

Why de-judicialize?

Explaining state preferences on judicialization in WTO DSB and ISDS reforms

By J. Robert Basedow
European Institute
London School of Economics and Political Science
Houghton Street
WC2A 2AE London
United Kingdom
j.r.basedow@lse.ac.uk
+447522973168

Acknowledgments: I am very thankful to the editors, four anonymous reviewers as well as Daniel Berliner, Ignacio Bercero, Peter Van Den Bossche, Chad Bown, Carlo Cantore, Isabelle Van Damme, James Flett, Matteo FrIORINI, Peter Helles, Bernard Hoekman, Jürgen Kurtz, Simon Lester, Abraham Newman, Waltraud Schelkle and Moritz Schmoll for helpful comments on this project and different versions of the manuscript. The project leading to this article received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 770680 (RESPECT).

Why de-judicialize?

Explaining state preferences on judicialization in WTO DSB and ISDS reforms

Abstract: Judicialization scholarship suggests that states must seek the de-judicialization of international dispute settlement mechanisms to regain regulatory space. Why then do some states seek a de-judicialization yet others increased judicialization of dispute settlement mechanisms in their pursuit of regulatory space? This article advances a twofold argument. First, the concept of judicialization has been erroneously conflated with state perceptions of regulatory space under dispute settlement mechanisms. States aspiring to consolidate regulatory space may pursue de-judicialization and increased judicialization alike. Second, states' preferences for de-judicialization or increased judicialization to regain regulatory space should largely depend on conceptions of legitimate international law as either intergovernmental contracts or cosmopolitan quasi-constitutional order. The article illustrates these arguments at the example of US and EU efforts to reform the Dispute Settlement Body of the WTO and Investor-to-State Dispute Settlement. Both seek to increase regulatory space. Yet, the USA pursues de-judicialization while the EU promotes judicialization.

Key words: judicialization, regulatory space, legitimacy, WTO, ISDS.

* * *

I. Introduction

States have established thousands of international dispute settlement mechanisms (DSMs) in the last decades, which play a central role in modern global governance (Alter, 2014; Koremenos, 2016). They complement and replace classic intergovernmental bargaining through dispute resolution procedures (Keohane et al., 2000). DSM design, however, considerably varies in terms of judicialization (Alter et al., 2019). Some DSMs take the form of ad hoc intergovernmental committees that resolve disputes in view of political considerations. Other DSMs take the form of permanent courts with secretariats and vetted judges that are tasked to resolve conflicts exclusively on the basis of international treaties and law. Variation in DSM judicialization matters in that it affects state preferences, conduct and compliance with international treaties and DSM rulings (Abebe and Ginsburg, 2019; Alter, 2009; Alter et al., 2019; De Bièvre et al., 2014; Zangl, 2008). Scholars have advanced manifold explanations for variation in judicialization yet all explanations – implicitly or explicitly – build on the assumption that high judicialization limits whereas low judicialization maintains states' regulatory space (Allee and Elsig, 2016; Alter, 2014; Helfer and Slaughter, 2005; McCall Smith, 2000; Posner and Yoo, 2005). State efforts to regain regulatory space under DSMs should thus result in de-judicialization attempts.

Recent state efforts to reform the DSMs of the international trade and investment regimes cast doubts over this assumption. The USA currently seeks to consolidate its regulatory space under the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). It criticises that notably the jurisprudence of the WTO's Appellate Body (AB) unduly interferes with its regulatory space and has thus been blocking for years the appointment of new AB judges. In December 2019, this 'high court' of the WTO has lost its quorum to adjudicate, which forces WTO members to resort to less judicialized dispute resolution arrangements. The EU, on the other hand, seeks to consolidate its regulatory space under investor-to-state dispute settlement (ISDS). It replaces conventional ad hoc arbitration through a semi-permanent Investment Court System and pursues in the long run the creation of a multilateral investment court under the umbrella of the United Nations (UN). These observations are noteworthy in that the USA and the EU both seek to consolidate their regulatory space under DSMs. Yet, they opt, on the one hand, for a partial de-judicialization and, on the other, further judicialization of relevant DSMs.

An intuitive explanation for diverging US and EU reform preferences to regain regulatory space may lie in the stark institutional differences between the WTO DSB and conventional ISDS. The DSB qualifies as highly judicialized permanent international court resolving disputes between states, whereas ISDS amounts to less judicialized ad hoc arbitration resolving disputes between states and private investors. Hence, the US preference for de-judicialization to regain regulatory space may reflect the WTO's high degree of initial judicialization, while EU preferences for increased judicialization may reflect the initially low degree of judicialization of ISDS. While this explanation is intuitive, it is misguided. If differences in pre-reform judicialization were to account for US and EU reform choices, then the US and EU should hold similar preferences on DSM reforms in both regimes. In reality, however, the USA favours the de-judicialization of both the WTO DSB and ISDS, while the EU favours increased judicialization of both ISDS and the WTO DSB. In short, variation in reform preferences does not occur across institutionally heterogeneous regimes and DSMs but across states. Taken together, these observations imply that state preferences on DSM judicialization are more complex than assumed and require further investigation.

This article sets out to analyse the determinants of DSM judicialization in greater detail. It develops a twofold argument. First, DSM judicialization and state perceptions of its effect on regulatory space do not stand in a negative relationship and are not conceptual flip sides as widely assumed. States may aspire to enjoy significant policy flexibility under highly judicialized DSMs yet expect to see their regulatory space limited under less judicialized DSMs. Manifold formal and informal *ex ante* and *ex post* checks can indeed curtail the autonomy of highly judicialized DSMs and protect state interests (Alter, 2008; Helfer and Slaughter, 2005, p. 844). Second, states' choice to seek the consolidation of their regulatory space through a reduction or increase in DSM judicialization depends to a large extent on states' conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions. Some states see international law and institutions as interstate contracts, whose legitimacy primarily flows from state consent and satisfaction. When seeking to consolidate regulatory space, these states should naturally focus on strengthening direct state control through the re-politicisation and de-judicialization of DSMs. Other states understand international law as quasi-constitutional cosmopolitan order. International law is not merely a state-serving instrument but a governance system, whose legitimacy flows from broad societal consent, satisfaction, transparent and accountable institutions. State efforts to consolidate their regulatory space should rather focus on strengthening transparency and accountability mechanisms of DSMs resulting in an increase in judicialization. In the language of principal-agent theory, states with a contractual conception of international law should consolidate their regulatory space and curtail judicial autonomy through control over delegation *per se* whereas states with a quasi-constitutional vision should seek greater formal and informal, institutional and procedural *ex ante* and *ex post* checks on judicial autonomy (Pollack, 2003).

The article illustrates these arguments at the example of recent US and EU efforts to reform the WTO DSB and ISDS. It contributes to research on dispute settlement design in emphasising the importance of ideational factors, sharpens our understanding of the judicialization of international affairs and sheds a light on two highly salient domains of global economic governance. The first section defines and discusses judicialization and its relationship with state perceptions of regulatory space. The following section conceptualises how diverging conceptions of legitimate international law influence state preferences on DSM design and reform strategies. The last sections operationalise the argument and develop the case studies.

II. Judicialization and regulatory space – An underspecified relationship

The concept of judicialization was developed to describe one of the defining phenomena of the 20th century in international affairs – namely the growing role of international tribunals in global governance. Judicialization refers to the process by which international judicial bodies and judicial decision-making come to shape and even dominate international politics and political decision-making thereby limiting state sovereignty and the powers

of national executives and legislators (Alter et al., 2019, p. 49). Judicialization is neither static nor uniform but varies across policy domains, regions and time. To measure variation, scholars focus on five judicialization dimensions (Chase et al., 2013; McCall Smith, 2000; Zangl, 2008): 1) scope and permanency of delegation; 2) state control over access to dispute resolution; 3) legal/diplomatic nature of operational procedures; 4) state control over operational procedures; 5) state control over decision-making. Chase et al. (2013) merge these judicialization dimensions into a parsimonious threefold categorisation of DSMs:

- Diplomatic DSMs – like intergovernmental committees – function predominantly according to a political logic. They come with no or limited and narrow delegation of dispute resolution to third parties and states retain control over access to dispute resolution, working procedures and decision-making of DSMs.
- Quasi-judicial DSMs – like ISDS tribunals or GATT panels – function according to a predominantly legal logic. They offer largely unconditional access to ad hoc third-party adjudication for state or non-state actors. They operate according to legal predefined working procedures and states retain limited control over decision-making mostly in the form of annulment procedures.
- Judicial DSMs – like the DSB or European Court of Justice – also function according to a legal logic. They enjoy compulsory jurisdiction with automatic access to institutionalised third-party adjudication and a high degree of permanency, administrative and resource autonomy in the form of multiannual budgets and long-term mandates for adjudicators. States have no say over working procedures and decision-making apart from collective management and reforms in concertation with other states.

