# INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC LAW

THIRD EDITION

ASIF H QURESHI AND ANDREAS R ZIEGLER



**SWEET & MAXWELL** 

## INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC LAW

By

### ASIF H. QURESHI

Professor of International Economic Law School of Law University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

> Barrister Quadrant Chambers Fleet Street London, UK

Editor-in-Chief

Manchester Journal of International Economic Law

AND

## ANDREAS R. ZIEGLER

Professor Faculty of Law and Criminal Justice University of Lausanne, Switzerland



Published in 2011 by Sweet & Maxwell, 100 Avenue Road, London NW3 3PF part of Thomson Reuters (Professional) UK Limited (Registered in England & Wales, Company No 1679046.

Registered Office and address for service:
Aldgate House, 33 Aldgate High Street, London EC3N 1DL)

Typeset by Servis Filmsetting Ltd, Stockport, Cheshire Printed in Great Britain by Ashford Colour Press, Gosport, Hants

\*For further information on our products and services, visit www.sweetandmaxwell.co.uk

No natural forests were destroyed to make this product; only farmed timber was used and re-planted.

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

#### ISBN 978 0 414 04615 3

Thomson Reuters and the Thomson Reuters logo are trademarks of Thomson Reuters. Sweet & Maxwell ® is a registered trademark of Thompson Reuters (Professional) UK Limited

Crown copyright material is reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Queen's Printer for Scotland.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without prior written permission, except for permitted fair dealing under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or in accordance with the terms of a license issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency in respect of photocopying and/or reprographic reproduction. Application for permission for other use of copyright material including permission to reproduce extracts in other published works shall be made to the publishers. Full acknowledgement of author, publisher and source must be given.

#### FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

At a time when the economic troubles of banana producers in Central America can lead to trade wars which affect the livelihoods of woollen manufacturers in the Scottish Borders, one may ask whether there is any international economic law and if so whether it is effective. This book seeks to answer those questions. It surveys the several strands of burgeoning international economic law and binds them together in a coherent whole. The Scottish woollen manufacturer may not find within it a swift and effective remedy for the adverse economic consequences visited upon him as a result of foreign government action, but that is not the fault of the book. It is the result of international economic law being still at a developing stage and serves to illustrate the need for a book of this nature.

Commercial lawyers, whether employed by industry or government or in private practice, will find that this book contains a wide ranging account of the several international economic institutions that have been created in an attempt to bring order to international economic relations. The many references to conventions, reports and articles indicate the difficulty which lawyers not familiar with the learning in this field would have, in the absence of this book, in researching the topics covered by it. For the same reasons Dr Qureshi's work will be of great assistance to students of this area of the law.

Dispute resolution in international trade traditionally centres upon the private rights and obligations of one trader to another. However, where the source of a trader's economic problems is a foreign government's decision, the law of private rights and obligations may not always provide a remedy. This book sheds much needed light on the alternative international avenues which may be available to traders, financiers, investors and their associations to seek redress for the consequences of such decisions. Even where the present international economic institutions cannot provide a remedy, this book will enable the lawyer to understand more of the framework in which governmental decisions affecting international trade are

taken and thereby improve his ability to protect the interests of the trader, financier and investor in the future.

April 1999 Nigel Teare Q.C. 4 Essex Court Temple, London

(Now Sir Nigel Teare Q.C., Justice of the High Court, UK)

#### FOR EWORD TO THE SECOND EDITION

A new generation of globalisation seems to be emerging in the early 21st century, one that poses fresh challenges for developing countries. For many of these nations, expectations that globalisation would accelerate the development process were dashed by the disappointing development results of liberalisation and integration in the 1990s. It was increasingly recognised that greater economic integration alone was not addressing development concerns. Despite extensive trade liberalisation, many of the 50 least developed countries (LDCs) had not significantly reduced poverty, and some had experienced negative growth. Concern that the benefits of globalisation were being reaped at the cost of the poor, environmental degradation and workers' rights, found expression in broad protest movements in a new global civil society.

As a result, a number of important international initiatives were taken to ensure greater benefits from global economic co-operation, the most prominent of which was the adoption by world leaders in 2000 of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), to be achieved by 2015. Priorities began to shift, as reflected, for example, in international efforts to mobilise finance for development and to address the supply constraints and limited productive capacities of developing countries through aid for trade.

