supervision of Professor Petersmann, I discovered that multilateralism in the area of foreign investment was a story of more failures than successes, and that even the existing successes took the form, most of the time, of non-binding effect agreements. The Cancun ministerial conference produced a point-blank verdict concerning the negotiations on investment: "The situation does not provide a basis for the commencement of negotiations in this area."¹ The existing and ever growing number of bilateral investment treaties (hereinafter 'BITs') was there to confirm that multilateralism in the area of foreign direct investment was dead - at least for the next couple of years. What could have been the options available to a researcher who, opting for a topical subject, was clearly a victim of multilateralism in decline? Basically, there were two: either continuing on the same path, or taking a u-turn and start looking for a new topic.

My initial decision to write a thesis emanated from my aspiration to not only ask relevant questions but also to propose practical answers. Since I wanted to continue a professional career as a practitioner in the field of foreign investment, I thought that the best method to identify the topic that was in need of such answers was to ask practitioners. In early May 2004, I met a number of prominent lawyers in Paris and from those discussions stemmed the idea of concentrating on the treatment of foreign investment. In the end, it was Professor Dupuy, who, after a long series of discussions, persuaded me to undertake a study of the fair and equitable treatment standard (hereinafter 'FET'). Two years and a multitude of discussions later, I defended my thesis in front of an eminent panel of professors who despite their criticism and observations encouraged me to publish it.

Thus, the current book builds on my doctoral thesis which I revised through the lenses of my short but intense and ongoing experience as a lawyer and the

¹ World Trade Organisation, Draft Cancun Ministerial Declaration (2003), available at <<http://www.wto.org>>, at point 13.

many comments I received from my doctoral thesis jury, my OUP reviewers and all those who took the time to read my work and send me their comments.

The FET standard became, in only ten years, an *incontournable* feature of the international law of foreign investment, mostly due to the Investor-State settlement of disputes system. Divided between the host States' discontent and the Investors' enthusiasm, FET creates mostly confusion. In this study this research puzzle is tackled by applying four conceptual frames: the legal basis of FET, its nature as a standard, its content and finally the implications of its breach (i.e. the calculation of compensation) and the enforcement of the award.

In the first two chapters I discuss the three classical sources of international law as possible sources for FET. I conclude that the main sources of FET lie in a rich conventional framework, mainly bilateral, although the increasingly important role of regional agreements must be noted. However, the high number of BITs does not appear to offer a uniform model of FET clauses, quite the opposite. I was able to classify the FET clauses found in 365 BITs in seven categories. Having concluded that the conventional framework is essential to FET, I turn to an examination of the possible customary character of FET and argue that the view that seeks to equate FET with the International Minimum Standard (hereinafter 'IMS') is not only erroneous but also limits the scope of FET. Alternatively, I suggest the FET itself to be a standard of customary nature. To complete the research into the legal basis, I look at the question whether FET constitutes a general principle of law. Having surveyed a number of legal systems that retain treatment according to fairness and equitableness as inherent to their systems, I conclude that FET is a general principle of law, which, in certain cases, is conditional upon an examination of the municipal laws concerned.

The study then looks at the nature of FET, that of being a standard, and retains three direct consequences for its meaning: its flexibility, the absence of a fixed content and its evolutionary character. With these three characteristics in mind, I proceed to the third conceptual framework, i.e. the content of FET. Although no fixed content may be given to it, I identify those situations in which the FET standard has already been applied. Moreover I propose a method for the arbitrators dealing with a FET claim as well as four pre-conditions for the validity of such a claim. Finally, the last conceptual framework aims at discussing the final act of a FET claim, i.e. the amount of compensation awarded in case of breach of FET. I argue that FET is a standard that balances the interests and behaviours of both the States and the Investors, at the stage of compensation. The legal obligation of the host State to treat foreign Investors fairly and equitably is a unilateral obligation and does not place the Investor in a reciprocal relationship in which he would assume a corresponding obligation. Despite its unilateral character, the FET obligation may contribute to the re-balancing of the Investor-State relationship, as opposed to its natural tendency to tilt in favour of the Investor. Directly connected to the calculation of compensation is the question of the enforcement of the award, which, if not annulled, opens the way for additional

negotiations between the parties as to the amount and methods of payment of the compensation.

The aim of this work is to use the legal characteristics of FET in order to propose new methods and ideas for its application. At the end of this study, it is appropriate to point to an element of *non-dit* that is inherent to the standard of FET and which constitutes both its paradox and its fortune. All my conclusions stem from a series of empirical research that are attached in the form of appendices at the end of the study.

Acknowledgements

The acknowledgements section of a book is the time to realize that this is not an individual work. The people I met in the course of this adventure have all contributed to the final product and had a positive impact on both my professional and personal life.

Completing this work required the assistance of, first and foremost, two professors. The first was Ernst-Ulrich Petersmann who accompanied me during my first two years at the EUI, providing me with indispensable research tools and making available to me his learned experience and deep understanding of international law. I am most grateful to him for his unfaltering support and for his understanding at the moment in which I decided to radically change the direction of my research. The second was Pierre-Marie Dupuy, who was pivotal in pointing me into the direction this work took me. In periods of hesitation and anxiety, he was as generous in encouragement as he has since been in his assistance. His extensive knowledge and passion for law, his availability, trust, and sense of humour have influenced me considerably in writing this work. I can only hope that I made the best of our long and numerous discussions and that I have managed to illustrate in this work what he has always taught me: that a lawyer has to be curious and imaginative.