Why do states at times create diplomatic, quasi-judicial or judicial DSMs? A sizeable literature engages with this question. Most studies tie in with the rational design school (Koremenos, 2016) and suggest that states select a degree of judicialization in view of the collective action problems, anticipated sovereignty costs and cooperative gains in a given situation (Allee and Elsig, 2016; Chase et al., 2013; Davis, 2015; Jo and Namgung, 2012; McCall Smith, 2000; Sweet, 2004; Poulsen, 2020; Zangl, 2008). Other studies ignore the design stage and focus on the diverging success of DSMs to engage in judicial activism (Alter, 2009, 2014; Barfield, 2001; Sweet, 2004). A third strand of research, in turn, adopts a bottom-up approach and argues that differences in DSM usage and ‘rights-claiming’ cause variation in judicialization (Alter et al., 2019). Finally, research on feedback politics argues that variation in judicialization is the result of path dependence (Abebe and Ginsburg, 2019; Alter, 2009; Alter et al., 2019). DSM jurisprudence is seen to mobilise domestic actors at times in support but typically against DSMs demanding de-judicialization thus returning issues to domestic regulatory control.

Remarkably, these explanations share the assumption that judicialization and regulatory space are two sides of the same coin. High judicialization – either as rational design choice, product of judicial activism, rights-claiming or feedback politics – is seen to limit states’ regulatory space while low judicialization is assumed to preserve it. This claim is conceptually underspecified. The concept of judicialization should not get conflated with state perceptions of regulatory space under DSMs. This assessment becomes clear when contrasting it with the concept of agent autonomy of Principal-Agent models (Pollack, 2003). Agent autonomy denotes the range of possible independent action available to agents like DSMs and depends on 1) the extent of powers delegated to agents and 2) ex ante and ex post control mechanisms to monitor and sanction agents (Pollack, 2003, pp. 39–47). Most judicialization research focuses on delegated powers to DSMs but ignores ex ante and ex post control mechanisms (see Chase et al., 2013; De Bièvre et al., 2014; Jo and Namgung, 2012; McCall Smith, 2000). Non-delegation, ad hoc delegation or permanent delegation are modelled as key proxies for judicialization, DSM autonomy and thus states’ regulatory space. DSM autonomy and states’ regulatory space are thus seen to flow from the ease of states to ‘recontract’ with DSMs (Posner and Yoo, 2005). Some studies adopt a more nuanced approach and extend the analysis to certain ex ante and ex post control mechanisms such as appointment

procedures or vetoes over dispute initiation (Elsig and Pollack, 2014; McCall Smith, 2000; Zangl, 2008). While these studies offer a more accurate picture, they again do not fully capture DSM autonomy and regulatory space.

Manifold subtle and overlooked dynamics shape DSM autonomy and states' regulatory space. Alter (2008) cautions in that regard that certain DSMs are trustees rather than agents. They are entrusted to protect the rights of third-parties like citizens, traders or investors against transgressions of contracting states and thus draw their authority and legitimacy from their reputation among these beneficiaries. This legitimation chain constrains DSM autonomy yet is ignored in most studies. Helfer and Slaughter (2005, p. 844), further, identify several formal and informal, legal and political dynamics that constrain DSM autonomy and affect states' regulatory space. They highlight that inter alia precision of substantive norms, prescribed legal interpretation techniques, reputational concerns of DSMs among peer institutions and the broader legal community as well as informal coordination practices with stakeholders may affect DSM autonomy and states' regulatory space. Alter and Helfer (2017) indeed note that the Andean Tribunal of Justice curtails states' regulatory space less than the European Court of Justice despite their almost identical designs. Judicialization, regulatory space and state perceptions of regulatory space thus do not stand in a negative relationship. Highly judicialized DSMs may be subject to greater constraints on their autonomy than less judicialized DSMs and vice versa.

This insight helps to explain the puzzling observation that the USA and the EU, in their pursuit of increasing regulatory space in the international trade and investment regimes, favour de-judicialization, on the one hand, and judicialization of the relevant DSMs, on the other. This triggers an important follow-up question: Why do states sometimes favour de-judicialization or judicialization to consolidate their regulatory space? The following section addresses this question and makes the argument that diverging conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions play a crucial but often ignored role.

III. Diverging conceptions of legitimate international law and judicialization trajectories

Conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions are elusive yet powerful factors shaping international affairs. In Western thinking, legitimacy is understood as the acceptance of the exercise of public authority through the governed (Tallberg and Zürn, 2019, pp. 285–6). In other words, legal and political regimes and institutions are legitimate, if the individuals and entities governed by these regimes and institutions perceive them as rightful and appropriate. In the absence of a global government with coercive powers, the effectiveness of international law and institutions depends on their legitimacy and states' willingness to comply (Tallberg and Zürn, 2019, p. 585)

The legitimacy of international law and institutions rests on their performance and institutional design (Tallberg and Zürn, 2019, p. 590). State consent (input) is traditionally the key source of legitimacy for international law and institutions. Adequate outcomes (output) for states and other stakeholders are a second important legitimacy source. Finally, transparent, accountable and fair procedures (throughput) to govern the exercise of international law and institutions is increasingly perceived as important for legitimation. The need for 'good governance' arises, as international public authority increasingly complements domestic public authority, which is subject to 'good governance' standards in many societies.

States' conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions are subjective and evolve over time. Differences result from two dynamics. First, states have different understandings of what exactly constitutes legitimate consent (input), adequate outcomes (output), fair, lawful and inclusive governance procedures (throughput). Second, states attach different importance to these distinct sources of legitimacy. Ultimately though, these differences in appreciation are socially constructed and rooted in national culture, history and power. As Byers and Nolte (2003) suggest, state experiences with economic and geopolitical power and indeed

hegemony play an important role in shaping national conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions. Hegemonic powers, which control unrivalled military capacity, access to globally dominant markets and financial systems, enjoy cultural and ideational leadership and control critical resources and technologies, are unchallenged in their capacity to coerce and impose their preferences on the international system. State power thus determines whether states perceive international law and institutions as constraint; or as protection against coercion. Power and legitimacy notions are intertwined though not identical. The relationship between power and states' conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions is subtle. Changes in state power do not automatically and instantaneously affect states' conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions requiring the treatment of power and legitimacy concepts as distinct factors.

How do diverging conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions acquire causal effect and shape DSM judicialization? From the perspective of social sciences, states' conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions are in essence 'ideas' about the consensual exercise of international public authority. Ideas are inter-subjective beliefs and norms embedded in society, markets, state bureaucracies, political, legal and regulatory systems. They acquire causal effect as 'cognitive instruction sheets' (Blyth, 2003) through which individuals and groups interpret materialist structures around them and develop preferences, strategies and actions to navigate and shape them to their advantage. Materialist structures are indeed often insufficient to account for interests, preferences and actions. Ideational research has pointed to various instances where social agents faced similar material constraints and options yet developed different preferences and actions due to their different ideational mindsets (see Blyth, 2003, pp. 698–99). Ideas, in other words, determine what individuals, groups or even states come to perceive as their 'rational' interest and how to 'rationally' pursue these interests in a given context. From this perspective, states' conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions function as normative frameworks to assess DSMs and to develop reform agendas. In a first step, states evaluate whether a DSM that has acquired political salience – typically due to controversial jurisprudence impinging on states' regulatory space – still meets their thresholds for input, output and throughput legitimacy and commands a 'moral duty to obey' or appears illegitimate and/or in need of reforms. In a second step, states may then develop priorities on how to reform DSMs so as to consolidate their regulatory space in line with their conception of legitimate international law and DSMs.