Paradoxically, this renewed emphasis on development comes not at a time of economic crisis, but at a time of sustained economic growth for a large number of developing countries. Ever since the early 2000s, the world economic environment has been extraordinarily propitious. Indeed, developing economies as a group have performed quite well in the past five years. Many African nations and other LDCs—34 of which are in Africa—have been growing at an annual average exceeding five per cent, marking considerable progress over the late 1990s. A distinctive characteristic of this new wave of globalisation is multipolarity, in which the South plays a major role. The new economic weight of some developing countries creates significant opportunities for the rest of the developing world. But because that weight is not equally distributed among them—and because their resource endowments vary greatly—policy diversity is of the essence.

There is, in fact, no room for complacency. Despite the economic success of the past five years, continued vigilance is required. The current broad-based

economic expansion is subject to risks, which should be avoided through careful economic management. Another risk relates to the potential impact of higher energy prices, and to the possible reversal of recent upswings in commodity prices. There are also signs that the rise of the South is prompting protectionist reactions in developed economies. This could undermine the liberalization paradigm that fuelled globalisation until now, and threaten the propitious environment. In the meantime, looming issues such as the economic impact of climate change and migration pose new challenges for the global partnership for development.

From UNCTAD's perspective, an even more compelling reason for caution is that despite the unprecedented expansion of trade, not everyone is benefiting from globalisation. The old issue of "growth with equity" has resurfaced in a new context, adding urgency to the need to find ways of sharing the gains from globalisation. Certain countries, and certain segments of the population within countries, are being left out of the current growth bonanza and are often adversely affected by its consequences. In addition, many countries, especially the LDCs and some middle-income and transition economies, have been unable to translate growth into poverty reduction and broader human development. Progress towards the MDGs in sub-Saharan Africa continues to lag far behind, despite accelerated growth. While the implementation of the WTO's Uruguay Round agreements improved developing countries' access to the markets of developed countries, the reduction in tariff barriers has recently been accompanied by greater use of non-tariff measures, and new gains from multilateral trade agreements remain elusive. Similarly in the financial domain, the launching of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Debt Initiative in 1996 has not been able to address the range of external debt problems, and commitments to step up official development assistance have yet to be translated into scaled-up flows.

Accordingly, this new edition of *International Economic Law*, co-authored by two distinguished scholars, comes at a timely juncture. There is growing recognition that pro-development considerations must be placed at the centre of all international economic cooperation. And greater coherence is essential between and within the global trade, monetary and financial systems, which do not always take account of the differing needs of countries at varying stages of development. An equally important recognition is that in the absence of a rules-based, transparent and co-operative approach to globalisation, any chances for achieving developmental results through multilateralism could be lost to the narrower gains that might result from bilateral or regional initiatives. There must be coherence between the rule of law and the cause of development if economic co-operation and progress are to extend to all nations, peoples and citizens of our increasingly interconnected global community.

August 2007 Supachai Panitchpakdi Secretary-General of UNCTAD

#### FOREWORD TO THE THIRD EDITION

International Economic Law is now in its third edition. Its first edition, of which Professor Qureshi was the sole author, appeared as recently as 1999. The second edition—for the preparation of which Professor Qureshi was joined by another leading scholar, Professor Ziegler—needed, among other things, to address the Millennium Development Goals articulated in 2000. The impacts, positive and negative (especially for least developed countries) of globalisation were centre stage.

It is a tribute to the authors that they have now been able to publish a rapid third edition a mere four years after publication of the second. Very much has happened since 2007. At that time we were in an era of development, in the sense that there had been an extended period of economic growth for a large number of developing countries. We now find ourselves in an era, which we must expect to be extended, of economic crisis.

These changes, and all the many relevant events within the broad umbrella of "international economic law", have required all chapters to be revisited. Even as the authors have put aside elements that have become outdated, they have nonetheless had to expand virtually every chapter. The attentive reader will note not only an updated bibliography (there has recently been much innovative writing in the areas comprised in International Economic Law, especially perhaps on trade and investment), but also a special focus now on International Financial Law and on IMF surveillance. Everywhere the law has been brought up to date, important cases from a variety of jurisdictions included, new agreements and treaties put under scrutiny.

