Contents

1 Introduction 1
1.1 Setting the Scene 1
1.1.1 The Ways and Moments in Which IIL Frustrates States' Protection of Human Rights in Latin America 1
1.1.2 The Functional Underpinning of IIL as the Reason Behind the Limited Success of Human Rights Argumentation in States' Favour 8
1.1.3 The Need for Re-politicising IIL in View of Its Increasing Problematic Interplay with States' Protection of Human Rights 11
1.2 Hypothesis, Aims and Structure of This Study 14
1.3 Methodology and Significance 16
References 18

2 The Politicisation of International Legal Instruments Protecting Foreign Investment in Latin America Through States' Articulation of Sovereign Rights 23
2.1 Politicisation Through States' Articulation of the Right to Freely Determine the Legal Scope of Foreign Property Rights' Protection (1830–1930) 24
2.1.1 Definition of States' Obligations vis-à-vis Foreign Nationals in Case of Pecuniary Damages 29
2.1.1.1 Legal Doctrines and Domestic State Practice 29
2.1.1.2 Regional State Practice 32
2.1.2 Establishment of Limitations Upon Inter-State Arbitration of Diplomatic Protection Claims 36
2.1.2.1 Denial of Justice and Local Remedies Rules 36
2.1.2.2 By Means of the Calvo Clause in Investor-State Contracts 39
2.1.3 Preliminary Conclusions 41

2.2 Politicisation Through States' Articulation of the Right to Expropriate Foreign Property (1930–1980) 42
2.2.1 Definition of States' Obligations Vis-à-vis Foreign Nationals in Case of Expropriation of Property Rights 46
2.2.1.1 Domestic State Practice 46
2.2.1.2 Regional State Practice 50
2.2.2 Establishment of Limitations Upon International Arbitration of Investor-State Contract-Based Disputes 53
2.2.2.1 National and Regional Practice 53
2.2.2.2 Latin American Refusal to Adhere to the ICSID Convention 56
2.2.3 Preliminary Conclusions 58
2.3 De-Politicisation of International Legal Instruments Protecting Foreign Investment (1990–present)? 59
2.3.1 Consolidation of the International Investment Treaty Regime 62
2.3.1.1 National Approach Towards Investment Treaty Protection 62
2.3.1.1.1 Ratification of Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) 62
2.3.1.1.2 Ratification of International Arbitration Rules 65
2.3.1.2 Regional Approach Towards Investment Treaty Protection 67
2.3.1.2.1 South American Context 67
2.3.1.2.2 For the Americas? 69
2.3.1.3 Preliminary Conclusions 71
2.3.2 Concerns About Investment Treaty-based Dispute Settlement 73
2.3.2.1 The Interpretation and Application of States' Obligation Under the FET Standard 73
2.3.2.2 The Interpretation and Application of States' Obligation in Cases of an Indirect Expropriation . . 78
2.3.2.3 Preliminary Conclusions 82
2.3.3 Re-Politicisation of IIL Through States' Articulation of the Right to Regulate 83
2.3.3.1 National Approaches 84
2.3.3.1.1 Reformed IIAs 84
2.3.3.1.2 Denunciation of BITs and the ICSID Convention 89
2.3.3.1.3 The Adoption of CFIAs 93
2.3.3.2 (Sub)regional Approaches 95
2.3.3.2.1 Along the Pacific 95

2.3.3.2.2 The UNASUR Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes 97
2.3.3.3 Preliminary Conclusions 98
2.4 Conclusion 98
References 101

