



HAL
open science

Issues and risks of nationalization of foreign companies

Hugo Spring-Ragain

► **To cite this version:**

| Hugo Spring-Ragain. Issues and risks of nationalization of foreign companies. 2024. <hal-04615655>

HAL Id: hal-04615655

<https://hal.science/hal-04615655v1>

Submitted on 18 Jun 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Copyright - All rights reserved

Research paper: International law and the nationalization of foreign companies

First of all, it's important to define the term nationalization. As a general rule, nationalization can be defined as follows: *The nationalization of a company is a process whereby a government or state entity takes full or partial control of a private company, transferring ownership and control from the private to the public or state sector. This process may involve the acquisition of all the company's shares by the state or government, or the assumption of majority control through the purchase of the majority of the company's shares or the confiscation of the company's assets.*

The nationalization of foreign companies is one of the most complex and controversial challenges in contemporary international law. This phenomenon, which involves a state taking control of property or companies owned by foreign investors, raises a multitude of legal, political and economic issues at both national and international levels. Against a backdrop of increasing economic globalization and heightened geopolitical competition, the nationalization of foreign companies has become a hot topic of debate and dispute, involving the interests of states, investors and the international community as a whole.

This introduction aims to explore the multiple dimensions of the nationalization of foreign companies under international law. We will examine the legal foundations of nationalization, the relevant international principles and norms, as well as the practical challenges and implications for the actors involved. In addition, we will analyze the main cases and disputes that have emerged in the context of nationalization, as well as emerging trends and recent developments in this field.

The nationalization of foreign companies raises fundamental questions concerning state sovereignty, respect for property rights and the balance between public and private interests. From the point of view of states, nationalization can be seen as a legitimate instrument of economic policy aimed at protecting national interests, promoting economic development and guaranteeing national security. However, from the point of view of foreign investors, nationalization can be seen as a violation of their legitimate rights, resulting in financial losses and serious damage to their business activities.

From a legal standpoint, the nationalization of foreign companies raises complex challenges in terms of international investment law, treaty law and host state law. Foreign investors generally enjoy specific protections under bilateral investment treaties, free trade agreements and other international legal instruments, which guarantee fair and equitable treatment, protection against arbitrary expropriation and other fundamental rights. Thus, the legality of a nationalization may depend on its compliance with the host state's international obligations and foreign investment protection standards.

In addition, the nationalization of foreign companies raises complex issues of host state liability, foreign investor recourse and international dispute settlement. Foreign investors often have the option of suing the host state before international arbitral tribunals to obtain compensation for damages suffered as a result of nationalization. These disputes can give rise to important arbitral awards with long-term implications for international investment law and international economic relations.

I. Legal implications of the nationalization of foreign companies

Examining the legal implications of nationalizing foreign companies reveals the tensions and challenges facing host states and foreign investors in a globalized environment. This section explores in detail the complex issues of international law, national law and investment protection that emerge during such nationalizations.

I.a. Potential conflicts between national and international law

In the context of the nationalization of foreign companies, conflicts between national and international law can emerge from a variety of sources, creating legal and diplomatic tensions. This section takes an in-depth look at the origins of these conflicts and their implications for the parties involved.

Firstly, a state's constitutional provisions may authorize nationalization in the public interest, reflecting national sovereignty and socio-economic concerns. However, such measures must often be reconciled with the state's international obligations under international treaties and bilateral investment agreements. International courts may interpret constitutional provisions differently from international treaties, leading to disagreements over the legality of nationalization and challenges in balancing national and international interests.

In addition, foreign investments often benefit from specific protections afforded by bilateral investment treaties (BITs) or free trade agreements (FTAs). These agreements generally guarantee fair and equitable treatment, protection against arbitrary expropriation and other essential rights to foreign investors. Thus, nationalization may be considered a violation of these international obligations, giving rise to disputes between the host state and foreign investors before international arbitral tribunals.

These potential conflicts between national and international law raise complex issues of sovereignty, legal certainty and international cooperation. They highlight the need for harmonization between national and international legal standards to ensure a stable and predictable legal environment for foreign investors. In addition, they underline the importance of constructive dialogue between States and investors to resolve disputes in a peaceful and cooperative manner, while respecting international obligations and the legitimate interests of the parties concerned.

I.b. Responsibility of the host state towards foreign investors

The host state's responsibility towards foreign investors is often based on the standards for the treatment of foreign investments set out in BITs and FTAs. These standards impose various obligations on the host state, such as fair and equitable treatment, protection against expropriation without adequate compensation, and the guarantee of non-discriminatory treatment.