I would like to extend my sense of appreciation to Emmanuel Gaillard, Andrea Giardina, and Christoph Schreuer, who gave me informed and thought-provoking advice for numerous parts of this work. Also, the three reviewers of my book proposal were extremely generous in sharing their ideas and comments. I am also indebted to Yannick Radi, who took time to read individual chapters and made helpful suggestions.

In the preparation of this book, I also benefited from the expert guidance and the availability of John Louth and Rebecca Smith from Oxford University Press, who made each step of this publication a joyful experience.

In addition, there are those who supported me on a personal level. I would like to mention my close EUI friends whose presence inspired me at various stages of this work and who will forever remain part of my EUI experience. I am most indebted to my parents, Rodica and Nicolae, and to my sister Olivia for their love, faith and determination, as well as for the sacrifices made during the years. Finally, I would like to thank Bernhard Knoll, who has contributed to this work by his constructive criticism and contagious passion for legal reasoning, always seated at the other side of the desk, completing his own book, through the late hours of the Florentine, Viennese, and now Warsawian nights.

OXFORD MONOGRAPHS IN
INTERNATIONAL LAW

The aim of this series is to publish important and original pieces of research on all aspects of international law. Topics that are given particular prominence are those which, while of interest to the academic lawyer, also have an important bearing on issues that touch upon the actual conduct of international relations. Nonetheless, the series is wide in scope and includes monographs on the history and philosophical foundations of international law.

RECENT TITLES IN THE SERIES

The Decolonisation of International Law
Matthew Craven

Investment Treaty Arbitration and Public Law
Gus van Harten

International Territorial Administration
Ralph Wilde

Diplomatic Protection
Ranjan Amerasinghe

The 'War on Terrorism', Human Rights, and Non-Discrimination
Daniel Moeckli

**The Immunity of States and their Officials in International
Criminal Law and International Human Rights Law**
Rosanne Van Alebeek

Defining Terrorism in International Law
Ben Saul

Peremptory Norms in International Law
Alexander Orakhelashvili

Differential Treatment in International Environmental Law
Lavanya Rajamani

International Organizations and their Exercise of Sovereign Powers
Dan Sarooshi

**International Justice and the International Criminal Court: Between
Sovereignty and the Rule of law**
Bruce Broomhall

Towards an International Criminal Procedure
Christoph J.M. Safferling

Human Rights in International Criminal Proceedings
Salvatore Zappalà

Universal Jurisdiction: International and Municipal Legal Perspectives
Luc Reydam

International Human Rights and Islamic Law
Mashood A. Baderin

*The Fair and Equitable
Treatment Standard*
in the International Law
of Foreign Investment

IOANA TUDOR, Ph.D
Associate, Gide Loyrette Nouel, Abogada

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Writing an acknowledgement section to a book represents the end of a long and winding road; without prejudice to the reader's judgement whether this book is a valuable contribution to the state of scholarship in the law of foreign investment, Henry Kissinger's words—evoking a degree of modesty as well as a sense for the challenges ahead—shall be recalled here: 'Each success only buys an admission ticket to a more difficult problem.'

Warsaw, August 2007

Contents—Summary

<i>Table of Arbitral Awards and Judicial Decisions</i>	xxiii
<i>List of Conventions and Treaties</i>	xxix
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxxi
Introduction	1
 I. SOURCES OF THE FET STANDARD	
1. The FET in International Investment Agreements: A Typology of Drafting Formulations	15
2. The FET Standard, Part of the Body of General International Law	53
 II. CONTENT OF THE FET STANDARD	
3. The Concept of Standard and its Application to the FET	109
4. Preparation Phases For A Successful FET Based Claim	134
5. Actual Situations in which the FET Standard has been Applied	154
6. Relation Between the FET and the Other Treaty Provisions	182
 III. BALANCING THE BREACH OF THE FET STANDARD	
7. Balancing States' and Investors' Conduct: Calculation of Compensation	207
Coda—Enforcement of FET Standard	229
Conclusion	233
 <i>Appendices</i>	239
<i>Bibliography</i>	293
<i>Index</i>	311

Contents

<i>Table of Arbitral Awards and Judicial Decisions</i>	xxiii
<i>List of Conventions and Treaties</i>	xxix
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxxi
Introduction	1
I. SOURCES OF THE FET STANDARD	
Introductory Note: Identification of the Sources of International Law	9
1. The FET in International Investment Agreements: A Typology of Drafting Formulations	15
Introduction	15
1.1 The FET Standard in Selected Bilateral Investment Treaties	19
1.1.1 Preamble	20
1.1.2 Body of the Treaty	22
1.1.3 Recent Developments in the Drafting of Bilateral FET Clauses	33
1.2 The FET Standard in Regional Agreements	36
1.2.1 Preamble	39
1.2.2 Body of the Text	40
1.2.3 Analysis of the Findings	44
1.3 The FET Standard in Multilateral Instruments	45
1.3.1 Preamble	47
1.3.2 Body of the Text	47
1.3.3 Analysis of the Findings	50
Résumé	51
2. The FET Standard, Part of the Body of General International Law	53
Introduction	53
2.1 Customary Framework of FET	54
2.1.1 The Traditional View	54
2.1.2 The International Minimum Standard	60
2.1.3 The Incompatibility Between the International Minimum Standard and the FET	65
2.1.4 The Two Elements Theory	68
2.1.5 The Two Elements Theory Applied to the FET	74