3 The States' Duty to Regulate Foreign Investment Activities Under IHRL As a Paradigm for Re-politicising IIL 105
3.1 The Duty to Regulate in Universal Human Rights Law 108
3.1.1 The Duty to Regulate in General 108
3.1.1.1 The Duty to Regulate Under the UN Instruments . . 108
3.1.1.2 The Duty to Regulate Under the ICESCR 111
3.1.2 The Duty to Regulate in Furtherance of the Right to Water . 118
3.1.2.1 Legal Basis 118
3.1.2.1.1 Universal Human Rights Treaties 118
3.1.2.1.2 Customary International Law 121
3.1.2.2 Scope of Application 129
3.1.2.2.1 In the Context of Foreign Investment in Water Facilities and Services 130
3.1.2.2.2 In the Context of Foreign Investment Activities' Pollution or Depletion of Water Resources 133
3.1.3 Interim Conclusion 135
3.2 The Duty to Regulate Under Inter-American Human Rights Law . . 137
3.2.1 The Duty to Regulate in General 137
3.2.1.1 The Duty to Regulate Under Inter-American Instruments 137
3.2.1.2 The Duty to Regulate Under the ACHR 140
3.2.2 The Duty to Regulate in Furtherance of Indigenous People's Land Rights 145
3.2.2.1 Legal Basis 145
3.2.2.1.1 International Treaties and Non-binding Instruments 145
3.2.2.1.2 Customary International Law 150
3.2.2.2 Scope of Application 154
3.2.2.2.1 In the Context of Foreign Property Rights' Interference with Indigenous People's Rights to Possess Traditional Lands and Territories 157
3.2.2.2.2 In Cases Where Natural Resources' Exploration and Exploitation Activities May Pose a Real and Imminent Risk upon Indigenous People's Survival . . . 158

3.2.3 Interim Conclusion . . . 162
3.3 Conclusion . . . 165
References . . . 169

4 Re-politicisation of IIL by States Through an Articulation of Their Duty to Regulate in IIAs . . . 171
4.1 Current Deployment of Human Rights Argumentation Before ISDS Tribunals . . . 173
4.1.1 Invoking IHRL as Applicable Law in ISDS? . . . 173
4.1.1.1 In Cases Arising in the Context of Investors' Provision in the Drinking Water Services . . . 173
4.1.1.2 In Cases Arising Out of Investors' Exploration and Exploitation Activities of Natural Resources . 179
4.1.2 Articulation of the Duty to Regulate on Questions of Substantive IIA Obligations . . . 184
4.1.2.1 On Questions of the FET Standard . . . 184
4.1.2.2 On Questions of Indirect Expropriation . . . 190
4.1.3 Articulation of the Duty to Regulate on Questions of Procedural IIA Rights . . . 193
4.1.3.1 On Questions of States' Right to Challenge Tribunals' Jurisdiction and/or the Admissibility of Investors' Claims . . . 193
4.1.3.2 On Questions of States' Right to Submit Counterclaims . . . 197
4.1.4 Interim Conclusion . . . 203
4.2 Required IIAs Reforms to Strengthen States' Duty to Regulate in IIL . . . 205
4.2.1 Reformed IIAs Substantive Provisions . . . 205
4.2.1.1 Explicit Reference to States' Duty to Regulate Protected Investment . . . 205
4.2.1.2 Imposing Investor Obligations . . . 207
4.2.2 Reformed IIAs Procedural Provisions . . . 210
4.2.2.1 Jurisdictional Clauses . . . 210
4.2.2.2 Counterclaims . . . 212
4.2.3 Interim Conclusion . . . 214
4.3 Legal Consequences Faced by States for Abstaining from Articulating Their Duty to Regulate in IIAs . . . 215
4.4 Conclusion . . . 217
References . . . 218

5 Re-politicisation of IIL by a Regional ISDS Tribunal Through Its Engagement with Inter-Regime Tensions . . . 221
5.1 Hypothetical Scenarios Likely to Cause Inter-Regime Tensions During the Conduct of Arbitration Proceedings . . . 222

5.1.1 ISDS Tribunal's Review of States' Measure Adopted in Compliance with a Human Rights Body's Interim Measure . . . 222
5.1.2 A Provisional Measure Issued by an Investor-State Tribunal Encounters a Human Rights Body's Interim Measure . . . 223
5.2 Legal Strategies Available to a Regional ISDS Tribunal for Settling Inter-Regime Tensions . . . 226
5.2.1 Tribunal's Settlement of Inter-Regime Tensions *by Itself* . . . 226
5.2.2 Tribunal's Settlement of Inter-Regime Tensions with the Assistance of Human Rights Bodies . . . 227
5.3 Additional Legal Strategies Conducive to Underpin Tribunal's Engagement with Inter-Regime Tensions . . . 228
5.4 Conclusions . . . 229
References . . . 230

6 Conclusions and Outlook . . . 231

Table of Cases . . . 237

Table of Legal Instruments . . . 249

Other Conventions, International Instruments, and Related Links . . . 263

Table of State Practice . . . 267

References . . . 273