Where nationalization results in a breach of these obligations, the host state can be held liable before international arbitral tribunals. Foreign investors can claim damages for losses suffered

as a result of nationalization, including the value of their investments, lost future profits and legal costs incurred in asserting their rights.

It should be noted that the liability of the host state may be limited in certain circumstances, notably if nationalization is justified by overriding reasons of public interest and if it is carried out in accordance with the appropriate legal procedures.

I.c. Recourse by foreign investors to international bodies

Faced with the nationalization of a foreign company, foreign investors are often faced with the need to assert their rights before international bodies. This section explores in detail the different remedies available to foreign investors in such cases, highlighting the complexities and implications of each option.

Investment arbitration is emerging as one of the most common ways for foreign investors to resolve disputes arising from nationalization. This process enables investors to submit their dispute to an independent international arbitral tribunal, providing a neutral and impartial forum for dispute resolution. Arbitral awards are generally binding and enforceable, which means that states are obliged to comply with their terms, giving investors a degree of assurance that the decision will be enforced.

In addition, foreign investors may choose to explore other dispute settlement mechanisms, depending on the specific nature of the dispute and the preferences of the parties involved. These include the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID). The ICJ provides a forum for disputes between states, while ICSID specializes in settling disputes between foreign investors and host states. The choice of mechanism often depends on the willingness of the parties to accept the court's jurisdiction, as well as on the specific provisions of the applicable investment treaties.

These dispute settlement mechanisms provide foreign investors with an effective means of redress in the event of violation of their rights by the host state. By enabling disputes to be resolved impartially and fairly, they help to strengthen the legal security of foreign investments and protect the interests of investors in the context of the nationalization of a foreign company. However, it should be noted that the choice of dispute settlement mechanism can have significant implications for the parties involved, and it is therefore essential to carefully weigh up the advantages and disadvantages of each option before making a decision.

II. Challenges and controversies of nationalizing foreign companies

II.a. Impact on economic and political stability

The nationalization of a foreign company can have far-reaching consequences for the economic and political stability of the host country, as well as on the international stage. From an economic point of view, nationalization can create disruption in key sectors of the economy, affecting capital flows, investor confidence and economic growth. Investors, both domestic and foreign, may react negatively to such events, fearing instability and the loss of guarantees on their investments.

Politically, nationalization can become a highly controversial issue, sparking passionate debate within society and government. Nationalization decisions are often taken against a backdrop of political, social and ideological considerations, which can create divisions and tensions within the population. Moreover, nationalization can have geopolitical implications, disrupting international relations and exacerbating rivalries between states.

II.b. Negotiations and arbitration between governments and foreign investors

The nationalization of foreign companies often involves complex negotiations between the host state and the foreign investors affected. These negotiations represent a crucial step in resolving disputes and finding a fair solution for all parties involved. This section examines in detail the challenges and mechanisms associated with nationalization negotiations and arbitration.

Negotiations between the host state and foreign investors can be extremely difficult and demanding. They often involve discussions on sensitive issues such as the valuation of expropriated assets, the assessment of damages suffered by investors, and settlement terms. Foreign investors generally seek fair and equitable compensation for their losses, while the host state seeks to justify its actions in the name of public interest and national welfare.

In the absence of an amicable agreement, foreign investors often resort to international arbitration proceedings to assert their rights. These arbitrations are often conducted before specialized international arbitral tribunals such as the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) (7-) or the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA). Parties present their arguments and evidence, and binding decisions are handed down by impartial arbitrators. These arbitral decisions are binding and enforceable, which means that states are obliged to comply with their terms.

These negotiation and arbitration processes provide foreign investors with an effective means of redress in the event of a dispute with the host state. They help to enhance the legal security of foreign investments by providing a transparent and fair framework for dispute resolution. However, they often require considerable time, resources and legal expertise, which can prolong the tensions and uncertainties associated with nationalization. Consequently, it is crucial for all parties involved to engage in constructive dialogue and seek mutually acceptable solutions to safeguard each other's legitimate interests.

II.c. Impact on the host country's international reputation

The nationalization of foreign companies can have a significant impact on the international reputation of the host state. Nationalization perceived as unfair or discriminatory can tarnish the state's image on the international stage, compromising its credibility and ability to attract foreign investment. Potential investors may be deterred from doing business in an environment where property rights are not fully respected.

