ARBITRATION AND THE CONSTITUTION

PETER B. RUTLEDGE

CAMBRIDGE

Arbitration and the Constitution

Peter B. Rutledge
Herman E. Talmadge Chair of Law
University of Georgia

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

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

Cambridge University Press
32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107006119

First published 2013

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Rutledge, Peter B.
Arbitration and the constitution / Peter B. Rutledge.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-107-00611-9 (hardback)
1. Arbitration and award. 2. Constitutional law. I. Title.
K2400.R88 2012
347'.09–dc23 2012025695

ISBN 978-1-107-00611-9 Hardback

ARBITRATION AND THE CONSTITUTION

Arbitration has become an increasingly important mechanism for dispute resolution, in both domestic and international settings. Despite its importance as a form of state-sanctioned dispute resolution, it has largely remained outside the spotlight of constitutional law. This landmark work represents one of the first attempts to synthesize the fields of arbitration law and constitutional law. Drawing on the author's extensive experience as a scholar in arbitration law who has lectured and studied around the world, the book offers unique insights into how arbitration law implicates issues such as separation of powers, federalism, and individual liberties.

Peter B. Rutledge is a Professor of Law and the Herman E. Talmadge Chair at the University of Georgia School of Law. A recognized figure in the field of international dispute resolution and an accomplished Supreme Court advocate, Professor Rutledge has published widely in both the United States and abroad. His articles have appeared in publications such as the *University of Chicago Law Review*, the *Vanderbilt Law Review*, and the *Journal of International Arbitration*.

This book is dedicated to our children
Anna, Marie, Nina, and Frank

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book represents the culmination of years of thinking, speaking, teaching, and writing about arbitration and, specifically, its relation to the Constitution. As with any project, it has benefited from countless conversations with professors, judges, lawyers, and students. Any attempt to list all the individuals who have had an impact on the project would inevitably be incomplete. Nonetheless, I would be remiss if I did not mention some of the many individuals and institutions whose support has made the finished work possible.

As far as individuals, first and most important thanks must go to my wife, Birgit Rutledge-Riel. She is – and always has been – the rock in my life, supporting me during long nights, late hours in the office, stressful work periods, and countless conversations about what must, at times, have seemed like an especially arid subject. She is the finest teacher I know and a thoughtful critic of ideas, legal and nonlegal. Quite simply, without her, this project would not have been possible.

Second, thanks must go to the people who have been deans over the course of my academic career as I wrote this book. As any professor knows, deans have an enormous impact on our early career. Their support on matters such as courseload, research funding, course selection, and research leave enable us to do the heavy lifting that results in publication. At Catholic University Law School, Dean Douglas Kmiec, and his successors, Bill Fox and Veryl Miles, helped me get started with a friendly teaching package, including an upper-level seminar on Arbitration and the Constitution in which I first was able to pull together

the literature on this topic in a systematic fashion. More recently, at the University of Georgia School of Law, Dean Rebecca White provided invaluable support, including sponsoring my application for a Fulbright award and granting me sufficient research leave to complete this project. Without her unwavering support, this project would never have become a reality.

In that same vein, special thanks must go to individuals at the J. William Fulbright Foundation and, especially, the Austrian Fulbright Commission. During the 2010–2011 academic year, a Fulbright award helped underwrite a year in residence at the Institut für Zivilverfahrensrecht at the University of Vienna Law School. The program granted me incomparable access to a network of scholars, jurists, and lawyers, both within Austria and throughout Europe, with whom I could exchange ideas and from whom I learned a great deal. For their support of my Fulbright project, special thanks to Antoinette van Zabner, Heinz Löber, Lonnie Johnson, and Irene Zavarsky.

Third, countless colleagues commented on and contributed to this work. Gary Born, my dear friend and coauthor, has been a constant source of advice on this and other projects throughout my career. Fellow scholars including Chris Drahozal, Susan Franck, Jack Goldsmith, David Kershaw, Douglas Kmiec, Richard Nagareda (whose passing was a great loss to the legal academy), Antonio Perez, Neil Richards, Stacie Strong, Symeon Symeonides, Kent Syverud, Steve Ware, Lloyd Weinreb, and Adrian Zuckerman all have commented on various parts of this project or invited me to workshops where I could present these ideas during their formative stages. In that same vein, I send my thanks to the several anonymous reviewers who commented on the book proposal while it was under consideration at Cambridge.