2.1.6 The FET as Customary Norm	83
2.2 The FET Standard—A General Principle of Law?	85
2.2.1 Use of General Principles Preceding the ICSID Convention	86
2.2.2 Article 42(1) of the ICSID Convention	90
2.2.3 Use of General Principles by ICSID Arbitral Tribunals	91
2.2.4 Definition and Method of Identification of the GPL	93
2.2.5 The FET as GPL	101
 II. THE CONTENT OF THE FET STANDARD	
Introductory Note	107
3. The Concept of Standard and its Application to the FET	109
Introduction	109
3.1 The Standard in the Legal Field	111
3.1.1 Etymology	111
3.1.2 History	112
3.1.3 Definitions Given by Scholars	114
3.2 Objective and Subjective Elements	116
3.2.1 The Objective Element: A Legal Concept and its Normative Content	117
3.2.2 The Subjective Element: The Application of the Standard	118
3.2.3 Comparison with the Rule	119
3.2.4 The Role of the Judge Confronted with a Standard	121
3.3 The FET: A Standard	123
3.3.1 Objective Element of the FET	123
3.3.2 Subjective Element	129
Résumé	132
4. Preparation Phases For A Successful FET Based Claim	134
Introduction	134
4.1 Pre-Conditions for Admitting a Claim Based on the FET Standard	135
4.1.1 An Action Attributable to the State	135
4.1.2 Damage suffered by the Investor	137
4.1.3 Causality Between State Action and Damage	137
4.1.4 Burden of Proof	138
4.2 The Parties' Approach to, and Interpretation of, the FET Standard	139
4.2.1 The FET Standard in the Investors' Claims	140

4.2.2 The FET Standard in the State's Defence	142
4.3 Methodology for Arbitrators	144
4.3.1 Ordinary Meaning	145
4.3.2 FET in the General Context of the BIT	146
4.3.3 Study of the Facts	148
4.3.4 Threshold	149
Résumé	152
5. Actual Situations in which the FET Standard has been Applied	154
Introduction	154
5.1. Lack of Respect for the Obligation of Vigilance and Protection	156
5.2 Denial of Due Process and/or Procedural Fairness	157
5.3 Non-Observance of the Investor's Legitimate Expectations	163
5.4 Coercion and Harassment by the Organs of the Host State	169
5.5 Failure to Offer a Stable and Predictable Legal Framework	169
5.6 Unjustified Enrichment	172
5.7 Evidence of Bad Faith	173
5.8 Absence of Transparency	175
5.9 Arbitrary and Discriminatory Treatment	177
Résumé — Achieving Stability in the Investor-State Relationship	180
6. Relation Between the FET and the Other Treaty Provisions	182
Introduction	182
6.1 Other Standards of Treatment	183
6.1.1 Full Protection and Security	183
6.1.2 Non-Discrimination	186
6.1.3 Most Favoured Nation Clause	189
6.2 Other Provisions	193
6.2.1 Pacta Sunt Servanda Clause	193
6.2.2 Standard of Non-Impairment	200
Résumé	201

III. BALANCING THE BREACH OF THE FET STANDARD

Introductory Note	205
7. Balancing States' and Investors' Conduct: Calculation of Compensation	207

Introduction	207
7.1 Relevance of the Investors' Behaviour, and of the States' Specific Situation at the Compensation Stage	209
7.1.1 Mainstream Position: Relevance at the Liability Stage	209
7.1.2 Proposed Alternative: Relevance at the Compensation Stage	211
7.2 Types of Investors' Behaviour and States' Specific Situation to be Considered at the Compensation Stage	217
7.2.1 Conduct of the Investors	217
7.2.2 States' Exceptional Circumstances	223
Résumé—Striking a Balance Between Reparation and Compensation	227
Coda—Enforcement of FET Standard	229
Conclusion	233
Appendices	239
Bibliography	293
Index	311

Table of Arbitral Awards and Judicial Decisions (in chronological order)