To clarify this argument, it is helpful to discuss US and European legal philosophies and conceptions of legitimate international law and institution. It is important to note here that these conceptions are not static but evolve over time and fluctuate around baseline conceptions across political and national administrations. They implicitly contain ideal-type conceptions of DSMs that serve as normative frameworks to assess DSMs and to develop reform preferences. Legal scholars suggest that the USA sees international law and institutions as intergovernmental contracts that states jointly create and manage in line with their interests (Bradford and Posner, 2011; Byers and Nolte, 2003; Petersmann, 2019). The legitimacy of international law and institutions predominantly flows from state consent (input) and state satisfaction (output). This conception implies that international law and institutions are 'weak' in that they are state instruments and must not take on a life on their own. International law and institutions, from the US perspective, cannot evolve and expand their authority yet remain legitimate as it implies a loss in state control and consent. Scholars, furthermore, observe that the USA adheres to 'legal exceptionalism'. The USA, as Bradford and Posner (2011, p. 8) suggest, sees itself as global hegemon. As hegemon, the USA claims moral and legal leadership and expects that other countries follow US interpretations of international law. The USA, in turn, cannot be expected to adjust to third country interpretations that run counter US values and interests. In case of persistent reticence of third countries to endorse US interpretations, the USA must seek exemptions or – in the eyes of third countries – at times use its power to breach international law. This 'legal exceptionalism' is not unique to the USA but a common feature of hegemonic powers throughout history. In sum, the USA adheres to a highly state-centric contractual conception of legitimate international law and institutions. How pronounced this intergovernmental vision and contractual conception of international law and institutions is varies within margins over time and across presidencies.

European legal philosophy and its conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions, in turn, adopt a Kantian perspective (Petersmann, 2019; Weiler, 1997). International law and institutions are seen to form a novel 'quasi-constitutional' order of universal acclaim based on multilateralism. This order confers rights and obligations on people and states alike. It draws its legitimacy not only from state consent (input) and satisfaction (output) but – more broadly – from societal support and satisfaction. As it thereby constitutes a source of public authority, which is in part independent of states, it may evolve and expand its reach without state consent. This normative independence implies that international law and institutions can be 'strong' yet require throughput legitimation. As domestic public authority must comply with standards of 'good governance' to legitimise its extensive powers in-between elections, international public authority must legitimise its powers through appropriate governance institutions and procedures in the absence of uninterrupted state consent. Nowhere does this European legal philosophy manifest itself more clearly than in the evolution of the European legal order itself. As Joseph Weiler (1997) argued, the European legal order transformed over time from a classic international law regime into an autonomous supranational constitutional order, which confers rights and obligations on European citizens and Member States alike and governs itself through novel transnational institutions and procedures. Yet, as recent developments in the EU demonstrate, the prevalence of this quasi-constitutional vision of international law and institutions changes over time and across Member States.

What do these diverging legal philosophies and conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions imply for state preferences on DSM reform and judicialization trajectories? First, the conceptions differ over the desirable strength of international law and DSMs. Whereas the US perspective best accommodates weak DSMs with limited authority over states, the European perspective accommodates strong DSMs with extensive authority over states as legitimate. States' preferences for limiting or preserving their regulatory space is thus at least partly endogenous to their legal philosophies. Second, the conceptions differ over the key sources of DSM legitimation and steer reform efforts toward different institutional properties of contested DSMs. The US perspective sees input and output legitimation through state consent and satisfaction as core property of legitimate DSM authority. The USA should thus evaluate contested DSMs and develop institutional reform strategies through these very lenses. US efforts to regain regulatory space and address legitimacy gaps of contested DSMs, in other words, should focus on regressing permanent to ad hoc or even non-delegation of dispute resolution to strengthen input and output legitimation. Similarly, the US may seek to weaken the legal logic and working principles of contested DSMs and instead amplify the diplomatic nature of dispute resolution procedures. These efforts amount to a de-judicialization and re-politicization of DSMs in that they devolve for instance judicialized DSMs into quasi-judicialized or diplomatic DSMs. The European perspective, in turn, sees DSMs as part of a global governance system whose legitimacy flows from state and broad societal consent and satisfaction, accountable, transparent and fair processes and institutions. Europeans evaluate the legitimacy and performance of contested DSMs with a much stronger emphasis on throughput legitimation. European reform preferences and efforts to consolidate states' regulatory space naturally focus more on strengthening the public interest by ensuring greater transparency, accountability and fairness of DSM institutions and procedures. These efforts amplify the legal logic of dispute resolution procedures, likely increase delegation and limit the role of diplomatic considerations and actors. Reforms focused on strengthening throughput legitimation are thus likely to amount to an increase in DSM judicialization.

The previous sections developed two theoretical claims in relation to existing judicialization and international institutions scholarship. These claims are summarised below in two hypotheses. Plausible alternative explanations are enshrined in corresponding counter-hypotheses.

- **H₁:** Judicialization and state perceptions of regulatory space do not stand in a negative relationship. If states seek to increase their regulatory space, they can pursue this through de-judicialization and judicialization alike.

- **C₁:** Judicialization and state perceptions of regulatory space stand in a negative relationship. If states seek to increase their regulatory space, they must reduce the judicialization of DSMs.
- **H₂:** US and EU preferences to consolidate regulatory space in the international trade and investment regimes through either de-judicialization or judicialization largely reflect conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions.
- **C₂:** References to diverging conceptions of legitimate international law and institutions are rhetorical tools to cloak material interests. US and EU preferences to consolidate their regulatory space in the international trade and investment regimes through de-judicialization or judicialization echo their satisfaction with DSM jurisprudence and/or material societal interests.

IV. Research design and operationalization

How to empirically test the hypotheses and counter-hypotheses? The article focuses on US and EU efforts to reform the DSMs of the international trade and investment regime. These regimes overlap in many regards (Kurtz, 2016), which limits noise and facilitates comparative analysis. Furthermore, their DSMs qualify as significant and hard cases. They resolve disputes of great political, economic and financial salience. If legitimacy considerations come to the fore even in domains of strong materialist struggles, they should play a prominent role also in other regimes. The focus on US and EU preferences, in turn, reflects their role as global economic powers. Again, if US and EU preferences reflect legitimacy considerations despite their ability to resort to power politics, then they should also shape preferences of weaker states.

To underpin the validity of hypothesis H₁ and refute corresponding counter-hypothesis C₁, it is necessary to identify an instance where states seek to regain regulatory space yet push for judicialization. The article produces this evidence at the example of EU efforts to reform ISDS. It is important to note that H₁ and C₁ focus on states' anticipated reform impacts on their regulatory space rather than actual variation in regulatory space pre- and post-reform. This approach is standard in research on institutional and DSM design and reform.

Testing hypothesis H₂ and counter-hypothesis C₂ poses greater challenges. Conceptions of international law and institutions – as all 'ideas' – pose the epistemological problem that their effects on preferences and actions are not directly observable. The article carries out four tests to overcome this challenge: First, it seeks to assess the prevalence of legitimacy considerations in policy narratives on reform efforts. If legitimacy considerations are prevalent in narratives, it is more likely that they shape policy. The analysis focuses inter alia on communications in the WTO and UNCITRAL working groups during the last decade from the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) and the Directorate-General (DG) for Trade of the European Commission, which are responsible for trade and investment policies. Second, it briefly evaluates consistency of state preferences and narratives across policy domains. If they are consistent, it increases confidence in their causal significance. Third, – to scrutinise the validity of C₂ – it evaluates the performance of the US and EU under the WTO DSB and ISDS. The judicialization literature stipulates that states pursue the de-judicialization of DSMs, if DSM jurisprudence is biased against them and frustrates state interests. If, however, states perform on or above average under DSMs in comparison to third countries, DSM jurisprudence can be seen to advance state interests. Hence, other factors including legitimacy considerations are more likely to fuel reform efforts. Logistic regressions based on WTO DSB statistics (WTO, 2021) and UNCTAD ISDS statistics (2021) are run to evaluate whether the USA and the EU won, lost or settled statistically significantly more or less disputes than third countries. The purpose of these regressions is to assess whether it is possible to reject the null hypotheses as implied in the judicialization literature or whether variation in descriptive statistics amounts to noise. Last, it builds on research on the impact of DSM judicialization on societal preferences and mobilisation (Goldstein and Martin, 2000; Poletti and De Bièvre, 2016) to evaluate the role of societal interests and lobbying in US and EU reform efforts. If powerful

societal interest groups push for reform efforts to advance private material interests, it supports C_2 and decreases confidence in H_2 . It needs mentioning that the two tests of C_2 also echo the widely-held assumption enshrined in C_1 that judicialization and state perceptions of regulatory space stand in a negative relationship. Rejecting C_2 should thus increase the explanatory leverage of both H_2 and H_1 .

V. WTO reform and legitimacy

The WTO – and its predecessor the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) – have been the cornerstone of the international trade regime since 1948. The GATT/WTO provides a forum for multilateral negotiations on market access and trade rules as well as a mechanism to resolve disputes among its 164 members. The DSM of the GATT/WTO has been playing a key role in managing the rules-based international trade regime. It dealt with 136 disputes during the GATT era (1947-1994) and almost 600 disputes during the WTO era (1995-today).