In addition, disputes and tensions resulting from nationalization can affect the host state's diplomatic relations with other states. Ongoing disputes and unresolved differences can

hamper economic and political cooperation, and create obstacles to building positive, lasting international relations.

III. State ownership as a tool of economic warfare

In an increasingly competitive global economic landscape, state ownership is emerging as a powerful instrument in economic warfare strategies. This section will examine the motivations and strategies behind the use of state ownership in economic warfare, as well as the need for international cooperation to prevent economic tensions and potential conflicts.

III.a. Strategies and motivations behind the use of state ownership in economic warfare

State ownership, which refers to direct or indirect government participation in domestic or foreign companies, has become a strategic tool increasingly used by states to promote their economic and geopolitical interests. The motivations behind the use of state ownership in economic warfare are diverse and complex.

Firstly, states can use state ownership to exert direct influence over key sectors of the economy, such as energy, telecommunications and strategic industries, in order to strengthen their economic security and protect their national interests. By controlling strategic companies, states can influence prices, gain access to critical resources and guarantee stable supplies for their economies.

In addition, state ownership can be used as an industrial policy tool to foster a country's economic and technological development. By investing in innovative and strategic companies, governments can stimulate economic growth, create jobs and strengthen their competitiveness in the global marketplace.

However, the use of state ownership in economic warfare can also raise concerns about fair competition and market distortion. State-controlled companies may enjoy unfair competitive advantages, such as preferential financing, privileged access to public markets and protection from foreign competition. This can create trade tensions and diplomatic frictions between countries, fuelling economic and geopolitical conflicts.

III.b. International cooperation to prevent economic tensions and potential conflicts

Faced with the challenges posed by the use of state ownership in economic warfare, international cooperation is essential to prevent economic tensions and mitigate the risks of potential conflict. States must work closely together to develop standards and regulatory mechanisms to ensure fair competition and prevent unfair trading practices.

To this end, institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) play a crucial role in developing international rules to regulate state investment and promote transparency and non-discrimination in international trade transactions. These organizations provide platforms for dialogue and cooperation where states can discuss economic and trade issues, share best practices and resolve disputes peacefully.

In addition, bilateral and regional investment protection agreements can also help prevent economic tensions by establishing common standards for the conduct of foreign investment and providing effective dispute settlement mechanisms to resolve disputes between states and investors.

However, to avoid economic tensions and potential conflicts, international cooperation is essential to develop effective rules and regulatory mechanisms, promote transparency and non-discrimination, and facilitate the peaceful settlement of disputes.

IV. Case studies in the nationalization of foreign companies

Case studies of foreign nationalizations offer valuable insight into the challenges, dynamics and implications associated with this complex phenomenon on the international stage. This section explores in detail some emblematic examples of nationalizations, highlighting the different contexts, underlying motivations and consequences for the parties involved. By analyzing the concrete cases of Bolivia and Russia, we can better understand the legal, economic and political issues surrounding the nationalization of foreign companies, and the lessons to be learned for the future.

IV.a Bolivia

Bolivia has witnessed the nationalization of foreign companies in the hydrocarbons sector under the presidency of Evo Morales. In 2006, the Bolivian government announced the nationalization of oil and gas activities, affecting foreign companies such as Repsol, Total and Petrobras. This decision was taken with the aim of regaining control of the country's natural resources and ensuring a greater share of the benefits for the Bolivian state and its citizens.

The impact of this nationalization has been significant, with important economic and political spin-offs. On the economic front, nationalization enabled Bolivia to benefit from an increased share of revenues from its natural resources, strengthening its ability to finance social and development programs. However, the decision also raised concerns among foreign investors, and contributed to creating a climate of uncertainty for future investment in Bolivia's energy sector.

Politically, nationalization was widely supported by the Bolivian people, who saw it as an important step towards the country's economic sovereignty. However, it also led to tensions with foreign governments and the multinational companies involved, generating disputes and diplomatic differences.

IV.b Russian threats

Russian threats to nationalize foreign companies have raised international concern. Russia has been accused of using nationalization as a tool for political and economic pressure as part of its regional geopolitical ambitions. A significant example is the crisis in Ukraine, where Russia has been accused of intimidating foreign companies operating in the region, particularly in the energy sector.

The threat of nationalization in Russia helped create a climate of uncertainty for foreign investors and undermined confidence in the country's business climate. Foreign companies were confronted with increased risks relating to the legal security of their investments, which had repercussions on investment decisions and capital flows.