<i>Boffolo case</i> , Award rendered in 1903, X RIAA 528 (1903)	62
<i>Sambaggio case</i> , Mixed Italo-Venezuelan Commission, Award rendered in 1903, 10 RIAA 512	183
<i>Expropriated Religious Properties</i> (case between France, Great Britain, Spain and Portugal), Award rendered on 4 September 1920, I RIAA 7 (1920)	86, 163
<i>Lusitania case</i> , 7 RIAA 32 (1923)	214, 215
<i>Rights of Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco</i> (United States v France), ICJ Reports (1954)	71
<i>Wimbledon Case</i> PCIJ, Serie A, no 1 (1923)	69
<i>USA (George W Hopkins) v United Mexican States</i> (Hopkins case), General Claims Commission, Award rendered on 31 March 1926, IV RIAA 41 (1926)	64, 65
<i>USA (Harry Roberts) v United Mexican States</i> (Roberts case), The Mexican—United States General Claims Commission, Award rendered in 1926, IV RIAA 77 (1927)	64, 65
<i>USA (Janes) v United Mexican States</i> (Janes case), Award rendered in 1926, IV RIAA 82	62
<i>USA (LFNeer) v United Mexican States</i> (Neer case), The Mexican—United States General Claims Commission, Award rendered on 15 October 1926, 21 AJIL 555 (1927)	63, 65, 118, 151, 152
<i>Lotus case</i> PCIJ, Decision rendered on 7 September 1927, Series A, 10 (1927)	72
<i>Factory of Chorzów</i> , PCIA, PCIJ, Series A, no 17, (1928)	208, 227
<i>Lena Goldfields v Soviet Government</i> (Lena Goldfields), 5 Annual Digest of Public International Law Cases 88 (1929)	87, 172
<i>Serbian Loans case</i> PCIJ, Series A, no 20 (1929)	55
<i>Free City of Danzig and ILO</i> (Danzig case), PCIJ, serie B, no.18 1930	70
<i>Corfu Channel</i> (United Kingdom v Albania), ICJ, Decision 25 March 1949, ICJ Reports (1949)	95
<i>Asylum case</i> (Colombia / Peru), ICJ, Decision 20 November 1950, ICJ Reports (1950)	69
<i>Legality of Nuclear Weapons</i> , ICJ, Advisory Opinion, ICJ Reports (1950)	96
<i>Fisheries case</i> (United Kingdom v Norway), Award 18 December 1951, ICJ Reports (1951)	71
<i>Petroleum Development Ltd v Sheikh of Abu Dhabi</i> (Abu Dhabi case), 18 International Law Reports (1951)	88
<i>Effect of Awards on Compensation made by the United Nations Administrative Tribunal</i> (Effect of Awards on Compensation case), ICJ, Advisory Opinion 13 July 1954, ICJ Reports (1954)	95
<i>Right of Passage case</i> (Portugal v India), ICJ, Award rendered on 12 April 1960, ICJ Reports (1960)	69, 71, 95
<i>South West Africa</i> (Ethiopia v South Africa; Liberia v South Africa), ICJ, First Phase, ICJ Reports (1962)	96, 101
<i>Sapphire International Petroleum Ltd v National Iranian Oil Co</i> (Sapphire case), 35 International Law Reports (1963)	89
<i>Saudi Arabia v Arabian American Oil Co</i> (Aramco case), 25 International Law Reports (1963)	89

<i>Advisory Opinion of the Arbitral Tribunal on the Interpretation of the aerial agreement</i> (Advisory Opinion on Aerial Agreement), 16 RSA (1964)	94
<i>North Sea Continental Shelf case</i> (Federal Republic of Germany v Netherlands Federal Republic of Germany v Denmark), ICJ, ICJ Reports (1969)	70–73, 95
<i>Barcelona Traction Light and Power Company Ltd</i> (Barcelona Traction case) (Belgium v Spain), ICJ, Second Phase, ICJ Reports (1970)	95
<i>Nuclear tests case</i> (New Zealand v France; Australia v France), ICJ, ICJ Reports (1974)	174
<i>Texaco v Libya</i> (Texaco Case), 53 ILR (1977) (Dupuy–sole arbitrator)	55
<i>Société Générale Alsacienne de Banque SA v Koesder</i> , Case 15/78, ECR 1971 (1978)	39
<i>Government of Kuwait v American Independent Oil Co</i> (Aminoil case), 66 ILR 518 (1982)	75, 163
<i>Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH v Cameroon</i> (Klöckner case), ICSID, Original Arbitration Procedure, Award rendered on 21 October 1983 (Jimenez de Arechaga.Rogers.Schmidt)	86, 92
<i>Gulf of Maine case</i> (Canada v United States), ICJ, Decision rendered 12 October 1984, ICJ Reports (1984)	73, 82
<i>Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH v Cameroon</i> (Klöckner case), ICSID, Annulment Procedure, Decision rendered on 3 May 1985 (Lalive.Kosheri.Seidi-Hohenveltern)	92
<i>Military and Paramilitary Activities case</i> (Nicaragua case) (Nicaragua v United States), ICJ, ICJ Reports (1986)	71, 82
<i>Borders and Transborder Armed actions case</i> , ICJ, (Nicaragua v Honduras; Nicaragua v Costa Rica) ICJ Reports (1988)	174
<i>Case Concerning Elettronica Sicula SpA</i> (ELSI case) (United States of America v Italy), ICJ, Decision rendered on 20 July 1989, ICJ Reports 15 (1989)	64, 178, 184
<i>Amco Asia Corp, Pan America Development Ltd and PT Amco Indonesia v Indonesia</i> (Amco case), ICSID, Award rendered on 31 May 1990 (Higgins.Lalonde.Magid)	12, 78, 86, 91, 104, 128
<i>Asian Agricultural Products Ltd v Republic of Sri Lanka</i> (AAPL case), ICSID, ARB/87/3, Award rendered on 27 June 1990 (El-Kosheri. Goldman.Asante)	78, 148, 156, 185
<i>Alpine Investments BV v Minister van Financiën</i> , C-384/93, ECR I-1141 (1995)	39
<i>Commission v Italy</i> , Case C-101/94, ECR I-2601 (1996)	39
<i>Oil Platforms</i> (Iran v United States), ICJ, Preliminary objections, ICJ 803 (1996)	95
<i>Prosecutor v Dushko Tadic</i> , ICTY, No IT-94-AR72, 2 October 1995, 35 ILM (1996)	81
<i>American Manufacturing & Trading Inc v Democratic Republic of Congo</i> (AMT case), ICSID, ARB/93/1, Final Award rendered on 21 February 1997 (Sucharitkul.Golsong.Mbaye)	3, 15, 156, 184, 215
<i>Case Concerning the Gabcikovo-Nagymaros Project</i> (Hungary v Slovakia), ICJ, Judgement of 25 September 1997 (1997)	224
<i>Fedax NV v Republic of Venezuela</i> (Fedax case), ICSID, ARB/96/3, Award rendered on 9 March 1998 (Vicuna.Heth.Owen)	194
<i>Robert Azinian v United Mexican States</i> (Azinian case), ICSID, ARB(AF)/97/2, Final Award rendered on 1 November 1999 (Paulsson.Civiletti. Wobeser-Hoepfner)	3, 161, 218
<i>Emilio Augustin Maffezini v Spain</i> (Maffezini case), ICSID, ARB/97/7, Final award rendered on 13 November 2000 (Orrego-Vicuna. Buergenthal.Wolf)	137, 167, 176, 188, 220
<i>Metalclad Corporation v United States of Mexico</i> (Metalclad case), ICSID, ARB (AF)/97/1, Final Award rendered on 30 August 2000 (Lauterpacht.Civiletti.Siqueiros)	137, 159, 163–167, 176, 188

