INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions ofthe authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in theJournal.

IJLRA

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

ISSN: 2582-6433

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur.Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board

Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India.India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time &Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020).Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

ISSN: 2582-6433

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi.Formerly Assistant professor of Law,Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration.10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.

Avinash Kumar

Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship.He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi.Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi.He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANLAYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

www.ijlra.com
Volume 2 Issue 8 | July 2025
ISSN: 2582-6433

ARBITRATION AS A TOOL OF NEO-COLONIALISM? THE POLITICS OF JUSTICE IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH

AUTHORED BY - PARZANIA EYASMINE
Student of Gitarattan International Business School, IPU University

Introduction

International arbitration has long been championed as a fair, neutral, and efficient alternative to domestic courts for resolving commercial and investment disputes. In theory, it provides investors with protection from biased or inefficient local judicial systems and ensures that states are held accountable to their contractual commitments. However, in recent decades, the increasing use of Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) mechanisms has triggered a wave of criticism, particularly from countries in the Global South. Critics argue that arbitration has evolved into a modern-day instrument of neo-colonial control, enabling multinational corporations and powerful states to infringe upon the sovereignty of developing nations under the guise of legal neutrality.

This article explores the complex relationship between arbitration and political power, examining the extent to which arbitration may reinforce global inequalities, and whether it truly serves the principles of justice, equity, and sovereign autonomy.

I. Understanding Arbitration and ISDS

1. What is International Arbitration?

International arbitration is a private dispute resolution process where parties agree to resolve conflicts outside of traditional court systems, often through institutional frameworks such as the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), or International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID).

2. Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS)

ISDS is a legal mechanism embedded in bilateral investment treaties (BITs) and free trade agreements (FTAs) that allows foreign investors to sue host governments for alleged breaches of investment protection obligations. These include claims of expropriation, unfair treatment, or denial of justice.

While ISDS is meant to ensure a stable investment climate, many developing countries have faced multi-million dollar claims for enacting laws in the public interest. According to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), over 1,200 ISDS cases have been registered globally, with a significant portion filed against Global South nations. (UNCTAD World Investment Report 2023)

II. The Critique: Arbitration as Legal Imperialism

1. Undermining Sovereignty

Critics argue that ISDS curtails sovereign legislative power by allowing foreign investors to challenge domestic laws and regulations. For example, when countries introduce environmental or public health regulations, they risk facing arbitration claims. This exerts a chilling effect on policymaking, discouraging governments from enacting reforms out of fear of legal retaliation.

2. Western-Dominated Forums

The vast majority of arbitrators come from Western countries, particularly the U.S., U.K., and other OECD nations. A 2017 study by Gus Van Harten found that 55% of ISDS arbitrators were from Western Europe or North America, and only 15% were women. This creates a homogeneity that risks reinforcing Western legal norms at the expense of local cultures and legal traditions. (Van Harten, "The (Lack of) Women Arbitrators in Investment Treaty Arbitration")

3. Transparency and Accountability Deficits

Unlike domestic courts, many arbitration proceedings are confidential. There is limited public access to hearings or rulings, and often no appellate mechanism. This secrecy undermines democratic oversight and public trust, especially when state funds are used to pay hefty arbitration awards.

4. Disproportionate Impact on the Global South

Countries like Argentina, Venezuela, India, and Pakistan have been some of the most frequent respondents in ISDS cases. In 2012, Argentina alone faced over 50 claims. These cases can result in massive compensation awards that strain public resources. The financial burden of defending such cases also disproportionately affects developing countries, where legal fees and tribunal costs can exceed tens of millions of dollars.

ISSN: 2582-6433

III. Landmark Cases Illustrating the Critique

1. Philip Morris v. Uruguay (2010)

Philip Morris sued Uruguay under a Switzerland-Uruguay BIT after the country passed strict tobacco regulations. Although Uruguay eventually won the case, it spent over $10 million in legal costs. The case raised concerns about corporations using ISDS to challenge legitimate public health laws. (ICSID Case No. ARB/10/7)

2. Cairn Energy v. India (2020)

Cairn Energy filed a claim against India under the UK-India BIT, challenging a retrospective tax amendment. The tribunal awarded Cairn $1.2 billion in damages. Critics argued this case exemplified how arbitration can penalize states for asserting their fiscal sovereignty. (Permanent Court of Arbitration)

3. Vedanta v. Zambia (2019)

Though not strictly an ISDS case, this illustrates broader concerns. Vedanta Resources, a UK-based company, was sued in England for pollution caused by its Zambian subsidiary. The case highlighted how jurisdiction and legal power often favor corporations based in the Global North. (Vedanta Resources Plc v Lungowe [2019] UKSC 20)

IV. The Case for Arbitration: Not Just a Colonial Tool

Despite its flaws, arbitration offers several important benefits:

1. Protection Against Hostile Legal Systems

Foreign investors are often wary of entering markets where judicial corruption or political instability threatens fair treatment. Arbitration provides a neutral venue insulated from local bias.

2. Efficiency and Enforceability

Arbitration awards are enforceable across more than 160 countries under the 1958 New York Convention. This global enforceability ensures that investors can actually recover damages.

3. Investment Promotion

Countries use BITs with ISDS clauses as tools to attract foreign direct investment (FDI). From the state's perspective, offering arbitration access signals a commitment to protecting investors.

V. Reforms and Global Pushback

In response to growing backlash, many countries and institutions are pushing for reform:

1. India's New Model BIT

India terminated over 60 BITs and introduced a new model BIT in 2016, narrowing the definition of investment and including a requirement to exhaust domestic remedies before arbitration. (Ministry of Finance, India)

2. South Africa and Bolivia's Exit from ISDS

South Africa opted to let its BITs lapse, replacing them with domestic legislation that allows international investors to access local courts. Bolivia withdrew from ICSID in 2007, citing concerns over bias and lack of accountability.

3. EU's Proposal for a Multilateral Investment Court (MIC)

The European Union is leading an initiative to replace ISDS with a standing court featuring permanent judges, an appeals mechanism, and greater transparency. (UNCITRAL Working Group III)

Conclusion: Between Reform and Resistance

The debate over arbitration as a tool of neo-colonialism reflects deeper tensions in international law: the struggle between global capitalism and national sovereignty, between efficiency and fairness, and between private gain and public interest. While arbitration can offer benefits in cross-border commerce, its current structure often reproduces the very inequalities it claims to transcend.

The challenge is not to discard arbitration altogether but to democratize it—to make it more transparent, representative, and responsive to the realities of the Global South. Only then can it be a true instrument of justice rather than a shadow of colonialism in a modern legal form.