

War Series: Exhaustion of Remedies in Lessons from the Finnish Shipowners' War-Time Arbitration

August 1, 2024

In the early 1930s, the arbitration case between Finnish shipowners and the British government over the use of certain Finnish vessels during World War I provides a rich field of study in international arbitration and the local remedies rule. This case, adjudicated in Stockholm, raises fundamental questions about the exhaustion of local remedies and the jurisdiction of international tribunals.

The Context and Claims

The case arose from the requisitioning of Finnish vessels by Russia during World War I, which were subsequently used by Britain. Finnish shipowners sought compensation, arguing that the British government had unlawfully used their property. The British countered that the shipowners had not exhausted all local remedies available in the UK, thus barring them from seeking international arbitration.

The Local Remedies Rule

At the heart of this dispute is the local remedies rule, which requires that claimants exhaust all available domestic legal avenues before turning to international arbitration. The British government insisted that the Finnish shipowners should have utilized the War Compensation Court and provisions under the Indemnity Act. They argued that these were adequate

remedies that the shipowners had ignored.

On the other hand, the Finnish government contended that pursuing these remedies would have been futile. They pointed out that the Arbitration Board had already determined that the ships were requisitioned by Russia. According to them, this ruling should be treated as **res judicata**, meaning the matter had already been adjudicated and should not be re-litigated in another forum.

Arguments Presented

During the hearings, both sides presented robust arguments. The British government acknowledged the finality of the Arbitration Board's decision but maintained that the shipowners could have appealed. They suggested that an appeal could have clarified whether the requisition by Russia was valid, thereby opening the door for claims based on British interference.

The Finnish government, however, argued that appealing would have been redundant and likely dismissed as frivolous. They cited principles of estoppel and **res judicata** to assert that re-litigating the same facts before another court would be unnecessary and legally unsound.

Requisition vs. Interference

A critical issue was whether the acts constituted a requisition by Russia or an interference by Britain. If the requisition by Russia was invalid, then the British use of the ships could be considered an interference, necessitating compensation under the Indemnity Act. The British government, however, maintained that their actions were legitimate, especially if the Russian requisition stood.

The Arbitrator's Decision

The arbitrator ruled in favor of the Finnish shipowners,

stating they had exhausted all reasonable local remedies. This decision was pivotal, affirming that seeking further recourse in the War Compensation Court would have been redundant and that the principle of **res judicata** applied.

This ruling underscored that the local remedies rule does not obligate claimants to pursue futile or redundant legal actions. It emphasized the need for claimants to demonstrate the ineffectiveness or inadequacy of local remedies convincingly.

Key Takeaways

1. **Exhaustion of Local Remedies:** This case affirms the necessity for claimants to exhaust domestic remedies but also clarifies that redundant or futile remedies do not need to be pursued. It highlights the balance between thoroughness and practicality in legal redress.
2. **Principle of Res Judicata:** The decision underscores the importance of **res judicata** in international arbitration, preventing the re-litigation of issues already decided by competent authorities. This principle ensures judicial efficiency and the finality of decisions.
3. **Complexities of Wartime Actions:** The arbitration sheds light on the legal challenges associated with wartime requisitions and the responsibilities of states in such contexts. It highlights the need for clear legal standards to address the use of private property during conflicts.
4. **Role of International Arbitration:** The case exemplifies the significance of international arbitration in resolving state disputes. It underscores the binding nature of arbitration agreements and the role of arbitral awards in providing definitive resolutions.

Conclusion

The arbitration between Finnish shipowners and the British

government serves as a critical reference point in international law and arbitration. It demonstrates the application of the local remedies rule, the principle of **res judicata**, and the legal intricacies of property requisition during wartime. This case continues to offer valuable lessons for practitioners, illustrating the necessity of exhausting local remedies and the pivotal role of international arbitration in achieving just outcomes.

Author: Mahmoud Abuwaseel

Title: Partner – Disputes

Email: mabuwaseel@waselandwaseel.com

Profile:

<https://waselandwaseel.com/about/mahmoud-abuwaseel/>

Lawyers and consultants.

Tier-1 services since 1799.

www.waselandwaseel.com

business@waselandwaseel.com

War Series: Arbitration and the Tax on War Profits

August 1, 2024

On 15 June 1922, Gustave Ador rendered a significant arbitration award regarding the applicability of a tax on war profits, a decision that resonates through the corridors of international arbitration to this day. This case, arbitrated between the French and Spanish governments, addressed whether Spanish nationals residing in France were subject to the French law of 1 July 1916 on exceptional war profits or exempted by virtue of the Franco-Spanish convention of 7 January 1862. This award exemplifies the intricate interplay between **domestic tax laws** and **bilateral treaties**, a theme recurrent in modern-day international arbitration.