<i>SD Meyers Inc v Government of Canada</i> , UNCITRAL, First Partial Award rendered on 13 September 2000 (Hunter.Schwartz.Rae.)	84, 148, 152, 159, 163, 168, 170, 180, 187, 223, 227
<i>Wena Hotels Ltd v Egypt</i> (Wena Hotels case), ICSID, ARB/98/4, Award rendered on 8 December 2000 (Leigh.Fadlallah.Wallace)	157
<i>Alex Genin v Republic of Estonia</i> (Genin case), ICSID, ARB/99/2, Final Award rendered on 25 June 2001 (Fortier.Heth.Van den Berg.)	79, 151, 163, 169, 175, 209, 220
<i>CME Czech Republic BV v Czech Republic</i> (CME case), SCC, UNCITRAL, Partial Award rendered on 13 January 2001 (Kühn.Schwebel.Händl.)	165, 213
<i>Eudoro A Olguén v Republic of Paraguay</i> (Olguin case), ICSID, ARB/98/5, Final Award rendered 26 June 2001 (Oreamuno. Mayora-Alvarado.Rezek)	170, 209, 219, 221
<i>Pope & Talbot Inc v Government of Canada</i> (Pope & Talbot case), UNCITRAL, Award (2nd phase) rendered on 10 April 2001 (Dervaird. Greenberg.Belman)	59, 78, 82, 131, 151, 188, 192
<i>Ronald S Lauder v Czech Republic</i> (Lauder case), UNCITRAL, Award rendered on 3 September 2001 (Briner.Cutler.Klein)	36, 130, 141, 143, 147, 156, 177–179, 183
<i>Middle East Cement Shipping and Handling Co SA v Arab Republic of Egypt</i> (Middle East Cement case), ICSID, ARB/99/6, Final Award rendered on 12 April 2002 (Böckstiegel.Bernardini.Wallace)	162
<i>Mondev International Ltd v United States of America</i> (Mondev case), ICSID, ARB(AF)/99/2, Final Award rendered on 11 October 2002 (Ninian. Crawford.Schwebel)	9, 56, 60, 65, 76, 82, 125, 130, 151, 155, 158, 160, 162, 174, 196, 199
<i>Pope & Talbot Inc v Government of Canada</i> (Pope & Talbot case), UNCITRAL, Award on Damages rendered on 31 May 2002 (Dervaird.Greenberg.Belman)	59, 78, 82, 131, 151, 188, 192
<i>United Parcel Service of America v Government of Canada</i> (UPS case), UNCITRAL, Decision on Jurisdiction rendered on 22 November 2002 (Keith.Fortier.Cass)	59, 79
<i>Feldman case</i> , ICSID, ARB (AF) /99/1, Award rendered on 16 December 2002, (Kerameus.Bravo.Gantz)	218
<i>ADF Group Inc v United States of America</i> (ADF case), ICSID, ARB(AF)/00/1, Final Award rendered on 9 January 2003 (Feliciano.de Mestral.Lamm)	60, 65, 131, 138, 141–145, 150, 174, 188
<i>Consortium RFCC v Kingdom of Morocco</i> (RFCC case), ICSID, ARB/00/6, Award rendered on 22 December 2003 (Briner.Cremades.Fadlallah)	129, 147, 180, 184, 198
<i>Generation Ukraine Inc v Ukraine</i> (Generation Ukraine case), ICSID, ARB/00/9, Final Award rendered on 16 September 2003 (Paulsson.Salpius.Voss)	79, 140, 164, 221
<i>Loewen Group Inc and Raymond L Loewen v United States of America</i> (Loewen case), ICSID, ARB(AF)/98/3, Final Award rendered on 26 June 2003 (Mason.Mikva.Mustill)	59, 143, 158–160, 174, 179, 188
<i>Nagel William v Czech Republic</i> (Nagel case), SCC, Case 49/2002, Award rendered on 10 September 2003 (Arb.unknown)	209, 220