On the diplomatic front, Russian threats of nationalization have also had significant implications, fuelling tensions with Western countries and exacerbating existing geopolitical conflicts. These threats were seen as an attempt by Russia to consolidate its regional influence by using economic means to achieve political objectives.

IV.c The case of Argentina: Nationalization of YPF

Argentina has been the scene of some controversial nationalizations, most notably that of YPF (Yacimientos Petrolíferos Fiscales), the country's largest oil company. Under the presidency of Cristina Fernández de Kirchner, the Argentine government decided to nationalize YPF in 2012, putting an end to Spanish company Repsol's majority stake in the company.

The decision was motivated by several factors, not least the Argentine state's desire to regain control of its strategic energy resources and boost domestic oil and gas production. The Argentine government justified the nationalization by accusing Repsol of not investing sufficiently in hydrocarbon exploration and production in Argentina, preferring instead to distribute dividends to its shareholders.

The nationalization of YPF drew strong criticism from the international community and foreign investors, fuelling diplomatic tensions with Spain. Repsol has taken legal action in international courts to obtain compensation for the expropriation of its assets.

Domestically, the nationalization of YPF was widely supported by the Argentine population, who saw it as a means of defending national interests and regaining control of the country's natural resources. However, some economic players expressed concern about the impact of nationalization on the business climate and the country's ability to attract foreign investment.

In conclusion, the various cases of countries that have used or threatened to use the tools of foreign company nationalization highlight the complexities and tensions inherent in the nationalization of foreign companies. While this measure may be seen as a way for states to protect their national interests and stimulate economic development, it also entails risks in terms of international relations and investor confidence. Thus, careful and transparent management of these processes is essential to minimize conflict and maximize long-term benefits for all concerned.

Bibliography

1. Kamga, Séverin, "La nationalisation des entreprises étrangères dans la jurisprudence arbitrale internationale". *Revue de l'arbitrage*, 2017, pp. 99-123.
2. Cassese, Sabino. "Nationalization of Alien Property in International Law". *The American Journal of International Law*, vol. 59, no. 4, 1965, pp. 716-740.
3. Ablajan, Eziz, "La nationalisation des investissements étrangers: entre droit international et législation nationale". *Revue générale de droit international public*, vol. 116, no. 4, 2012, pp. 765-790.
4. Kunz, Josef L. (ed.). *Nationalization, a Study in the Protection of Alien Property in International Law*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1953.
5. Lowe, Vaughan and Douglas Fisher (eds.). *The Development of International Law by the International Court*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.
6. Focsaneanu, L. (1953). *The international consequences of nationalization*. *Politique Étrangère*, 18(1), 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.3406/polit.1953.5741>
7. International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (Ed.). (2006). *ICSID Convention and Rules*. <https://icsid.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/documents/ICSID%20Convention%20French.pdf>
8. Beaud, O. (2014). *Nationalizations and state sovereignty*. *Histoire@Politique*, 72-87. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-histoire-politique-2014-3-page-72.htm>
9. Barjot, D. 2019. Nationalisations, privatisations, key industries and the national interest: the French experience (1944-2016). In Carbonell, M. (Ed.), *Industrie entre Méditerranée et Europe: XIXe-XXIe siècle*. Presses universitaires de Provence. doi :10.4000/books.pup.46770
10. Gully, H. (2020, April 6). Coronavirus: four questions about possible company nationalizations. *Les Echos*. <https://www.lesechos.fr/economie-france/budget-fiscalite/coronavirus-quatre-questions-sur-les-possibles-nationalisations-dentreprises-1188715>
11. Laviee, J. 1985. Chapitre V. Expropriation and nationalization. In *Protection et promotion des investissements : A study in international economic law*. Graduate Institute Publications. doi :10.4000/books.iheid.4197
12. Salacuse, J. W. (2012). *The law of investment treaties*. Oxford University Press.
13. Titi, C. (2017). The consequences of nationalization on foreign investment. *Revue Internationale de Droit Économique*, 36(2), 153-168.
14. Schill, S. W. (2009). *International investment law and comparative public law*. Oxford University Press.
15. Dolzer, R., & Schreuer, C. (2012). *Principles of international investment law*. Oxford University Press.

16. Van den Bossche, P., & Zdouc, W. (2013). *The law and policy of the World Trade Organization*. Cambridge University Press.
17. Schreuer, C. (2009). *The ICSID Convention: A Commentary*. Cambridge University Press.