International Economic Law is a subject that contains other subjects within it. This book thus covers International Trade Law (including WTO activity, juridical and otherwise); International Financial Law (with special emphasis, fully updated, on the IMF); International Fiscal Law; International Investment Law; and International Development Law. What is occurring within these fields and, importantly, the relationships among them, is well presented and very informative. It hardly needs saying that in these stressful times developments within several of these topics are of the keenest interest.

Teachers will understand that International Economic Law comprises the entirety of the elements within this book. Others may turn to it for contemporary analysis of particular issues engaging their attention. The following aspects have particularly attracted my own attention.

The chapter on International Development Law-significantly updated and expanded since the last edition-has had to reflect the changes of the last few years in this area. The focus on developing countries' preoccupations with trade preferences and natonalisation has incrementally shifted to a more global interest in stability in commodity prices (with models for achieving this having had mixed success) and insistence on good governance. And in recent years, we have seen that human rights can no longer be perceived as a freestanding subject. It now finds its place—and is acknowledged by all concerned to need to find its place—within IMF investment assessments, where impressive structures to this end have in recent years been put in place; and within trade and development law more generally. That development should not take place save in a holistic context (human rights, respect for local culture) is now accepted; though the means to achieve those ends are to an extent still the subject of debate. In particular, the place of human rights within the vastly expanding area of International Trade Law (rather than as inimical to it) is especially marked. The literature has not failed to reflect this.

Recent writing, including by Professor Qureshi, has not failed to address the issue of whether one institutional vehicle can serve other purposes—for example, whether WTO practices suggest that it is a development, as well as a trade, institution.

One of the most burgeoning areas of practice and study in recent years has been that of International Investment Law. Throughout the book the authors keep up to date by noting how the social and political contexts have developed through time (and since the first edition). International Investment Law was especially related to capital flows from developed to developing states, with all the tensions that that reality entailed. Today "all states try to attract important foreign investment flows" (p.490). The legal framework covering this is diffuse, but the number of bilateral investment treaties—and the ICSID and other possibilities for arbitrating them—has grown exponentially. The reader will find much on the emergence of norms across institutions—BITs, EPAs, GATS, TRIPS and TRIMS, and many others.

Just as no domestic lawyer can today ignore the basics of International Law (impacting as it does on so much of national law), so all international lawyers today require some understanding of the world of international economic law. This book (which, incidentally, is very attractively presented) will provide that bridge. It will also be invaluable to the specialist.

Rosalyn Higgins President of the International Court of Justice (2006–2009)

### PREFACE

This book focuses on that branch of Public International Law which is concerned with international economic relations between States. However, International Economic Law is also increasingly directly concerned with the individual, the trader, the investor, and the international financier. International commercial lawyers can no longer operate within the parameters of national legislation. They need to have a sense of that legislation in the context of International Economic Law.

Part One is concerned with some of the fundamental and introductory aspects of International Economic Law. Parts Two, Three, Four and Five comprise of an examination of the core spheres of the international economic order—namely International Monetary Law, International Trade Law, the International Law Relating to Factor Movement, International Taxation and International Development Law. This view of International Economic Law is taken here with the conviction that the disparate international economic phenomena need to be understood in the context of the totality of International Economic Law. The necessity to engage in legal analysis of the international economic order from a wider perspective is dictated not merely from the consequences of globalization, but also from the need to bring to bear the influences of the respective fields to each other, as well as to ensure balance and moderation to the liberal and welfare poles of the international economy.

However, such an approach is becoming increasingly difficult to formulate, given that the different branches of International Economic Law are expanding to such an extent as to require treatment in their own right. Consequently, the short-comings of this work are as much the authors' weaknesses, as those borne out of an attempt to host the different spheres in a single time/ space dimension. Any strength however is entirely attributable to the various International Economic Law scholars in the different specialisms of the subject, on whom the authors here have had to rely as a result of having to take this particular approach.

We have not set out to de-construct International Economic Law; nor indeed have we tried to craft our own distinct perspective of it. With respect to the former, we should have—all disciplines need to. In relation to the latter, certainly a peg for academic credibility—our concern however has

XII PREFACE

been that perspectives can be not so much illuminators as blinkers—and often driven by dogma. We have tried here to give the reader some sense of the various debates and trends in International Economic Law from a Public International Law stand-point—and hope dearly that the reader will unfold many of our own blinkers.