<i>Tecnicas Medioambientales Tecmed SA v United Mexican States</i> (Tecmed case), ICSID, ARB(AF)/00/2, Final Award rendered on 29 May 2003 (Grigera Naón.Fernández Rozas.Verea)	147, 165, 169, 174–179, 184, 189
<i>SGS Société Générale de Surveillance S.A. v Pakistan</i> (SGS Pakistan case), ICSID, ARB/01/13, Decision on Jurisdiction rendered on 6 August 2003 (Feliciano.Faures.Thomas)	194
<i>Ceskoslovenska Obchodni Banka AS v Slovak Republic</i> (CSOB case), ICSID, ARB/97/4, Award rendered on 29 December 2004 (Van Houtte. Bernardini.Bucher)	200
<i>GAMI Investments Inc v United Mexican States</i> (GAMI case), UNCITRAL, Final Award rendered on 15 November 2004 (Reisman.Lacarte Muro.Paulsson)	130, 136–138, 165, 169, 176, 180, 213
<i>Siemens v Argentina</i> (Siemens case–jurisdiction), ICSID, ARB/02/8, Decision on Jurisdiction rendered on 3 August 2004 (Rigo Sureda.Brower.Bello Janeiro)	190
<i>Occidental Exploration and Production Company v Ecuador</i> (OPEC case), LCIA, UN3467, Final award rendered on 1 July 2004 (Vicuna.Brower.Sweeney)	171, 186, 201
<i>MTD Equity Sdn Bhd and MTD Chile SA v Chile</i> (MTD case), ICSID, ARB/01/7, Award rendered on 25 May 2004 (Sureda.Lalonde. Oreamuno)	135, 145, 148, 152, 162, 179, 190, 199, 214, 221
<i>Waste Management Inc v United Mexican States – Number II</i> (Waste Management II case), ICSID, ARB (AF)/00/3, Award rendered on 30 April 2004 (Crawford.Civiletti.Gómez)	85, 129, 141, 167, 168, 178, 197, 200
<i>SGS Société de Surveillance S.A. v Philippines</i> (SGS Philippines case), ICSID, ARB/02/6, Decision on Jurisdiction rendered on 29 January 2004 (El-Koshery.Crawford.Crivellaro)	194
<i>Methanex Corporation v United States of America</i> (Methanex case), UNCITRAL, Final Award rendered on 3 August 2005 (Veeder.Rowley.Reisman)	58, 138, 141, 145, 159, 178, 187
<i>Noble Ventures Inc v Romania</i> (Noble case), ICSID, ARB/01/11, Final Award rendered on 17 October 2005 (Böckstiegel.Lever.Dupuy)	55, 131, 137, 147, 151, 167, 194, 199, 220
<i>Consortio Groupement L.E.S.I.–Dipenta v Algeria</i> (LESI case), ICSID, ARB/03/8, Award rendered on 10 January 2005 (Tercier.Faurès.Gaillard)	194
<i>Bogdanov v Republic of Moldova</i> (Bogdanov case), SCC, Award rendered on 22 September 2005 (Cordero Moss–sole arbitrator)	171, 178, 216
<i>CMS Gas Transmission Company v Argentina</i> (CMS case), ICSID, ARB/01/8, Final Award rendered on 25 May 2005 (Orrego-Vicuna.Lalonde.Rezek)	136, 142, 171, 214, 225, 230
<i>Eureko BV v Republic of Poland</i> (Eureko case), Ad-hoc Tribunal, Partial Award rendered on 19 August 2005 (Fortier.Schwebel.Rajski)	151, 165, 169, 180, 198
<i>Impregilo SpA v Islamic Republic of Pakistan</i> (Impregilo case), ICSID, ARB/03/3, Decision on Jurisdiction rendered on 22 April 2005 (Guillaume.Cremades.Landau)	198
<i>Plama v Republic of Bulgaria</i> (Plama case), Decision rendered on 8 February 2005	191
<i>Petrobart Limited v Kyrgyz Republic</i> (Petrobart case), SCC, Award rendered on 29 March 2005 (Danelius.Bring.Smets)	280, 281, 289