Fourth, I have profited greatly from numerous students whose research assistance has ensured the depth and accuracy of the ideas presented here. Former students at Catholic University including Nicole Angarella, Bri DiBari, Barney Ford, Gordon Jimison, Maureen Smith, and Sarah Wyss all contributed during various stages of this process. More recently, a crackerjack team of students at the University of Georgia helped bring the manuscript to completion. These include Halley Espy, Amanda Holcomb, Nicholas Howell, Christopher Smith, and Julianne Thon. Without this team, which operated like a

well-oiled machine in the final months, these chapters would have remained unsculpted lumps of clay.

Finally, among the individuals deserving thanks, I extend my heartfelt gratitude to those persons who helped take the ideas presented here and make them ready for publication as a book. John Berger at Cambridge University Press shepherded me through the proposal-approval process, and Carol McGeehan at Wolters Kluwer provided a valuable early endorsement of my promise as an author. Research librarians including Steve Young of Catholic University and James Donovan and T. J. Striepe at the University of Georgia unfailingly tracked down difficult sources, especially, the voluminous legislative history surrounding NAFTA's implementing legislation. Julie Kendrick, Barbara Pitzl, and, especially Cindy Wentworth have provided administrative support of immeasurable value.

Beyond the individuals, numerous institutions have supported this project, whether through financial support, administrative support, or simply an opportunity to share the ideas with members of their law faculty. To that end, I must begin by thanking my home institution, the University of Georgia School of Law, quite simply one of the finest law schools in the country. I also must acknowledge the support of the University of Vienna Law School, my "home away from home" during the 2010–2011 academic year, where many of these chapters were first drafted. Participants in workshops at Cambridge University, the University of Oslo, McGill University, Washington University, George Washington University, the University of Georgia, the University of Alabama, the University of Nebraska, Willamette University, and Kansas University, as well as the Southeast Association of Law Schools all provided enriching input on early drafts of various chapters. To all of these institutions, I owe a debt of intellectual gratitude.

This list only scratches the surface of those who have had an impact on this project. To everyone, individuals and institutions, this book is better for your contributions and support. Errors remain, and for those I take full responsibility.

Peter B. Rutledge
Athens, GA

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Arbitration and the Constitution? At first glance, these two bodies of law appear to be strange bedfellows.

Arbitration, one would think, essentially involves private conduct. In arbitration, private parties contractually exit the system of state-controlled dispute resolution in favor of a purely private system wherein they authorize a private decision maker to resolve their rights and obligations. Proceedings typically are confidential, and the parties agree in advance to be bound by the result reached by the decision maker. Under these circumstances, state institutions such as courts play little to no role. They may become involved at the front end of the dispute, when one of the parties challenges the enforceability of the agreement. Or they may become involved in the back end of the dispute, when the losing party does not voluntarily comply with the arbitrator's award. Even in these instances when state actors do become involved, they play only a limited role. In most civilized legal systems, courts presumptively enforce the parties' arbitration agreements subject to a narrow range of exceptions. Similarly, they presumptively enforce the arbitrators' awards, subject again to a narrow range of exceptions.

By contrast, systems of constitutional law generally regulate various forms of public conduct. Consider the U.S. Constitution, for example. That document governs three main types of relationships with public institutions. First, it addresses the horizontal distribution of power among branches of government (for example, the division between the president and the Senate of the power to make and

ratify treaties). Second, it sometimes covers the vertical distribution of power across levels of government (for example, Article III's limited grant of subject-matter jurisdiction to the U.S. courts. with the implication that state courts enjoy exclusive jurisdiction over other matters not enumerated therein). Third, the Constitution speaks to the relationship between the State and the individual (for example, the Fourth Amendment's bar on unreasonable searches and seizures serves as a restraint on the interaction between law enforcement officers and private citizens). Tellingly, what the Constitution does not regulate (subject to a few minor exceptions) is the relationship between purely private actors. Thus, for example, the Constitution does not dictate how two neighbors (or businesses) resolve the disputes that arise between them.