Pre-reform judicialization: The WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) qualifies as judicial DSM. It is a permanent DSM with compulsory jurisdiction, clearly defined legalistic operational procedures and minimal state influence on decision-making. As laid out in the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU), it has a permanent institutional setup, its own staff and resources and draws on detailed operational procedures, which govern access and decision-making. In a first step, states can after compulsory mediation request the constitution of a panel of three adjudicators – selected from a roster of experienced diplomats and academics – to rule on a matter within six months. Unless WTO members unanimously reject the panel report, the DSB automatically adopts it within 60 days. If a disputing party appeals, the report is sent to the Appellate Body (AB). The AB is a standing international court that counts seven full-time judges and assesses panel reports in the light of legal consistency. AB judges are vetted and appointed by WTO members for a four-year term renewable once. To take decisions, the AB must count at least three judges. The AB is meant to decide appeals within 60 days yet not more than 90 days. The AB report is automatically adopted unless WTO member unanimously reject it. Following the adoption of a panel or AB report, states found in breach of WTO commitments have time to bring contested measures into compliance before the WTO can authorise retaliation tariffs.

US de-judicialization efforts: The USA has grown highly critical of the WTO DSB and notably the AB in recent years. Initially, however, the USA was the main proponent of a limited judicialization of its precursor the GATT DSM (De Bièvre, 2017). During the Uruguay Round negotiations (1986-1994), it pushed for the elimination of the veto of defendant states to block the initiation of dispute resolution procedures (Elsig and Eckhardt, 2015, pp. 25–26). Other states – including Canada, Japan and the EU – were hesitant but agreed to compulsory jurisdiction under the condition to establish a permanent AB to rectify potentially flawed panel reports. The USA unwillingly accepted this compromise. In the early 2000s, the Bush and Obama administrations started calling for a DSB reform voicing frustration with the jurisprudence of the AB (USTR, 2018, p. 23). The Obama administration repeatedly vetoed re-appointments of AB judges, who it deemed responsible for misjudgements. In 2016, the Trump administration then intensified US complaints and started vetoing the appointment of any new AB judge. On 11 December 2019, as the term of several AB judges came to an end, the AB lost its minimum quorum to hear new appeals. The new Biden administration has so far only signalled that it shares the concerns of previous US administrations, will not agree to the nomination of new AB judges and demands AB reforms. While the US has not presented concrete reform proposals, its actions have immediate implications for WTO dispute resolution and can be considered as de facto reform. They paralyse the AB and DSB and force WTO members to resort to less judicialized dispute resolution mechanisms (see Pauwelyn, 2019).

- Disputing states might use ‘floating’ panel reports to diplomatically resolve their disagreements. After a panel has released its report, states may request the suspension of the proceedings, which prevents the formal adoption, appeals and implementation of a report. Like under the GATT, WTO dispute

resolution would transform from a judicial into a diplomatic or quasi-judicial DSM. States would use a panel report as an expert opinion to inform diplomatic negotiations. Former US Trade Representative Lightizer suggested that this was his preferred option (Pauwelyn, 2019, p. 315).

- Disputing states unsatisfied with first-instance panel reports may appeal 'into the void' knowing that the AB must not hear the case. The panel report would disappear in a procedural 'black hole'. WTO dispute resolution would again regress to a diplomatic DSM.
- Disputing states might formally agree that first-instance panel reports are final. The DSB would get diminished to ad hoc panels with no permanent second instance and tenured judges turning it into a quasi-judicial DSM.
- Disputing states can agree to use ad hoc arbitration under Art. 25 DSU to resolve appeals. In case first-instance panel reports are not satisfactory, parties could agree to 'appeal' to arbitration tribunals. Appellate decisions of these arbitration tribunals are only notified to the DSB but fully enforceable *inter alia* through retaliation (Pauwelyn, 2019, p. 313). The EU in particular champions this solution and has been promoting a Multi-Party Interims Appeal Arrangement (MPIA), which counts 24 signatories as of April 2021 and emulates the AB in terms of procedures and adjudicators. While this solution maintains judicial dispute resolution, it hinges on state consent.
- Disputing states can resort to bilateral DSMs under FTAs where possible. These DSMs exhibit lower levels of judicialization than the WTO DSB (see Chase et al., 2013). In this scenario, dispute resolution would *de facto* regress to a quasi-judicial or diplomatic DSM depending on the FTA.

Prevalence and consistency in US legitimacy considerations: The USA justifies its actions on the basis of several concerns (USTR, 2018, pp. 22–28). With regard to substance, the USA is concerned about AB jurisprudence on trade remedies. The USA holds that the AB has a flawed understanding of WTO law and unduly limits states' ability to apply trade remedies (USTR, 2018, pp. 23–24). The USA is particularly concerned with AB rulings against its practice of 'zeroing' to calculate anti-dumping duties. With regard to process, the USA is concerned that the AB disrespects its mandate and procedural rules laid down in the DSU (USTR, 2018, pp. 24–28). The USA criticises that the AB regularly exceeds the time limit of 90 days. In a similar vein, the USA laments that AB judges prolong their own terms by weeks or months to finalise appeals procedures. Further, the USA is concerned that the AB seeks to establish a doctrine of precedence and gives advisory opinions on the interpretation and application of WTO law not pertinent to concrete appeals. Finally, the USA criticises that the AB regularly engages in *de novo* reviews of facts and domestic laws of WTO members despite the fact that the DSU merely tasks the AB to correct legal mistakes in panel reports.

These substantive and procedural issues reflect deep-rooted US legitimacy concerns regarding the WTO regime. The USA sees the WTO as an intergovernmental regime and contract that is meant to serve states. Petersmann (2019, p. 510) notes that this contractual conception precludes a dynamic evolution of WTO law and principles through argumentative and judicial practice. The WTO's authority and legitimacy are seen to flow exclusively from state consent (input). Hence, WTO law and jurisprudence must not acquire autonomy and develop without state consent. US concerns regarding substance and process of AB jurisprudence are thus fundamentally objections to the growing autonomy of the AB in particular and WTO regime in general. It curtails state control and sovereignty and arguably distorts the intergovernmental nature of the WTO regime. US actions aim to redress this problem through augmented state control and de-judicialization. Countless official US statements on the DSB published since the early 2000s and all statements published after 2016 emphasise this fundamental US concern about the legitimacy gap and constitutional 'mutation' of the WTO regime. The following quote of the US representative to the WTO summarises the US position: "...for more than 15 years and across multiple

US Administrations, the United States had been raising serious concerns with the Appellate Body's disregard for the rules set by WTO Members. Through persistent overreaching, the WTO Appellate Body had been adding obligations that had never been agreed by the United States ... when the Appellate Body abused the authority it had been given..., it undermined the legitimacy of the system and damaged the interests of all WTO Members who cared about having the agreements respected as they had been negotiated and agreed..." (WTO, 2019b, p. 17).

These concerns, moreover, are bipartisan. Prominent republicans and democrats – including incoming USTR Tai, former USTR Lightizer (CFR, 2007), interim USTR Stephen Vaughn (Keynes and Bown, 2019, pp. 12–13) and past USTRs Ron Kirk and Mikey Kantor (Alter, 2008, p. 49) – have persistently criticised the AB for illegitimate judicial overreach whilst in government and opposition. US critique of the WTO AB is, furthermore, consistent with US positions in other international regimes. The USA has a difficult relationship with judicialized DSMs. The USA has been promoting the international rule of law yet has been opposing judicialized DSMs including the International Court of Justice, the International Criminal Court, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights or the International Tribunal of the Law of the Sea. In short, US legitimacy concerns about the DSB and WTO regime are vocal, long-standing, bipartisan and consistent with US attitudes in other regimes.