<i>Bayindir Insaat Turizm Ticaret Ve Sanayi AS v Pakistan</i> (Bayindir case), ICSID, ARB/03/29, Decision on Jurisdiction rendered on 14 November 2005 (Kaufmann-Kohler.Berman. Böckstiegel)	147, 191, 199
<i>Consortium RFCC v Kingdom of Morocco</i> (RFCC case–annulment), ICSID, ARB/X/X, Decision on Annulment rendered on 18 January 2006 (Hanotiau.Berman.Fatouros)	230
<i>International 2 underbird Gaming v United States of Mexico</i> (Thunderbird case), UNCITRAL, Award rendered on 26 January 2006 (Van den Berg.Walde.Ariosa)	165–168
<i>Saluka Investments BV v Czech Republic</i> (Saluka case), PCA, UNCITRAL, Partial award rendered on 17 March 2006 (Watts.Fortier.Behrens)	79, 84, 128, 142, 147, 151, 154, 165, 167–169, 172, 178, 201, 222
<i>Delaware El Paso International Energy Company v Argentina</i> (El Paso case), ICSID, ARB/03/15, Decision on Jurisdiction rendered on 27 April 2006 (Cafi isch-Stern-Bernardini)	145, 194
<i>Pan American Energy LLC & BP Argentina Exploration Company v Argentina</i> (Pan American case), ICSID, ARB/03/13, Decision on Preliminary Objections rendered on 27 July 2006 (Cafi isch-Stern-Bernardini)	195
<i>LG&E Energy Corp, LG&E Capital Corp and LG&E International Inc v Argentina</i> (LG&E case), ICSID, ARB/02/1, Decision on Liability rendered on 3 October 2006 (De Maekelt.Rezek.Van den Berg)	150, 167, 171, 175, 177, 180, 225
<i>PSEG Global Inc and Konya Ilgin Elektrik Üretim ve Ticaret Limited Sirketi v Republic of Turkey</i> (PSEG case), ICSID, ARB/02/5, Award rendered on 19 January 2007 (Orrego Vicuna.Fortier.Kaufmann-Kohler)	66, 68, 139, 171, 186
<i>Siemens v Argentina</i> (Siemens case–merits), ICSID, ARB/02/8, Award rendered on 6 February 2007 (Rigo Sureda.Brower. Bello Janeiro)	53, 136, 171, 175, 181, 185
<i>MTD Equity Sdn Bhd and MTD Chile SA v Republic of Chile</i> (MTD case – annulment), ICSID, ARB/01/7, Decision on Annulment rendered on 28 March 2007 (Guillaume.Crawford.Ordóñez Noriega)	230
<i>Fraport AG Frankfurt Airport Services Worldwide v Republic of the Philippines</i> (Fraport case), ICSID, Arb/03/25, Award rendered on 16 August 2007, (Fortier.Cremades.Reisman)	167, 219
<i>Compania de Aguas del Aconquija SA and Vivendi Universal SA v Argentine Republic</i> (Vivendi II case), ICSID, ARB/97/3, Award rendered on 20 August 2007, (Rowley. Kaufmann-Kohler. Bernal Verea)	185, 194, 216

List of Treaties and Conventions

<i>The Abs-Shawcross Draft Convention on Investments Abroad</i> (1957)	18, 48, 268
Africa, Common Market for Eastern and Southern, <i>signed on 5th November 1993</i> (1993), available at < http://www.comesa.int >	17, 38, 261
ASEAN, <i>Framework Agreement on the ASEAN Investment Area</i> (1998), available at < http://www.aseansec.org >	17, 37, 42, 265
CARICOM, <i>Agreement on Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Investments</i> available at < http://www.caricom.org >	17, 37, 42, 263
Commission on Transnational Corporations, <i>The United Nations Code of Conduct on Transnational Corporations</i> (1983)	18, 46, 48, 274
Eleventh Arab Summit Conference, <i>Unified Agreement for the Investment of Arab Capital in the Arab States, 26 November 1980</i> (1980), available at < http://www.transnational-dispute-management.com >	17, 259
Energy Charter Treaty, <i>signed on 17 December 1994</i> (1994), available at < http://www.encharter.org >	17, 38, 43, 193, 264
Fourth ACP-EEC Convention, 'Lomé IV', <i>Signed on 15 December 1989,</i> (1990) 29 ILM 809	17, 37, 40, 42, 260
IBRD, <i>Convention establishing the MIGA</i> (1988)	18, 46, 47, 49, 275
International Chamber of Commerce, (ICC), <i>International Code of Fair Treatment for Foreign Investors</i> (1949)	18, 46, 47, 267
International Chamber of Commerce, (ICC), <i>Guidelines for International Investment</i> (1972),	18, 46, 278
International, Court of Justice, <i>Statute of the International Court of Justice</i> (1945), available at < http://www.icj-cij.org >	9, 11, 99, 127
International Trade Organisation, <i>The Havana Charter</i> (1948)	1, 18, 45–47
MERCOSUR, <i>The Treaty of Cologne for Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Investments in MERCOSUR</i> (1994), available at < http://www.mercosur.int >	17, 38, 40, 261
NAFTA, Free Trade Commission, <i>Notes of Interpretation of Certain Chapter 11 Provisions, 17 December 2001</i> (2001), available at < http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca >	58, 131, 187
North American Free Trade Agreement Act Statement of Administrative Action, <i>HR Doc No 103–159, 103rd Cong</i> (1993), available at < http://www.naftaclaims.com >	17, 38, 42, 58, 84, 151, 182, 192, 262
OECD, <i>Code of Liberalisation of Capital Movements</i> (1961)	17, 46
OECD, <i>Declaration on International Investment and Multinational Enterprises</i> (1976), adopted on 21 June 1976, available at < http://www.oecd.org >	17, 46
OECD, <i>Draft Multilateral Agreement for Investment</i> (1998), available at < http://www.oecd.org >	17, 46, 47, 49, 276
OECD, <i>Draft Convention on the Protection of Foreign Property</i> , (1960), available at < http://www.oecd.org >	18, 19, 45, 46
Organisation of American States, <i>Economic Agreement of Bogotá, 2 May 1948</i> (1948), available at < http://www.oas.org >	17, 37, 41, 259
Statute of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, (1907), available at < http://www.pca-cpa.org >	99