This intellectual separation between arbitration and the Constitution was not always the case. Consider the following examples

- The French Constitution of 1793 specified that "[t]he right of the citizens finally to resolve their disputes through arbitrators of their choice cannot in any respect be decreased by law."[1] By the time of the Napoleonic Code, however, arbitration fell into disfavor.[2]
- The Articles of Confederation provided for resolution of interstate disagreements by jointly appointed "five commissioners or judges." In the event of disagreement, parties employed a complex list system to strike names of unacceptable candidates.[3] By the time the Constitution was adopted, this idea had dropped out.
- At one time, the law of certain German principalities such as Bavaria and Prussia granted citizens a right to arbitrate and enforce their agreements. That changed when the National Socialists came to power in the 1930s. The Nazis curtailed the use of arbitration. According to the Guidelines of the Reich regarding arbitration tribunals, "from a state-political point of view a further spread of arbitration would shatter confidence in state jurisdiction and the State itself." One intellectual sympathetic to the Nazi cause declared

[1] French Constitution of Year 1, 1793 (Art. 86).
[2] *See* GARY B. BORN, INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION 18 (2010).
[3] Articles of Confederation Art. IX (1781). *See also* JACKSON H. RALSTON, INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION FROM ATHENS TO LOCARNO 190 (1929).

> "that the national-socialist state rejects – contrary to the liberalists' view – arbitral tribunals" altogether.[4]

The relationship between arbitration law and constitutional law therefore raises many puzzles. Some are historical, such as trying to explain the rising and falling popularity of arbitration within and across societies (some historical research dates its earliest use back 2550 B.C.[5]). Others are jurisprudential, as we try to unpack how legal systems navigate the relationships between these two seemingly disparate fields. This book focuses on that latter set of puzzles.

At the advent of the twentieth century, these two regimes – arbitration and constitutional law – indeed would have been strange bedfellows. They comfortably occupied separate spheres. Constitutional law did not influence the design of arbitration systems, and arbitration cases had little influence on the development of constitutional law.

Several forces contributed to the "wall" separating the two fields. For much of the nineteenth century, the division was traceable to courts' refusal to enforce pre-dispute arbitration agreements at all, viewing them as illegal contracts that sought to divest courts of jurisdiction.[6] Even as countries began to soften their resistance to arbitration as an effective form of dispute resolution (an acceptance symbolized through treaties such as the Geneva Convention of 1927[7] and statutory enactments such as the Federal Arbitration Act of 1925[8]), the non-arbitrability doctrine helped to ensure that arbitration would occupy only a relatively narrow field, largely limited to private commercial disputes between businesspersons. Finally, although arbitration between states enjoyed a relatively rich historical tradition, arbitration between private companies (or individual investors) and those states had not.[9] Consequently, arbitration did not implicate any serious constitutional values.

[4] *See* Gary B. Born, *Arbitration and the Freedom to Associate*, 38 GA. J. COMP. & INT'L L. 7, 19–20 (2009).

[5] *See* Gabriel Wilner, Domke on Commercial Arbitration §2:01 (3d ed. 2006).

[6] *See, e.g.*, Kill v. Hollister, 95 Eng. Rep. 532 (K.B. 1746); Judgment of 10 July 1843 (*L'Alliance v. Prunier*), 1843 Dalloz 561 (Cour de Cassation civ.).

[7] *See* Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards (1927), 92 L.N.T.S. 302 (1929–1930).

[8] 9 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*

[9] *See* GARY B. BORN, INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION 2–6 (2010).

Beginning in the second half of the twentieth century, a number of forces began to put pressure on the wall that had historically separated arbitration law from constitutional law. One development was the demise of the non-arbitrability doctrine. This spawned a proliferation of arbitrations in areas of "public laws" traditionally reserved to the courts (such as securities, employment, and antitrust disputes) and triggered calls for ensuring that arbitration embody fundamental principles of due process.[10] It also raised new questions under Article III about the constitutional limits on resolution of federal questions outside federal court.