The second edition of this book was published eight years after the first edition, with Asif H Oureshi as the sole author. During this period the first edition established itself as one of the leading texts in International Economic Law. The second edition brought on board Professor Andreas Ziegler as a co-author, thus making the publication truly international. The second edition updated the treatment of the subject in the first edition, and added new chapters viz., International Labour Law and International Double Taxation Relief. Moreover, the text of the second edition was accompanied by materials. This innovation is continued in the third edition. The third edition comes just after four years of the publication of the second edition. However, the four years seem a decade—having witnessed many changes—in particular precipitated by the financial crisis and under the shadows of the Doha multilateral trade negotiations. Moreover, there has been considerable jurisprudence both in investment law and WTO law, as well as an increase in focus in investment law. Thus, the updating has been substantial and many parts of several chapters have been revised.

The authors reiterate their gratitude to all those whose assistance facilitated the first and second editions. The authors are grateful to successive generations of readers, in particular postgraduate students, for their contribution to the value of this book. Individual and specific thanks are extended to Mianghi for her assistance and constant support in bringing the various editions to fruition; and to the editors of Sweet and Maxwell, in particular Nicola Thurlow, for their contribution and timely reminders about deadlines.

Asif H. Qureshi, Professor of International Economic Law School of Law University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

Quadrant Chambers, Fleet Street, London, UK Editor-in-Chief, Manchester Journal of International Economic Law

Andreas R. Ziegler Professor, Faculty of Law and Criminal Justice, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

> Conjoint Professor, Faculty of Law University of New South Wales, Sydney Of Counsel, Blum & Grob Attorneys-at-law, Zurich

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Grateful acknowledgment is made to the following authors and publishers for permission to quote from their works:

The Canadian and American Secretariat for NAFTA, http://www.nafta-sec-alena.org/

European Union, http://eur-lex.europa.eu

International Labour Organization, http://www.ilo.org

International Monetary Fund, http://www.imf.org/externallindex.htm

The New Press, http://thenewpress.com/

OECD, http://www.oecd.org

OECD (1998), Tax Sparing: A Reconsideration, OECD Publishing, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264162433-en

Publications Office of the European Union, http://publications.europa.eu/ index\_en.htm

United Nations, http://www.un.org

World Bank, www.worldbank.org/publications

World Trade Organization, http://www.wto.org/

While every care has been taken to establish and acknowledge copyright, and contact the copyright owners, the publishers tender their apologies for any accidental infringement. They would be pleased to come to a suitable arrangement with the rightful owners in each case.

## TABLE OF CASES

A Ahlstrom Osakeyhtio v Commission of the European Communities (C-89/85) [1988]	
E.C.R. 5193; [1988] 4 C.M.L.R. 901	)7
AAPL v Sri Lanka (1991) 30 H M 577 14-00	01
ADF v United States, ICSID Case No.ARB(AF)/00/1 (NAFTA (Award, January 9,	
2003)	)2
Aegean Sea Continental Shelf Case (1978) I.C.J. Reports	26
Agip v Congo (Award, November 30, 1979, (1993) 1 ICSID Reports 311)	04
Amco v Indonesia (1988) 27 ILM 1281	08
American International Group Inc v Iran (1983 AIG Award 4 Iran-US CTR)2-00	)4
American Machine Tools v Zaire (1997) 36 I.L.M. 1531	01
Amoco International Finance Corp v Iran (1987) 15 Iran-US. C.T.R. 189; (1988)	
I.L.M	25
Anglo-Iranian Oil Co Case (1952) I.C.J. Rep. 93	)7
Azinian v Mexico (1999) Case No ARB (AF)/97/2 November 1 1999 14-00	8
14-009, 14-017, 14-02  BP v Libya (1973) 53 I.L.R. 297	23
BP v Libva (1973) 53 L.L.R. 297 2-004, 14-00	)4
Banco do Brasil, SA v AC Israel Commodity Co Inc (1963) 239 N.Y.S. 2d 8727-02	22
Barcelona Traction Light & Power Co Ltd (Second Phase) (1970) I.C.J. Rep. 31-02	
2-004, 2-005, 3-013, 3-014, 14-010, 14-02	23
Barclays Bank PLC v Franchise Tax Board, 1994 Sup Ct (US)	
Batra v Ebrahim [1982] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 11 (Note) CA (Civ Div)	
Burkina Fasa v Mali Case (1986) I.C.J. Rep. 554	
CME Czech Republic BV v Czech Republic, UNCITRAL (The Netherlands/Czech	
Republic BIT) Final Award, 14 March 2003	28
CMS Gas Transportation Co v Argentine Republic (Case No.ARB/01/8), Award of May	
12, 2005	17
Ceskoslovenska obchodni banka, a.s. v Slovak Republic (Case No.ARB/97/4)	
(Jurisdiction, May 24, 1999) 14 ICSID Rev. 251	37
Chorzów Factory Case (1928) P.C.I.J. Series, No.17 (1928)2-004, 14-02	26
Competence of Conciliation Commission, Re (1955) 22 International Law Reports, p.867	
at 871	18
Competence of the General Assembly for the Admission of a State to the United Nations	
(Second Admissions Case) (1950) I.C.J. Reports, p.4	8
Competence of the ILO to Regulate the Personal Work of the Employer (1926) P.C.I.J.,	
Series B, No.13, p.6 at 18	8
Series B, No.13, p.6 at 18	
Reports 3-003, 3-00	)6
Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee of the IMCO (1960) I.C.J. Reports 1501-01	8
Corfu Channel Case (Merits) (1949) I.C.J. Reports	16
Council Decision 94/800/EC concerning the conclusion on behalf of the European	
Community, as regards matters within its competence, of the agreements reached in	
the Uruguay Round multilateral negotiations [1994] OJ L336/14-00	18
Daiei Motion Picture v Zavicha Paris, May 14, 1970, (1974) R.C.D.I.P., p.4867-02	
Decision No.138, July 8, 1974 CA (Berlin)7-02	
Decision No 8240_(86/56) SAF March 26, 1986	16