Assessing alternative explanations: US statements justifying its actions through legitimacy considerations may cloak material interests. Judicialization scholarship suggests that US actions could be a response to adverse DSB rulings (Abebe and Ginsburg, 2019; Alter et al., 2019; Elsig and Eckhardt, 2015). Adverse DSB rulings could have frustrated US interests and thus eroded political support. It is a challenging task to assess whether the DSB has overall ruled in favour or against the USA. One approach – employed for instance by Elsig and Eckhardt (2015) – is to take stock of how often the DSB ruled in favour of the USA as claimant and how often it fully exonerated the US as defendant in comparison to the other WTO members. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the USA, the EU and other WTO members (grouped together). It draws on WTO classifications of dispute outcomes in conjunction with substantive analyses of panel reports to classify disputes as won, settled or lost. It points to some variation in DSB performances. But are these differences statistically significant? Logistical regressions on the basis of 333 concluded WTO DSB proceedings (WTO, 2021) using defendant/complainant states as independent variable and winning/non-winning as dependant variables help to scrutinise the null hypothesis. They suggest that the USA acting as complainant does not statistically significantly win fewer cases than other WTO members (Table 2, model 1). The USA acting as defendant, however, does statistically significantly win more cases (Table 2, model 4) and is furthermore less likely to settle than other WTO members (see annexe: Table 7, model 4) pointing to power preponderance effects (Sattler and Bernauer, 2011). The marginal effects on predicted probabilities suggest that the US as defendant is 13% more likely to win and 17% less likely to settle than other WTO members. Overall, these findings go against claims of an anti-US bias. Johanneson and Mavroidis (2017, p. 37) offer a more fine-grained legal analysis. They disaggregate panel and AB reports in view of distinct legal claims made by parties. They find that panels and the AB ruled in favour of almost 70% of the claims made by the USA and EU as complainants and almost 40% of their claims as defendants. Other WTO members were less successful in defending legal claims.

Table 1: DSB performance of US, EU and WTO average (1995-2021)

		Number of cases	Number of DSB decisions	Won disputes	Settled disputes	Lost disputes
Defendant	USA	155	89	17 (19%)	16 (18%)	56 (63%)
	EU	102	62	4 (6%)	26 (42%)	32 (52%)
	Other WTO members	339	182	11 (6%)	60 (33%)	111 (61%)
Complainant	USA	118	73	40 (55%)	27 (37%)	6 (8%)
	EU	105	58	38 (66%)	14 (24%)	6 (10%)
	Other WTO members	373	202	121 (60%)	61 (30%)	20 (10%)

Source: WTO (2021), author's own calculation.

Table 2: Logistic regression of US, EU and WTO average performance under WTO DSB

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>					
	<i>Complainant won</i>			<i>Defendant won</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
USA complainant	-0.261 (0.267)					
EU complainant		0.297 (0.302)				
Other complainant			0.015 (0.229)			
USA defendant				1.282*** (0.379)		
EU defendant					-0.513 (0.554)	
Other defendant						-0.921** (0.390)
Constant	-0.454*** (0.127)	0.345 *** (0.122)	0.386 *** (0.178)	-2.726*** (0.267)	-2.161*** (0.196)	-1.823 *** (0.235)
Marginal effect on predicted probability	-0.06	0.06	0.00	0.13	-0.03	-0.07
Observations	333	333	333	333	333	333

Source: WTO (2021), author's own calculation.

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

These evaluations, nonetheless, overlook differences in the political salience and economic value of disputes. Certain disputes are more important than others, which implies that dispute settlement statistics may not fully capture states' perceptions of their DSB performances. Scholars, however, suspect the DSB to benefit the interests of major economic powers – such as the USA – rather than developing and least developed countries. A vast literature reports that the DSB does not erode but preserves and even amplifies power asymmetries among WTO members (see Sattler and Bernauer, 2011). Schott and Jung (2019) for instance argue that the DSB generally ruled in favour of the USA in salient disputes with China. Davis (2016), further, finds that the USA was more successful in removing trade hurdles in third countries through the DSB than through alternative political channels. In sum, one cannot substantiate the alternative explanation that DSB jurisprudence is manifestly biased against the USA thus fuelling de-judicialization efforts.

A second alternative explanation is that powerful domestic interest groups have captured US policy-making and account for US actions. Scholars theorise that high degrees of judicialization may trigger societal backlashes against international regimes and DSMs (Abebe and Ginsburg, 2019; Alter 2014). Judicialized DSMs are seen to provide more and better information on the redistributive effects of regimes and to reconfigure redistributive conflicts in society (Goldstein and Martin, 2000; Poletti and De Bièvre, 2016). With regard to the WTO, Poletti and De Bièvre (2016, pp. 99-109) observe that judicialization encourages narrow sectorial or product-based societal mobilisation in that the redistributive effects of DSB jurisprudence are highly concentrated. In line with these assumptions, it has been suggested that notably the US steel industry drives US policy. Historically, the US steel industry has been the main beneficiary of US trade remedies to curb import competition and maintain price levels (Congressional Research Service, 2020). Since 1995, these trade remedies – and notably the use of 'zeroing' – moreover account for 65% of all WTO disputes brought against the USA (Bown and Keynes, 2020, p. 12) and the DSB frequently ruled against the USA calling for their termination. The US steel industry thus criticised the DSB for 'illegitimate judicial overreach' unfounded in the WTO Agreements and has been

demanding DSB reforms for many years. The question then is whether US efforts to de-judicialize the DSB reflect government concerns about legitimate international law; or whether the interests of the US steel industry and its de-legitimation discourse shape US policy. Evidence is mixed and in all likelihood both – genuine legitimacy concerns and protectionist interests – are at play. US steel interests were strongly represented in the Trump administration in that the careers of many top officials were closely tied to the US steel industry (Politi, 2018). The position of the Trump administration, however, does not markedly differ from the positions of the Biden administration and previous administrations with weaker ties to the US steel industry. The Clinton, Bush and Obama administrations repeatedly flouted US steel interests through the conclusion of trade agreements resulting in employment in the US steel sector to more than half since the 1990s (Bloomberg, 2018). Nonetheless, these administrations voiced the same concerns regarding the WTO as the Trump administration. These observations suggest that US concerns about legitimate international law are long-standing and genuine yet that domestic interest groups cultivate, employ and reinforce them for their purposes.

EU re-judicialization efforts: For the sake of analytical completeness, it is important to briefly assess the EU’s position in the DSB crisis. The EU plays a reactive part in the DSB crisis and behaves in accordance with hypothesis H₂. The EU acknowledges certain US grievances yet condemns unilateral US de-judicialization efforts. It acts as leader of multilateral initiatives to temporarily replace the DSB through the MPIA and ultimately to reinstate the DSB (European Commission, 2020a; Pauwelyn, 2019). The EU invokes legitimacy considerations to justify its position and critique of the USA in the WTO. It emphasises the importance of a functioning AB for the predictable and neutral interpretation of trade rules and its commitment to multilateralism and the rule of law (European Commission, 2020b; WTO, 2019). The EU’s commitment to judicialized dispute settlement, the international rule of law and multilateralism is not unique to the WTO but cuts across international affairs (see Alter, 2014) and also comes to the fore through societal support for the EU’s re-judicialization efforts in the WTO. The EU’s position further cannot be explained through a bias of DSB jurisprudence in its favour (Tables 1, 2). The brief assessment of the EU’s position and actions thus supports hypothesis H₂ and weakens counter-hypothesis C₂.

Table 3: Summary table of theoretical predictions and empirical observations on WTO reform

Explanation	Test	Theoretical prediction	Empirical observation	Overall fit
Regulatory space and judicialization stand in no relationship (H₁)	State efforts to regain regulatory space	US & EU: efforts may result in judicialization	US: efforts result in de-judicialization of WTO DSB;	Support for C ₁ but no rejection of H ₁
Regulatory space and judicialization stand in negative relationship (C₁)		US & EU: efforts must result in de-judicialization	EU: seeks to maintain high judicialization	
Ideational explanation for de-judicialization and judicialization efforts (H₂)	Prevalence of legitimization narrative	US: Strong focus on input legitimization EU: Strong focus on throughput legitimization	Strong focus on input legitimization Strong focus on throughput legitimization	Support for H ₂
	Consistency of legitimization narrative across policy domains	US: Consistent aversion to judicialized DSMs EU: Consistent support for judicialized DSMs	Consistent aversion to judicialized DSMs Consistent support for judicialized DSMs	Support for H ₂
Materialist explanation for de-judicialization and judicialization efforts (C₂)	Jurisprudence	US: Predominantly adverse rulings EU: Predominantly favourable rulings	Minor bias in favour of US observable No bias in favour of EU observable	Challenge to C ₂
	Societal demands	US: Domestic demands for de-judicialization EU: Domestic demands for judicialization	Steel industry pushes for de-judicialization EU business supports EU re-judicialization	Support for C ₂ but no challenge to H ₂

VI. ISDS reform and legitimacy

Legitimacy consideration also play a key role in efforts to reform ISDS. Since the 1960s, states have concluded some 3500 IIAs with ISDS provisions to resolve investment disputes (Bonnitcha et al., 2017; Poulsen, 2020). States commit through IIAs to treat foreign investors in accordance with substantive post-establishment treatment and protection standards. The ISDS provisions of IIAs, in turn, enable foreign investors to seek financial compensation in case a host state breaches these standards. ISDS provisions allow investors to by-pass potentially biased courts in host countries.