The Compromis Arbitral: Foundations of the Dispute

The arbitration agreement, or **compromis arbitral**, between France and Spain tasked the sole arbitrator, Ador, with resolving a critical issue: the applicability of the 1916 French tax law on Spanish nationals in France, against the backdrop of the 1862 treaty. The agreement underscored that Ador's decision would be final and binding, highlighting the **binding nature** of arbitral awards in international disputes.

Context and Historical Background

The 1862 treaty between France and Spain was a diplomatic effort to establish **mutual tax exemptions** for their nationals residing in each other's territories. This treaty aimed to shield foreign nationals from extraordinary taxes imposed during exceptional circumstances, such as war. Ador meticulously examined the treaty's intent and the historical context, which played a pivotal role in his decision.

Treaty Interpretation and Legal Principles

Ador's analysis revolved around the interpretation of Article 4 of the 1862 treaty, which sought to balance the **principle of domicile** with **nationality-based exemptions**. The treaty exempted foreign nationals from extraordinary contributions tied to their nationality, while subjecting them to ordinary taxes based on domicile. This distinction was crucial in determining the applicability of the 1916 tax law.

The arbitrator dismissed the restrictive interpretation that the exemption was solely for civil war scenarios. He argued that the **broad language** of the treaty did not confine the exemption to such a narrow scope, instead covering any extraordinary contributions arising from exceptional circumstances, such as the global conflict of World War I.

Nature of the 1916 Tax Law

The French law of 1 July 1916 was enacted to address the extraordinary economic gains made during wartime, imposing a tax on **exceptional war profits**. Ador emphasized that this tax was not a standard commercial levy but a response to the extraordinary economic conditions created by the war. He underscored the law's exceptional nature, aligning it with the treaty's provisions exempting foreigners from such extraordinary taxes.

Ador highlighted the **transitory and exceptional character** of the tax, noting that it targeted only the excess profits generated due to the war, distinguishing it from regular commercial taxes. This differentiation was pivotal in concluding that the tax law fell within the treaty's exemption clause.

Equity and Fairness Considerations

The award also touched upon the **equity arguments** presented by France, which contended that it was unfair for Spanish nationals to benefit from the war without contributing to the extraordinary fiscal burdens. Ador acknowledged these concerns but emphasized that any perceived inequity should have been addressed by renegotiating or denouncing the 1862 treaty, a step France had not taken.

He pointed out that the legislative debates in France, particularly the statements by French officials, reinforced the view that the extraordinary tax was linked to national solidarity and patriotism. This further bolstered the argument that the tax was inherently tied to French nationals, not foreign residents.

Implications and Contemporary Relevance

Ador's award is a landmark in the realm of **international arbitration**, illustrating the delicate balance arbitrators must maintain between **state sovereignty**, **treaty obligations**, and **equitable considerations**. The principles elucidated in

this award continue to influence contemporary arbitration, particularly in disputes involving **taxation and international treaties**.

The award underscores the importance of **clear treaty drafting** and the need for states to periodically review and update their international agreements to reflect evolving circumstances. It also highlights the role of arbitrators in navigating the **intersection of domestic laws and international obligations**, ensuring that justice is served while respecting the sovereign rights of nations.

In modern contexts, this case resonates in debates over **taxation of multinational corporations**, where treaties and domestic laws often collide. The principles of **fairness, equity, and the intent of treaties** remain central to resolving such disputes, making Ador's reasoning as relevant today as it was a century ago.

Conclusion

Gustave Ador's arbitration award on the tax on war profits is a testament to the enduring relevance of principled arbitration. It demonstrates the critical role of historical context, treaty interpretation, and equitable considerations in resolving complex international disputes. As we navigate contemporary challenges in international arbitration, the wisdom embedded in this award provides valuable guidance for balancing the interests of states and the principles of justice.

Author: Mahmoud Abuwasel

Title: Partner – Disputes

Email: mabuwasel@waselandwasel.com

Profile:

<https://waselandwasel.com/about/mahmoud-abuwasel/>

Lawyers and consultants.

Tier-1 services since 1799.

www.waselandwasel.com

business@waselandwasel.com

War Series: When Geopolitics Meets Arbitration in the UTI vs. Iran Case

August 1, 2024

In the arbitration case **United Technologies International, Inc. v. Islamic Republic of Iran**, the Tribunal faced a complex dispute arising from the Iranian Revolution and subsequent geopolitical upheavals. At the heart of the matter were **helicopter components** that Iran Helicopter Support and Renewal Company (IHSRC) had shipped to United Technologies International, Inc. (UTI) for repairs. The core issue was the proper return and payment for these components, with UTI seeking compensation for services rendered and storage costs, while IHSRC demanded the return of all components or their value.