Decision Sup.C. Decision.Nos.85nu 448 (1987) and 91 nu 10763 cited by Chung (1997),		
p.373 Sup Ct (Korea)	4	-008
Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary in the Gulf of Maine Area (1984)	.1-	-026
Dyestuff case. See Imperial Chemical Industries (ICI) Ltd v Commission of the European Communities (48/69)		
ELSI Case (1989) LC J. Reports	.2-	-004
Fbrahimi Case Iran-US Claims Tribunal (1994)	.2-	-004
Edgington v Fitzmaurice (1885) L.R. 29 Ch. D. 459 CA	0-	-020
Elettronica Sicula S.P.A. (ELSI) (1989) I.C.J. Reports	.1-	-026
Emilio Agustin Maffezini v Kingdom of Spain, ICSID Case No.ARB/97/7, Decision of		
the Tribunal on Objections to Jurisdiction, January 25, 2000, ICSID Review—(2001)		
16(1)	4	-018
Enron Corp v Argentine Rep (2007)	1-	-014
Ethyl Corp v Canada UNCITRAL (NAFTA) Decision on Jurisdiction, June 24, 1998.	4	-023
European Communities v United States, Panel Report circulated: August 6, 2001;	2	oon
Appellate Body Report circulated: January 2, 2002	2	-009
215; [1973] C.M.L.R. 199	3	014
Fedax v Venezuela, July 11, 1997 (BIT US—Venezuela)	4	037
Fisheries Jurisdiction Case (1974) I.C.J. Reports		
Free Zones of Upper Savoy & the District of Gen (1929) (1930) and (1931) P.C.LJ	1-	-026
Gabeikovo-Nagymaros Project (Hungary/Slovakia) (1997) I.C.J. Reports		
	2	004
Gencor Ltd v Commission of the European Communities (T-102/96) [1999] All E.R. (EC)		
289; [1999] E.C.R. II-753; [1999] B.C.C. 877; [1999] 4 C.M.L.R. 971; [1999] C.E.C.	2	007
395	3	-007
General Electric Co v Commission of the European Communities (T-210/01) [2005] E.C.R. II-5575; [2006] 4 C.M.L.R. 15	2	007
General Electric/Honeywell (Decision COMP/M220) [2001] OJ L48/1	3	007
Germany v Council of the European Communities (C-280/93) [1994] E.C.R. I-4973		
German Interests in Polish Upper Silesia Case (1926) P.C.I.J., Series A, No.7 (1926)		
Hartford Fire Insurance Co v California (1993) 113 S Ct 2891	3-	007
INA Corp v The Islamic Republic of Iran 8 Iran-US CTR, p.3732-004, 1		
ITTSA v OPIC (1974) 13 I.L.M. 1346	2	005
Imperial Chemical Industries (ICI) Ltd v Commission of the European Communities (48/69) [1972] E.C.R. 619; [1972] C.M.L.R. 5573–007,	3	014
Import of Certain Shrimp and Shrimp Products (Shrimps Case), WTO Appellate Body		
(1998)	3-	-015
International Fruit Co NV v Produktschap voor Groenten en Fruit (No.3) (21/72 to 24/72) [1972] E.C.R. 1219; [1975] 2 C.M.L.R. I	A	000
24(72) [1772] E.C.R. 1219, [1973] 2 C.W.E.R. 1		
Interpretation of the Convention of 1919 Concerning Employment of Women during the	1	010
Night (1932), P.C.I.J., Series A/B, No. 50, p.365 at 380	I	018
Island of Palmas Case (1928) 2 UN Rep.Int'L Arb.Awards 829		
Istituto Chemioterapico Italiano SpA v Commission of the European Communities		
(6/73); sub nom. Commercial Solvents Corp v Commission of the European		
Communities (7/73) [1974] E.C.R. 223; [1974] 1 C.M.L.R. 309	3-	014
JH Rayner (Mincing Lane) Ltd v Department of Trade and Industry; Maclaine Watson		
& Co Ltd v Department of Trade and Industry; Maclaine Watson & Co Ltd v		
International Tin Council; TSB England and Wales v Department of Trade and Industry; Amalgamated Metal Trading Ltd v International Tin Council [1989] Ch.		
72; [1988] 3 W.L.R. 1033; [1988] 3 All E.R. 257; (1988) 4 B.C.C. 563; [1988] B.C.L.C.		
404; [1989] P.C.C. 1; [1989] P.C.C. 68; (1988) 132 S.J. 1494 CA (Civ Div)	4	200
Jerusalem Concessions Case (1925) P.C.I.J., Series A, No.5 (1925)	2	004
Kuwait v Aminoil (1982) 21 I.L.M.	2	004
LG&E Energy Corp v Argentine Rep (2006)		
Lauder v Czech Republic (2002)		
Lauder v Czech Republic, UNCITRAL (United States/Czech Republic BIT), Final		
Award 3 September 2001	A	028