Pre-reform DSM judicialization: Conventional ISDS provisions qualify as quasi-judicial DSM and are remarkably similar across IIAs (Bonnitcha et al., 2017, pp. 33–59). They foresee delegation of adjudication to ad hoc third-party arbitration tribunals. Investors and states jointly appoint arbitrators for specific disputes. Access of investors to ISDS is fairly unrestricted. IIAs mostly differ in terms of the length of mandatory consultation and cooling-off periods before investors can force the constitution of a tribunal. Most IIAs, moreover, allow the disputing parties to choose from different arbitration frameworks including the rules of International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) or the UN Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). Finally, arbitrators enjoy considerable judicial autonomy in that the vague wording of traditional IIAs provides for extensive interpretative leeway (Helfer and Slaughter, 2005, p. 945). In sum, ISDS is a quasi-judicial DSM. It functions according to a legal logic, constitutes compulsory jurisdiction with limited state control over access, operational procedures and decision-making. Yet, unlike judicial DSMs, ISDS builds on ad hoc delegation and lacks independent institutional resources and memory.

Post-reform DSM judicialization: The EU Member States invented IIAs with ISDS and were for decades their main proponents (Bonnitcha et al., 2017, pp. 33–59). In recent years though, the EU and its Member States have grown critical of conventional ISDS. In 2009, the EU Member States empowered the EU to regulate foreign direct investments (FDI) and to conclude IIAs (Basedow, 2020). The Member States largely ceased to exist as analytically distinct actors in investment policy and now speak through the EU with a common voice. So far, the EU has launched 12 negotiations on IIAs or FTAs with IIA-like chapters. Since 2012/13, these negotiations have attracted public scrutiny (Dietz et al., 2019). Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), trade unions and politicians lament that ISDS presents a threat to democracy and states' regulatory space. The European Parliament and several Member State governments thus announced to veto the ratification of treaties with conventional ISDS while other Member States initially remained silent or committed to conventional ISDS (Basedow, 2020; see also Meunier and Nicolaidis, 2006). Due to the growing public contestation as well as constraint under European law to find a common line on investment policy, all Member States ultimately supported the European Commission's proposal to replace conventional ISDS through an Investment Court System (ICS) and Multilateral Investment Court (MIC) (European Commission, 2016). The ICS serves as template for current negotiations on investment protection provisions in IIAs and FTAs (Basedow, 2020), while the MIC proposal informs the EU's position in UNCITRAL negotiations on ISDS reform (Roberts, 2018). Reformed ISDS shall ultimately resemble the WTO's DSB and AB.

- ICS: The ICS constitutes a step toward turning ISDS from a quasi-judicial into a judicial DSM. First, it foresees a higher degree of institutionalisation of dispute resolution than conventional ISDS. It creates a first instance arbitration tribunal and second instance appeals mechanism. The judges of the first instance tribunal are drawn from a roster of fifteen vetted judges with an expertise in public law, who serve for a four-year term renewable once. The equivalent roster of the appellate tribunal encompasses six judges with a non-renewable nine-year term that ensure judicial continuity and institutional permanency. Second, the ICS maintains full access of investors yet introduces procedural hurdles for investors that echo equivalent rules in national legal systems. Investors for instance cannot pursue a

claim in parallel before domestic courts and the ICS but must choose a forum. Third, the ICS increases the precision of operational procedures. It mandates the use of the UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency governing public access to hearings and the publication of dispute documents. It, moreover, requires judges to sign up to a code of conduct that curtails secondary employment to prevent conflicts of interest. Fourth, the ICS judicializes and alters decision-making dynamics. For one, the ICS comes with more precise language on substantive post-establishment and protection standards limiting the judicial autonomy of tribunals (Helfer and Slaughter, 2005, p. 945). In case first instance tribunals still advance controversial interpretations, parties can hold recourse to the ICS appeals tribunal. Finally, the ICS rectifies an in-built decision-making bias in favour of investors (Van Harten, 2007, p. 173). Under conventional ISDS, arbitrators need investors to initiate dispute resolution and to select them as adjudicators. The remuneration of arbitrators, moreover, hinges on the amount in dispute and is paid by disputing parties. Arbitrators thus face a monetary incentive to rule in favour of investors to increase demand for adjudication services. The ICS, in turn, is set up similarly to a court. Only states appoint judges to rosters, who get automatically assigned to disputes and are paid a flat-rate fee. In sum, the ICS is an attempt to better protect states' regulatory space through judicialization.

- MIC: The EU's MIC proposal builds on the ICS in that it constitutes the corresponding long-term vision for the creation of a standing global investment court within the UN (European Commission, 2016). UNCITRAL members indeed launched discussions to identify needs for ISDS reform in 2017. Since 2019, these discussions have zeroed in on reform options including the creation of a global court. The EU has outlined its conceptions for a court, which echoes the ICS yet aims for an open multilateral treaty. The MIC – like the ICS – seeks to consolidate states' regulatory space through judicialization. Observers suggest that dispute resolution in the international investment regime is likely to be bifurcated in the future with some states further relying on conventional ISDS, others joining a MIC and yet others withdrawing from investment arbitration (Roberts, 2018).

Prevalence and consistency of EU legitimacy considerations: Scholarship concurs that legitimacy considerations play a preeminent role in EU judicialization efforts (see Dietz et al., 2019; Roberts, 2018). EU policy-makers from the European Commission, the European Parliament, the Council of Ministers and Member State governments persistently stress that the ICS and MIC proposals respond to civil society concerns that conventional ISDS unduly limits states' regulatory space and lacks legitimacy to scrutinise public policy measures (see UNCITRAL, 2021). The European Commission (2019) for instance stated “... to ensure the highest standards of legitimacy, transparency and neutrality, the EU has been promoting since 2015 a reformed approach to investment dispute settlement both in bilateral and multilateral investment agreements...” and added that “... [the ICS] seeks to strike a balance between protecting investors in a transparent manner and safeguarding a state's right to regulate to pursue public policy objectives”. Hundreds of almost identical statements have come from the European Parliament and Member State governments (Dietz et al., 2019; European Commission, 2018; European Parliament, 2015). They emphasize that EU judicialization efforts seek to increase the transparency and accountability of investment dispute resolution and thereby aim at increasing its throughput legitimacy and protecting states' regulatory space. Recent EU trade and investment agreements contain similar statements linking ICS provisions to legitimacy and regulatory space (see CETA Art. 8.9§1).

These observations confirm H_1 in that the EU promotes an increase in DSM judicialization to inter alia consolidate its regulatory space. They challenge conventional views of judicialization scholarship enshrined in C_1 that states must seek the de-judicialization of DSMs to regain regulatory space. This finding underscores the argument developed in previous sections that the concepts of judicialization and regulatory space should not get conflated.

The EU's judicialization efforts in the international investment regime are further consistent with EU preferences and narratives in other domains of international affairs. As discussed above, the EU is critical of US actions in the

WTO and leads efforts to re-judicialize the WTO DSB. Beyond global trade governance, the EU and its Member States are, furthermore, keen promoters and supporters of a legalization and judicialization of international affairs and dispute resolution inter alia in Human Rights law, international criminal law, international maritime law and alike (Alter, 2014). Unlike the USA, the EU and its Member States have subjected themselves to a large number of international courts. European support for international judicialization seems anchored in the EU's political identity as transnational constitutional order (Weiler, 1997). In sum, legitimacy considerations are prevalent in the EU's justifications for judicialization efforts and consistent with EU actions in other domains of international affairs, which lends support to hypothesis H₂.

Assessing alternative explanations: Are EU legitimacy concerns eventually only a cover for material interests? Judicialization scholarship (Abebe and Ginsburg, 2019; Alter et al., 2019) implies that the EU should seek increased judicialization of ISDS, if ISDS tribunals overall rule in its favour and advance European interests. Table 4 presents descriptive statistics for the EU including its Member States and the UK, the USA and the rest of the world. It draws on UNCTAD's official classification of dispute outcomes (UNCTAD, 2021). To assess whether differences in performance across these actors are statistically significant, logistic regressions on the basis of 574 concluded ISDS proceedings (UNCTAD, 2021) are carried out. The respondent/home state serves as independent variable while winning/non-winning serves as dependent variable. The results paint a mixed picture. They suggest that ISDS advances notably the defensive interests of the USA and to a lesser degree of the EU. While third countries are statistically significantly less likely to win arbitration, the EU and notably the USA are significantly more likely to win (Table 5, models 1, 2, 3). The marginal effects on the predicted probability to win arbitration amount to 16% for the EU but 32% for the USA. Home states, in turn, have no statistically significant effect on the likelihood of investors to win (Table 5, models 4, 5, 8). It follows that the USA – rather than the EU – should propel ISDS judicialization thus challenging C₂.