A second development was the expansion of arbitration in fields such as trade and investment law.[11] The use of arbitration in these areas, coupled with extremely limited opportunity for judicial or other review of the arbitrator's action, raised concerns about whether the U.S. government is delegating too much power to democratically unaccountable actors. These developments also raised concerns about whether private arbitral tribunals, not accountable to the U.S. president, could compel the executive branch to take some sort of action. As a result of these and other forces, constitutional principles began to seep into arbitration law.

A third development was the increasing popularity of arbitration as a mechanism for resolving disputes between companies and individuals (such as employer/employee relationships, company/consumer relationships, and broker/investor relationships).[12] Critics of arbitration attacked these inroads by arbitration and, among other things, decried the apparent lack of procedural protections for the individual in these settings. This led to attempts to import principles of "due process" into arbitration – initially through litigation attempting to impose the requirements of procedural due process onto arbitration, and later (after these efforts largely failed), the development of private "due process protocols."

[10] *See, e.g.*, Scherck v. Alberto-Culver Co., 417 U.S. 506 (1974); Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler, 473 U.S. 614 (1985).

[11] *See, e.g*, CAMPBELL MCLACHLAN ET AL., INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT ARBITRATION: SUBSTANTIVE PRINCIPLES (2007).

[12] *See* I GARY B. BORN, INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION 781–85 (2009).

Each of these foregoing developments produced fissures in the wall that traditionally separated arbitration law from constitutional law. Consequently, today, arbitration and constitutional law are no longer the strange bedfellows that they once were.

This cross-fertilization of arbitration and constitutional law is an organic, ongoing process that affects how a growing share of disputes in our society are resolved. Despite its importance, however, the relationship between these two disciplines suffers from a complete lack of rigorous theoretical examination. The purpose of this book, then, is to fill that gap.

Its objective, therefore, is twofold. First, as a positive matter, the book aims to chart systematically the breakdown of the wall separating these two disciplines and the alloying of their various principles. Second, as a normative matter, the book also (at times) critiques these developments. Sometimes, those critiques concern the substance of the alloying, where the constitutional norm is undesirable. Other times, those critiques concern the process whereby that alloying occurs (where, for example, a norm is developed through a private rather than public process or through a judicial rather than a legislative one).

Put simply, my thesis is as follows: Over the past half century, constitutional norms increasingly have worked their way into arbitration law and, to a lesser extent, arbitration law has influenced the development of constitutional norms. Tellingly, this seepage between the two disciplines has not occurred with a great deal of systematic thought or deliberation. Instead, it has tended to take place through incremental developments in various fields of arbitration, often occurring in isolation of each other and with little consideration of the broader implications of the growing interconnectivity of these two disciplines.

Rarely has this seepage taken the form of express "constitutionalization" of arbitration; with very rare exception, courts have not expressly subjected arbitral regimes to the constitutional norms governing state-run organs of dispute resolution such as judiciaries or administrative agencies. In other words, the wall between arbitration and constitution remains, although significant porous cracks have formed. The resulting seepage takes various forms. In some cases, constitutional norms have affected arbitration law through the design of treaties or statutes by the

executive and legislative branches. In other cases, constitutional norms have affected arbitration law through judicial interpretation of those treaties or statutes. Finally, and perhaps most interestingly, constitutional norms have affected arbitration law through the development of private norms, whether by arbitral institutions or the parties themselves; those norms are then incorporated by the parties into their arbitration agreements and, like any other provision of contract, shape the course of the dispute.

Before we turn to the chapters that elaborate on this thesis, a few preliminary matters are in order. First, it is necessary to articulate a more formal definition of "arbitration," as that term has many meanings depending on the context. Second, it is important to describe the methodology animating the study. Third and finally, this introduction offers a road map to the remaining chapters.

DEFINING ARBITRATION

Although scholars may quibble around the edges, there is a broad consensus about the defining features of arbitration. A classic definition posits that arbitration – at least private commercial arbitration – is the private, voluntary agreement to have a dispute resolved by a private actor whose decision is presumptively binding on the parties.[13] This definition includes certain arbitrations within self-regulated organizations ("SROs") such as the National Association of Securities Dealers ("NASD") and the New York Stock Exchange ("NYSE"). It excludes, however, certain types of court-ordered arbitration for parties who have not previously consented to the procedure.