- United Nations General Assembly, *Resolution 3281, Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States* (1974), adopted at its 29th session on 12 December 1974 18, 46, 273
- United Nations, *The set of multilaterally agreed equitable principles and rules for the control of restrictive business practices* (1980), adopted by the UN GA at its 35th session, on 5th December 1980, by RES 35/63. 18, 46, 272
- Updated US Model Bilateral Treaty, 16 March 2005* (2005), available at <<http://www.State.gov>>. 33, 34, 57
- United Nations Conference for Trade and Development, *The Draft International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology* (1985 version), available at <<http://www.unctad.org>> 18, 46, 49, 270
- United States Model Bilateral Treaty* (1992 and 1994), available at <<http://www.state.gov>> 28, 56
- Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organisations and between International Organisations, (1986), reproduced in (1986) 25 ILM 543 59, 125, 135, 145, 148, 212, 229–231
- World Bank, *Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States, 18 March 1965* (1965), available at <<http://www.worldbank.org/icsid>> 11, 90, 127
- World Bank, *Guidelines on the Treatment of Foreign Direct Investment* (1992), available at <<http://www.worldbank.org>> 18, 46, 49, 83, 275
- World Trade Organisation, *Draft Cancun Ministerial Text* (2003), available at <<http://www.wto.org>> xi, 46

List of Abbreviations

ACP	Africa Caribbean Pacific
AJIL	American Journal of International Law
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
BIT, BITs	Bilateral Investment Treaty, Bilateral Investment Treaties
BYIL or BYBIL	British Yearbook of International Law
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CU	Custom Union
CUP	Cambridge University Press
EC	European Community
ECT	Energy Charter Treaty
EEC	European Economic Community
EUI	European University Institute
FCN	Friendship Commerce and Navigation Treaties
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FET	Fair and Equitable Treatment
FIPA	Foreign Investment Protection and Promotion Agreement
FTA	Free Trade Area
FTC	Free Trade Commission
GPL	General Principles of Law
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICC	International Chamber of Commerce
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICLQ	International and Comparative Law Quarterly
ICSID	International Court for the Settlement of Investment Disputes
IAs	International Investment Agreements
ILC	International Law Commission
ILM	International Legal Materials
ILR	Transnational Disputes Management
ILSA	International Law Students Association
IMS	International Minimum Standard
ISO	International Standardization Organization
ITO	International Trade Organisation
LCIA	London Court of International Arbitration
LE	Legitimate Expectations
MAI	Multilateral Agreement for Investment
MERCOSUR	Mercado Común del Sur
MFN	Most Favoured Nation
MIGA	Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement

NT	National Treatment
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OUP	Oxford University Press
PCA	Permanent Court of Arbitration
PCIJ	Permanent Court of International Justice
RCADI	Recueil des cours de l'Académie de droit international de La Haye
RGDIP	Revue Générale de Droit International Public
RIAA	Reports of International Arbitral Awards
SCC	Stockholm Chamber of Commerce
SFDI	Société Française de Droit International
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures
TBT	Technical Barriers to Trade
UNCITRAL	United Nations Commission on International Trade Law
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade And Development
UNCTC	United Nations Code of Conduct on Transnational Corporations
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
US	United States
WB	World Bank
WIR	World Investment Report
WTO	World Trade Organisation
YILC	Yearbook of the International Law Commission

Introduction

When it is necessary for (a prince) to proceed against the life of someone, he must do it on proper justification and for manifest cause, but above all things he must keep his hands off the property of others, because men more quickly forget the death of their father than the loss of their patrimony.¹

The following historical preface introduces the reader to the existence of the FET in the international law of foreign investment.

i. Historical Background of the Standard: A Long But Accelerated Story

Historically, most cases brought before an international tribunal involved the protection of foreign investments; the recurrent situation was that of a direct expropriation by means of nationalization accompanied by a refusal of the host State to compensate the foreign Investor. This situation occurred in the context of the post-war decolonization process, where the attitude of the newly independent States towards foreign investment was rather ambivalent. The desire to safeguard recently gained independence conflicted with the generally recognized economic benefits of foreign investment. This resulted in inconsistent national policies. Naturally, the Investors' main concern was to secure their assets from possible acts of the host State that may have had a negative impact on their property. In the event of damage, Investors could rely exclusively on the diplomatic protection of their home State in order to solve the dispute. Of course, this mechanism offered an indirect protection since the Investors depended on the State's will to engage in such procedures against another State.² Therefore, the private Investor was deprived of a direct mechanism for enforcing his rights against the host State.

Early multilateral initiatives translated this growing problem in draft articles including the fair and equitable treatment clause. The first of this kind was the 1948 Havana Charter, prepared as the basis for the establishment of the International Trade Organization. The objective of the Charter was not only international trade but also more generally the encouragement of economic development, especially in developing countries. Article II (2) of the Charter gave as a mandate to the future organization 'to assure just and equitable treatment' to the Investors of the Member States. This first multilateral initiative was not ratified,

¹ N Machiavelli, *The Prince* (1515).

² Engaging in a diplomatic protection procedure could sometimes conflict with the home State's strategic plans in connection with the host State. In this case, the decision not to open a case, for reasons of political choice, was taken against the interests of the Investor.