Lenzing AG's European Patent; R. v Comptroller of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Ex p. Lenzing (QBD); Lenzing AG v Courtauld (Fibres) Ltd [1997] Eu. L.R. 237; [1997] R.P.C. 245; (1997) 20(4) I.P.D. 20030; (1997) 94(9) L.S.G. 31; (1997) 141
S.J.L.B. 36 QBD
Liamco v Libya (1981) 62 I.L.R. 140
Libra Bank Ltd v Banco Nacional de Costa Rica (1983) 570 F.Sup.870
Linder v Portocarrero, 747 F.Supp 1452
Maclaine Watson & Co Ltd v Department of Trade and Industry. See JH Rayner
(Mincing Lane) Ltd v Department of Trade and Industry
Maffezini v Spain. See Emilio Agustin Maffezini v Kingdom of Spain
Mannington Mills Inc v Congoleum Corp (1979) 595 F.2nd 1287
83 L.S.G. 3508; (1986) 136 N.L.J. 260; (1986) 130 S.J. 801 CA (Civ Div)7-022
Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain, Jurisdiction
and Admissibility, Judgment (1995) I.C.J. Reports, p.6
Metalclad Corp v Mexico, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/97/1, August 30, 200014–023,
14-024
Methanex Corp v United States of America, Arbitration under NAFTA and UNCITRAL,
Final Award of the Tribunal, August 9, 2005
Middle East Cement Shipping and Handling Co S.A v Arab Republic of Egypt (ICSID
Case No.ARB/99/6), April 12, 2002
Middle East Shipping and Handling Co v Egypt (2002)
Mihalny v Sri Lanka (BIT USA—Sri Lanka), March 15, 2002
Mondey (Canada) v United States, Arbitral Award of October 11, 2002
Morrison v National Australian Bank, 2010 Sup Ct (US)
Nicaragua Case (1986) I.C.J. Reports 186
North Sea Continental Shelf Cases (1967) I.C.J. Reports
Norwegian Loans (1957) I.C.J. Reports
Nottebohm (Liechstein v Guatemala) (1953) I.C.J. Reports
Nottebohn case (1955) I.C.J. Reports 3–003
Nuclear Tests Case (Australia v France) (1974) I.C.J. Reports2-004, 10-022, 13-040,
13–044
Oil Platforms (1996) I.C.J. Reports
Overseas Union Insurance v AA Mutual International Insurance [1988] 2 Lloyd's Rep.
63; [1988] F.T.L.R. 421 QBD (Comm)
Pantechniki SA Contractors & Engineers v Republic of Albania, ICSID Case
No.ARB/07/21
Phosphate Lands in Nauru (1992) I.C.J. Reports
Pope & Talbot Inc v Canada UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Award, April 10, 2001
R. v Comptroller of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Ex p. Lenzing. See Lenzing AG's
European Patent Reid v Covert (1957) 354 US 1, 77 S.CT 1222, 1L.ED 11484-008
Republic of Guinea v Democratic Republic of the Congo (2002)
Right of Passage Over Indian Territory (1960) 1–026
River Oder Case (1927) P.C.1.J. 2–004
SD Myers v Canada, Arbitral Award of November 13, 2000/October 21, 2001
SGS Société Générale de Surveillance SA v Islamic Republic of Pakistan (Case
No.ARB/01/13), ICSID, Decision on Objections to Jurisdiction of August 6, 2003;
(2003) 18 ICSID Rev.—F.I.L.J. 301; (2003) 42 I.L.M. 1290; (2005) 8 ICSID Rep.
406
SGS Société Générale de Surveillance SA v Republic of the Philippines (Case
No.ARB/02/6), ICSID, Decision of the Tribunal on Objections to Jurisdiction of
January 29, 2004; (2005) 8 ICSID Rep. 518
SS Lotus (France v Turkey) (1927) P.C.I.J. Series A.No.10, 18–193–007, 3–014
SS Lotus, The PCIJ, Series A, No.1 (1923)
Salini Construtorri SpA and Italstrade SpA v Morocco, Jurisdiction, ICSID Case
No.ARB/00/4 (Italy/Morocco BIT), July 23, 2001
Saluka v Czech Republic, Award of March 17, 2006
Saudi Arabia v Aramco Oil Co (1958) (1963) 27 L.L.R. 117
Sempra Energy International v Argentine Rep (2007) 7-014