A classic example would be a sales contract between two private parties providing, in relevant part, that any disputes related to the contract shall be resolved exclusively by a single arbitrator in New York pursuant to the rules of the American Arbitration Association and subject to New York law. To be sure, arbitration clauses do not *need* to contain all of these elements. Sometimes the clause may not specify

[13] *See* BORN, *supra* note 11, at 1–7; CHRISTOPHER R. DRAHOZAL, COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION 14–27 (2d ed. 2006).

the arbitral forum or the applicable law. In other cases, the arbitral clause may not specify the applicable rules (preferring instead ad hoc arbitration), or the number of arbitrators (leaving the matter to the parties or, otherwise, an appointing authority). In all events, though, the parties have opted to have their dispute resolved extrajudicially (in contrast to a forum selection clause) and to be bound by the outcome before they know the terms of the results (in contrast to mediation).[14]

Arbitration takes other forms beyond the private commercial setting. These variations are important because they often become the medium through which one or more constitutional norms first seeps into arbitration law. The simplest variation is a private arbitration between parties of unequal bargaining power such as employment contracts or consumer contracts. That form of arbitration involves all the hallmarks of private commercial arbitration but may raise distinct public policy concerns. These concerns prompt some countries to treat these arrangements as per se non-arbitrable (at least on a pre-dispute basis), whereas others allow them. This toleration of such private arrangements is the sort of doctrine that puts pressure on the wall separating arbitral law from constitutional law and creates the conditions for seepage of due process norms into arbitration.

Investment arbitration presents another variation. Unlike private commercial arbitration, the parties in an investment arbitration often are not in direct contractual privity (instead, the right to arbitrate arises by virtue of a treaty between the investor's state and the capital-importing state);[15] moreover, awards under investment arbitration often are subject to less judicial oversight than private commercial awards. As with consumer and employment arbitration, these variations put pressure on the wall separating arbitration law from constitutional law and stimulate the seepage of constitutional norms (such as transparency protocols) into arbitration law.

Finally, there is a long tradition of State–State arbitration as well. Such arbitrations, such as those that occurred between Ethiopia and

[14] *See* GARY B. BORN, INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AND FORUM SELECTION AGREEMENTS: DRAFTING AND ENFORCING (3d ed. 2010).

[15] According to one report, over 2500 such treaties are presently in force. *See* UNCTAD, I. Bilateral Investment Treaties 1995–2006: Trends in Investment Rulemaking.

Eritrea, enjoy a long history as a mode of resolving disputes such as boundary or compensation claims between States. Like commercial arbitration, they typically involve a consensual act (the States' willingness to consent to the arbitration), but, unlike private arbitration, the results are not ordinarily enforced through national courts. Although perhaps one of the most historically significant forms, State-to-State arbitration has not been as fertile a source for the incorporation of constitutional norms into arbitration. That historical puzzle, however, lies beyond the scope of this book.

Although this book focuses primarily on commercial arbitration, an understanding of these other forms is important. This is because those forms often become the mediums through which constitutional principles first filter into the arbitration jurisprudence. Once nested into the particular branch of arbitration such as investor/state arbitration, they can eventually spread, like water, into other crevices such as commercial arbitration.

A NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

At a certain level of generality, the themes of this book are universal. As the anecdotes introduced earlier illustrate, they apply across historical eras and across cultures. The only ingredients necessary to examine them are a State organized around a system of constitutional principles and some room for private orderings of dispute resolution, which then rely upon the power of the State for their enforcement.

Consequently, there is a certain temptation to make this book a truly comparative undertaking. I have opted not to do so for a couple of reasons. For one thing, I recognize that the art of comparative constitutional jurisprudence requires a degree of linguistic expertise that simply lies beyond my ken. Merely relying on available translations of foreign law sources would paint a picture that is at best inadequate and at worst affirmatively misleading. For another thing, that undertaking would distract from my purpose – which is to focus on the act of cross-fertilization between the two disciplines rather than a comparison of how the cross-fertilization occurs (or does not) across countries. Thus, my focus is primarily on U.S. law, the system I know best.