UTI's Position and Claim

UTI, represented by its unincorporated division Sikorsky, argued that they fulfilled their contractual obligations by repairing and overhauling the components at their Connecticut facility. These repairs were conducted under terms specifying **delivery "F.o.b. Factory"**. However, post-revolution, IHSRC's request to alter the delivery terms to "C and F, Tehran" was declined by UTI, leading to a stalemate exacerbated by U.S. government orders that froze Iranian assets and prohibited the shipment of the components, classified under the **U.S. Munitions List**.

UTI thus found itself in possession of 22 fully repaired and 11 partially repaired components, for which payment was not received. They sought **\$183,886.05** for these services, plus

storage charges and interest. UTI asserted that due to the changing geopolitical landscape, including the U.S. embargo, they were rightfully retaining the components and sought Tribunal authorization to auction them or receive directions for continued storage and cost reimbursement.

IHSRC's Defense and Counterclaim

IHSRC countered with a multifaceted defense, asserting that UTI was obligated to return the components under IHSRC's terms, which specified "C and F Tehran, Iran". They disputed the claim, arguing that UTI failed to deliver the components as agreed and contended that UTI's non-performance couldn't be excused by U.S. government actions. IHSRC's counterclaim demanded either the return of all components sent for repair, valued at **\$5,500,000**, plus **\$15,000,000** in damages for non-delivery and **\$68,410,713** in incidental damages.

Request for Interim Measures

UTI's request for interim measures centered on auctioning the components or obtaining explicit instructions for their continued storage, highlighting the financial burden of storage costs and the risk of component obsolescence. They emphasized their **artisan's lien** under Connecticut law, securing payment for their repair and storage services. UTI argued that the interim measures were essential to prevent further economic loss and asset deterioration.

Tribunal's Analysis and Decision

The Tribunal's decision hinged on several critical points. Firstly, under Article 26 of the Tribunal Rules, interim measures can be granted to prevent **irreparable harm** to the parties' rights or property pending the final decision. This principle aligns with the International Court of Justice's practice of preserving the rights under dispute.

However, the Tribunal identified several obstacles:

1. **Ownership and Control:** Although IHSRC owned the components, they were stored in UTI's warehouses. The Tribunal noted that granting UTI's request could preempt a final decision on the restitution of these goods to IHSRC, thus complicating any future awards.
2. **Specificity and Jurisdiction:** There was ambiguity regarding the specific components held by UTI and those listed in IHSRC's counterclaim. Furthermore, the issue of storage costs beyond January 19, 1981, and whether these were within the Tribunal's jurisdiction, posed additional complications.
3. **Export Licensing:** UTI did not address the responsibility for obtaining export licenses, which was crucial given the components' classification under the U.S. Munitions List.

Given these factors, the Tribunal concluded that granting the interim measures would effectively constitute a provisional judgment on UTI's claims, which was inappropriate. Moreover, the Tribunal highlighted that the payment of storage costs, should it be warranted, was secured by the General Declaration's Security Account, thus negating the need for immediate interim relief.

Implications and Considerations

This decision underscores the delicate balance tribunals must maintain between providing interim relief and preserving the integrity of the final judgment. The ruling demonstrates the importance of clear contractual terms, especially in international transactions affected by geopolitical events. It also highlights the complexities of enforcing contractual rights amid governmental restrictions and the importance of addressing jurisdictional scope clearly in arbitration proceedings.

Key Takeaways

1. **Contractual Clarity:** Parties must ensure contracts are explicit about terms, especially regarding delivery and liability in the event of geopolitical changes.
2. **Interim Measures:** Tribunals have the authority to grant interim measures, but such requests must be compelling, clearly within jurisdiction, and not prejudicial to the final award.
3. **Geopolitical Impact:** Businesses operating internationally must consider the implications of political instability and government regulations on their contractual obligations.

This case serves as a poignant reminder of the intricacies involved in international arbitration and the critical role of clear legal frameworks and strategic foresight in managing cross-border disputes.

Author: Mahmoud Abuwasel

Title: Partner – Disputes

Email: mabuwasel@waselandwasel.com

Profile:

<https://waselandwasel.com/about/mahmoud-abuwasel/>

Lawyers and consultants.

Tier-1 services since 1799.

www.waselandwasel.com

business@waselandwasel.com