Serbian and Brazilian Loans Cases (1929), P.C.I.J., Series A, Nos. 20–21 1–018, 5–012, 9–030
Serbian Loans issued in France (1927) P.C.L.J., Series A. No.10, p.44
Shrimps/Turtle case WTO Appellate Body Report (1998)
Shufaldt Claim (1930) RTA A (1949) 2-004
Siemens AG v Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No.ARB/02//8, Decision on Jurisdiction,
August 3 2004
Spanish Zones of Morocco Case (1923) RIAA (1949)
Succession in Taxes (Czechoslovakia) Case Sup Administrative Ct (Czechoslovakia)
19253-001
TOPCO v Libya (1977) 53 I.L.R. 38914-004
Técnicas medioambientales (Tecmed) SA v United Mexican States, ICSID (Additional
Facility) Case ARB(AF)/00/2, Award of the Tribunal, May 29, 200314-023
Territorial Dispute (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya/Chad), Judgment (1994) I.C.J. Reports,
p.61-018
Texaco v Libya (1982) 17 I.L.M
Timberlane Lumber Co v Bank of America (1976) 549 F.2nd 5973-007
Tokio Tokeles v Ukraine (Case No. ARB/02/18), Decision on Jurisdiction of April 29,
2004
Trendtex Trading Corp v Central Bank of Nigeria [1977] Q.B. 529; [1977] 2 W.L.R. 356;
[1977] 1 All E.R. 881; [1977] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 581; [1977] 2 C.M.L.R. 465; (1977) 121
S.J. 85 CA (Civ Div)
Tunis-Morocco Nationality Decrees case (1923) P.C.I.J. Rep3-003
US v Aluminum Co of America (1945) 148 F.2d 4163-007
United City Merchants (Investments) Ltd v Royal Bank of Canada (The American
Accord); American Accord, The [1983] I A.C. 168; [1982] 2 W.L.R. 1039; [1982] 2 All
E.R. 720; [1982] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 1; [1982] Com. L.R. 142 HL
United States of America v France 1–018
Vostokneftegaz Cov. Mongolia, UNCITRAL (Russia/Mongolia), -Award on Jurisdiction
and Liability, April 28, 2011
Wena Hotels v Egypt (2002) 41 I.L.M. 896. 14–001
Western Sahara Case (1995) I.C.J. Reports
Wilson, Smithett & Cope Ltd v Terruzzi [1976] Q.B. 683; [1976] 2 W.L.R. 418; [1976]
1 All E.R. 817; [1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 509; (1976) 120 S.J. 116 CA (Civ Div)
Zeevi v Grindlays Bank (Uganda) Ltd (1975) 371 N.Y.S. 2d 892
Executive Board Decisions
Executive Board Decision No.71-2, September 26, 19469-002, 10-007
Executive Board Decision No.446-4, June 10, 1949
Executive Board Decision No.102-(2/11) February 13, 1952 9-002
Executive Board Decision No.102-(5211) February 1952
Executive Board Decision No.144 (52/51), August 14, 1952
Executive Board Decision No.541–(56/39), July 25, 1956
Executive Board Decision No.955–(59/45), October 23, 1959
Executive Board Decision No.1289-(62/1), January 5, 1962
Executive Board Decision No.3153-(70/95), October 26, 19707-006
Executive Board Decision No.4254-(74/75), June 26, 1974
Executive Board Decision No.4377–(74/114), September 13, 1974
Executive Board Decision No.5719–(78/46), March 31, 1978
Executive Board Decision No.6000–(79/1)S, December 28, 1978
Executive Board Decision No.6053–(79/34)S. February 26, 1979
Executive Board Decision No.6209–(79/124), July 24, 1979
Executive Board Decision No.6437–(80/37), March 5, 1980
Executive Board Decision No.6484–(80/77)S April 18, 1980
Executive Board Decision No.6790-(81/43), March 20, 1981
Executive Board Decision No.7116–(82/68), May 7, 19828–013
Executive Board Decision No.7842–(84/165) November 16, 1984
10-020, 10-022, 10-036
Executive Board Decision No.8240–(86/56), March 26, 19869–015, 9–020
Executive Board Decision No.8433–(86/175), October 31, 1986
Executive Board Decision No.8759 ESAF, December 18, 1987 9-015, 10-004, 10-006