Table 4: ISDS performance of US, EU and Rest of World (1987-2021)

		Number of known investment disputes	Number of investment disputes with known outcomes	Won disputes	Settled disputes	Lost disputes	Neutral ruling
Respondent state	USA	17	14	10 (71%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EU, Member States and UK	238	127	67 (53%)	16 (12%)	39 (31%)	5 (4%)
	Rest of World	728	433	153 (36%)	119 (27%)	152 (35%)	9 (2%)
Home state of complainant	USA	178	114	38 (33%)	26 (23%)	48 (42%)	2 (2%)
	EU, Member States and UK	533	327	110 (33%)	83 (26%)	125 (38%)	9 (3%)
	Rest of World	307	151	50 (33%)	35 (23%)	62 (41%)	4 (3%)

Source: UNCTAD (2021), author's own calculations. Note: investors may have several home states, which inflates the count of disputes per home state.

Table 5: Logistic regression of EU, US and Rest of World performance under ISDS

<i>Dependent variable:</i>						
<i>State won dispute</i>						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
USA respondent	1.352** (0.598)					
EU/UK respondent		0.666*** (0.203)				
Other respondent			-0.789*** (0.197)			
USA home state				0.105 (0.212)		
EU/UK home state					-0.178 (0.172)	
Other home state						0.056 (0.193)
Constant	-0.435*** (0.087)	-0.555 *** (0.098)	0.185 (0.169)	-0.424*** (0.095)	-0.302*** (0.129)	-0.417 *** (0.099)
Marginal effect on predicted probability	0.32	0.16	-0.19	0.02	-0.04	0.01
Observations	574	574	574	574	574	574

Source: UNCTAD (2021), author's own calculation. Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

A second alternative explanation points to domestic interest groups lobbying for judicialization to advance their material interests. Poletti and De Bièvre (2016, pp. 33-37) indeed demonstrate that judicialization may mobilise liberal interest groups and fuel lobbying for additional integration and judicialization. Their work implies that European multinational corporations and associations could have lobbied for the ICS and MIC projects to improve the protection of their investments abroad. While a detailed assessment of lobbying in EU international investment policy exceeds the scope of this study, a brief stocktaking of lobbying patterns in the EU casts doubts over this explanation. Studies suggests that European multinational corporations and associations generally showed limited interest in EU IIAs and ISDS and only got involved in the policy-making debate once civil society started successfully mobilising notably against the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and its ISDS provisions in 2013/14 (Basedow, 2020). Civil society raised legitimacy concerns and warned of detrimental impacts on democracy and rule of law (see European Commission, 2015). The European Commission developed its ICS and MIC proposals indeed largely in response to mounting opposition from civil society, the European Parliament and certain Member States to conventional ISDS (Dietz et al., 2019). It was in this context that European multinational corporations and associations saw the need to publicly endorse EU judicialization efforts to safeguard some form of investment protection. European business thus did not propel EU judicialization efforts, but legitimacy concerns in civil society triggered ISDS reforms.

US de-judicialization efforts: The USA behaves in line with expectations enshrined in H₂. It opposes the EU's judicialization efforts in UNCITRAL. Its position recently hardened by advocating a de-judicialization of ISDS and return to diplomatic dispute resolution (USTR, 2018) and significantly scaled back ISDS in the United States Mexico Canada Agreement. As assessed above (Tables 4, 5), the performance of the USA under conventional ISDS cannot explain its de-judicialization efforts in that the USA performed better than others. The USA justifies its position through protectionist considerations and its scepticism vis-à-vis judicial dispute resolution and legalisation of global governance. Former USTR Lightizer explained in congressional hearings that ISDS promoted off-shoring hurting parts of the US economy and undermined US sovereignty and regulatory space (Lester, 2018). These justifications suggest that the US position reflects both materialist interests and long-standing genuine legitimacy considerations.

Table 6: Summary table of theoretical predictions and empirical observations on ISDS reform

Hypotheses	Test	Theoretical prediction	Empirical observation	Overall fit
Regulatory space and judicialization stand in no relationship (H₁)	State efforts to regain regulatory space	US & EU: efforts may result in judicialization	US: efforts result in de-judicialization;	Support for H ₁ and rejection of C ₁
Regulatory space and judicialization stand in negative relationship (C₁)		US & EU: efforts must result in de-judicialization	EU: efforts aim at judicialization	
Ideational explanation for de-judicialization and judicialization efforts (H₂)	Prevalence of legitimization narrative	US: Strong focus on input legitimization	Strong focus on input legitimization	Support for H ₂
		EU: Strong focus on throughput legitimization	Strong focus on throughput legitimization	
	Consistency of legitimization narrative across policy domains	US: Consistent aversion to judicialized DSMs	Consistent aversion to judicialized DSMs	Support for H ₂
		EU: Consistent support for judicialized DSMs	Consistent support for judicialized DSMs	
Materialist explanation for de-judicialization and judicialization efforts (C₂)	Jurisprudence	US: Predominantly adverse rulings	Strong bias in favour of US observable	Challenge to C ₂
		EU: Predominantly favourable rulings	Minor bias in favour of EU observable	
	Societal demands	US: Domestic demands for de-judicialization	Marginal domestic mobilisation	Challenge to C ₂
		EU: Domestic demands for judicialization	Civil society demands de-judicialization	

VII. Conclusion

This article contributes to judicialization research in two regards. First, it cautions that judicialization and state perceptions of regulatory space are not conceptual flipsides as often assumed in judicialization research. States may pursue the consolidation of their regulatory space by pushing for de-judicialization and judicialization of DSMs alike (H₁). Second, it cautions that states' choice of de-judicialization or judicialization of DSMs to consolidate regulatory space depends to a large extent on their conception of legitimate international law and institutions (H₂). Depending on their legal philosophies, they are likely to pursue the consolidation of their regulatory space either through greater control over delegation or the strengthening of throughput legitimization through notably transparency and accountability mechanisms.

What are the broader implications of this study? It sharpens our understanding of the phenomenon of judicialization and highlights the importance of ideational factors – in addition to materialist factors – behind states' choices of international institutional and DSM designs. While legitimacy considerations and legal philosophies play an important role in debates on domestic legal systems, comparatively little attention has been afforded to these questions in research on international law and DSMs. It further improves our empirical understanding of US actions in the WTO and EU efforts to build a multilateral investment court. Media and policy commentary mostly focuses on daily quibbles and overlooks structural forces and long-term tendencies. Finally, the article follows in the footsteps of legal scholarship in that it studies the international trade and investment regime from a comparative perspective (Kurtz, 2016). Trade and investment are inextricably linked economic phenomena and their regimes interact, overlap and converge in regulatory scope, actors and disputes. Political science research stands to gain new insights from studying commonalities and differences of these twin regimes.

VIII. Bibliography

- Abebe, D., Ginsburg, T., 2019. The Dejudicialization of International Politics? *Int Stud Q* 63, 521–530.
- Allee, T., Elsig, M., 2016. Why do some international institutions contain strong dispute settlement provisions? New evidence from preferential trade agreements. *Rev Int Organ* 11, 89–120.
- Alter, 2009. *The European Court's Political Power*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Alter, K.J., 2014. *The New Terrain of International Law: Courts, Politics, Rights*. Princeton University Press.
- Alter, K.J., 2008. Agents or Trustees? International Courts in their Political Context. *European Journal of International Relations* 14, 33–63.
- Alter, K.J., Hafner-Burton, E.M., Helfer, L., 2019. Theorizing the Judicialization of International Relations. *International Studies Quarterly* 63, 449–463.
- Alter, K.J., Helfer, L.R. *Transplanting International Courts: The Law and Politics of the Andean Tribunal of Justice*. International Courts and Tribunals Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Barfield, C.E., 2001. Free Trade, Sovereignty, Democracy: Future of the World Trade Organization. *Chi. J. Int'l L.* 2, 403.
- Basedow, J.R., 2020. The EU's International Investment Policy Ten Years on: The Policy-Making Implications of Unintended Competence Transfers. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 2020.
- Bloomberg, 2018. Steel and aluminium jobs don't add up to much.
- Blyth, M., 2003. Structures Do Not Come with an Instruction Sheet: Interests, Ideas, and Progress in Political Science. *Perspectives on Politics* 1, 695–706.
- Bonnitcha, J., Poulsen, L., Waibel, M., 2017. *The Political Economy of the Investment Treaty Regime*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bown, C., Keynes, S., 2020. Why Trump shot the Sheriffs: The End of Dispute Settlement 1.0. PIIE, Washington D.C.
- Bradford, A., Posner, E., 2011. Universal Exceptionalism in International Law. *Harvard International Law Journal* 52, 1–54.
- Byers, M., Nolte, G. (Eds.), 2003. *United States Hegemony and the Foundations of International Law*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK; New York.
- CFR, 2007. *Is the WTO Dispute Settlement System Fair?*. Council on Foreign Relations.
- Chase, C., Yanovich, A., Crawford, J.-A., Ugaz, P., 2013. Mapping of Dispute Settlement Mechanisms in Regional Trade Agreements - Innovative or Variations on a Theme? WTO Economic Research And Statistics Division Working Papers.
- Congressional Research Service, 2020. *Trade Remedies: Antidumping*. R46296. Washington D.C.
- Davis, C., 2016. *Deterring Disputes: WTO Adjudication as a Tool for Conflict Management*.
- Davis, C.L., 2015. The political logic of dispute settlement: Introduction to the special issue. *Rev Int Organ* 10, 107–117.
- De Bièvre, D., 2017. The origins of the WTO Dispute Settlement System, in: Bourgeois, J.H.J., Bronckers, M., Quick, R. (Eds.), *WTO Dispute Settlement: A Check-up: Time to Take Stock*. Peter Lang AG, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, Brussels, pp. 13–26.
- De Bièvre, D., Poletti, A., Thomann, L., 2014. To enforce or not to enforce? Judicialization, venue shopping, and global regulatory harmonization. *Regulation & Governance* 8, 269–286.
- Dietz, T., Dotzauer, M., Cohen, E.S., 2019. The legitimacy crisis of investor-state arbitration and the new EU investment court system. *Review of International Political Economy* 26, 749–772.
- Elsig, M., Eckhardt, J., 2015. The Creation of the Multilateral Trade Court: Design and Experiential Learning. *World Trade Review* 14, S13–S32.

- Elsig, M., Pollack, M.A., 2014. Agents, trustees, and international courts: The politics of judicial appointment at the World Trade Organization. *European Journal of International Relations* 20, 391–415.
- European Commission, 2020a. The WTO multi-party interim appeal arrangement gets operational.
- European Commission, 2020b. Introductory statement by Commissioner Phil Hogan at informal meeting of EU Trade Ministers.
- European Commission, 2018. Commission welcomes adoption of negotiating directives for a multilateral investment court. Trade - European Commission.
- European Commission, 2016. The Multilateral Investment Court project.
- European Commission, 2015. Online public consultation on investment protection and investor to-state dispute settlement (ISDS) in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership Agreement (TTIP). Brussels.
- European Parliament, 2015. European Parliament resolution of 8 July 2015 containing the European Parliament's recommendations to the European Commission on the negotiations for the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) (2014/2228(INI)). European Parliament, Brussels.
- Helfer, L.R., Slaughter, A.-M., 2005. Why States Create International Tribunals: A Response to Professors Posner and Yoo. *California Law Review* 93, 899–956.
- Jo, H., Namgung, H., 2012. Dispute Settlement Mechanisms in Preferential Trade Agreements: Democracy, Boilerplates, and the Multilateral Trade Regime. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56, 1041–1068.
- Johannesson, L., Mavroidis, P., 2017. The WTO Dispute Settlement System 1995–2015: A Data Set and its Descriptive Statistics. IFN Working Paper 1148.
- Keohane, R., Moravcsik, A., Slaughter, A.-M., 2000. Legalized Dispute Resolution: Interstate and Transnational. *International Organization* 54, 457–488.
- Keynes, S., Bown, C., 2019. Trade Policy Under Trump. *Trade Talks* 111.
- Koremenos, B., 2016. *The Continent of International Law: Explaining Agreement Design*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Kurtz, J., 2016. *The WTO and International Investment Law: Converging Systems*, Cambridge International Trade and Economic Law. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lester, S., 2018. Brady-Lighthizer ISDS Exchange. *International Economic Law and Policy Blog*.
- McCall Smith, J., 2000. The Politics of Dispute Settlement Design: Explaining Legalism in Regional Trade Pacts. *International Organization* 54, 137–180.
- Meunier, Sophie, and Kalypto Nicolaidis. 'The European Union as a Conflicted Trade Power'. *Journal of European Public Policy* 13, no. 6 (2006): 906–25.
- Pauwelyn, J., 2019. WTO Dispute Settlement Post 2019: What to Expect? *Journal of International Economic Law* 22, 297–321.
- Petersmann, E.-U., 2019. How Should WTO Members React to Their WTO Crises? *World Trade Review* 18, 503–525.
- Poletti, Arlo, and Dirk De Bièvre. *Judicial Politics and International Cooperation: From Disputes to Deal-Making at the World Trade Organization*. Colchester, United Kingdom: ECPR Press, 2016.
- Politi, J., 2018. Trump trade team draws heavily from one law firm: Skadden. *Financial Times*.
- Pollack, M.A., 2003. *The engines of European integration: delegation, agency, and agenda setting in the EU*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Posner, E.A., Yoo, J.C., 2005. Judicial Independence in International Tribunals. *Calif. L. Rev.* 93, 1.
- Poulsen, Lauge. 'Beyond Credible Commitments: (Investment) Treaties as Focal Points'. *International Studies Quarterly* 64, no. 1 (2020): 26–34.
- Roberts, A., 2018. Incremental, Systemic, and Paradigmatic Reform of Investor-State Arbitration. *American Journal of International Law* 112, 410–432.

- Sattler, T., Bernauer, T., 2011. Gravitation or discrimination? Determinants of litigation in the World Trade Organisation. *European Journal of Political Research* 50, 143–167.
- Schott, J., Jung, E., 2019. In US-China Trade Disputes, the WTO Usually Sides with the United States. PIIIE.
- Sweet, A.S., 2004. *The Judicial Construction of Europe*. Oxford University Press.
- Tallberg, J., Zürn, M., 2019. The legitimacy and legitimation of international organizations: introduction and framework. *Rev Int Organ* 14, 581–606.
- UNCITRAL. 'Working Group III: Investor-State Dispute Settlement Reform', 2021.
https://uncitral.un.org/en/working_groups/3/investor-state.
- UNCTAD, 2021. Investment Dispute Settlement Navigator: full data release as of 31/07/2020 (excel format).
- USTR, 2018. 2018 Trade Policy Agenda and 2017 Annual Report of the President of the United States on the Trade Agreements Program. Washington D.C.
- Van Harten, G., 2007. *Investment treaty arbitration and public law*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Weiler, J.H.H., 1997. The Reformation of European Constitutionalism. *J. Common Mkt. Stud.* 35, 97.
- WTO, 2019. WT/DSB/M/425. Geneva.
- WTO, 2021. 'Chronological List of Dispute Cases'.
https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/dispu_by_country_e.htm.
- Zangl, B., 2008. Judicialization Matters! A Comparison of Dispute Settlement Under GATT and the WTO. *International Studies Quarterly* 52, 825–854.

IX. Annexe

Table 7: Logistic regression of US, EU and WTO average likelihood to settle disputes

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>					
	<i>Dispute settled</i>					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
USA complainant	0.370 (0.278)					
EU complainant		-0.391 (0.333)				
Other complainant			-0.052 (0.243)			
USA defendant				-0.910*** (0.307)		
EU defendant					0.617** (0.291)	
Other defendant						0.244 (0.241)
Constant	-0.903*** (0.137)	-0.754 *** (0.129)	-0.786 *** (0.188)	-0.608*** (0.134)	-0.942*** (0.135)	-0.954*** (0.182)
Marginal effect on predicted probability	0.08	-0.07	-0.01	-0.17	0.13	0.05
Observations	333	333	333	333	333	333

Source: WTO (2021), author's own calculation.

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 8: Logistic regression of EU, US and Rest of World performance under ISDS

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>					
	<i>Dispute settled</i>					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
USA respondent	0.231 (0.600)					
EU/UK respondent		-0.968*** (0.288)				
Other respondent			0.830*** (0.264)			
USA home state				-0.097 (0.248)		
EU/UK home state					0.149 (0.198)	
Other home state						-0.077 (0.223)
Constant	-1.147*** (0.099)	-0.969*** (0.106)	-1.800*** (0.241)	-1.122*** (0.108)	-1.227*** (0.152)	-1.121*** (0.113)
Marginal effect on predicted probability	0.04	-0.14	0.13	-0.02	0.02	-0.1
Observations	574	574	574	574	574	574

Source: UNCTAD (2021), author's own calculation.

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01