Executive Board Decision No.10464-(93/130), September 13, 1993
Executive Board Decision No.11428–(97/6) January 19979–006
Executive Board Decision No.11436–(97/10), February 4, 1997
Executive Board Decision No.11493–(97/45), April 24, 1997
Executive Board Decision No.12067-(99/108), September 22, 19999-006, 10-010, 10-011
Executive Board Decision No.12249-(00/77) July 27, 2000
Executive Board Decision No.12281–(00/98), October 11, 2000
Executive Board Decision No.12341-(00/117) November 28, 20009-013, 9-015
Executive Board Decision No.12481–(01/45), May 4, 2001
Executive Board Decision No.12546–(01/84), August 22, 2001
Executive Board Decision No.12864–(02/102) September 25, 20029–007, 9–033,
9-034, 9-035, 9-037, 9-039, 10-004, 10-005, 10-006,
10-008, 10-009, 10-014, 10-028, 10-031, 10-033
Executive Board Decision No.12865–(02/102) September 25, 2002
Executive Board Decision No.12899–(02/119), December 4, 2002
Executive Board Decision No.13229-(04/33), April 2, 20049-011, 9-012, 10-006, 10-026
Executive Board Decision No.13561–(05/85) October 5, 2005
Executive Board Decision No.13588–(05/99), November 23, 2005
Executive Board Decision No.13595–(05/99), November 23, 2005
Executive Board Decision No.13919–(07/51), June 15, 2007
6-009, 6-012, 6-016, 7-016
Executive Board Decision No.14282–(09/29), March 24, 2009. 9–004
Executive Board Decision No.14283-(09/29), March 24, 2009. 9-011, 9-012
Executive Board Decision No.14287–(09/29), March 24, 2009
Executive Board Decision No.14354-(09/79), July 23, 2009
9-015, 9-031, 9-041, 10-004, 10-007
Executive Board Decision No.14407–(09/105), October 26, 2009
Executive Directors Decision No.8165–(85/189), December 30, 1985 10–036
Lacedure Directors Decision 110.0103 (05/107), December 30, 1903