A. Good Faith in Contractual Relations

Good faith is "the fundamental principle of every legal system." Binding individuals, juridical persons, and sovereigns alike, it essentially "converts a moral or ethical precept" into a legal principle—an obligation to act with fairness, reasonableness, and decency in the formation and performance of a contract. It further requires fair dealing in the exercise of rights and prohibits parties from benefiting from their own illegitimate actions. Parties would not enter into contractual relations if there were not a mutual expectation that promises would be honored, that obligations would be performed, and that compensation would be provided in the event of breach. An integral facet of legal certainty, good faith is viewed as "the fundamental principle of the entire system"—the "Magna Carta of international commercial law."

1. Pacta Sunt Servanda: Agreements Must Be Honored

A contract would not be a contract if not binding. The principle pacta sunt servanda is, in H.L.A. Hart's phrase, "the minimum content of Natural Law." In 1969, the principle was codified for States in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which has been widely accepted as setting forth rules of customary international law. With roots in both Western and Eastern legal systems, this principle has become a fixture in the international legal order precisely because "no international jurisdiction whatsoever has ever had the least doubt as to [its] existence." All civilizations, from the earliest, have recognized the rule, and it has been handed down throughout the centuries...
Pacta sunt servanda also means that obligations should be carried out according to the good faith and mutual intention of the parties—that is to say, in Cheng's words, "carrying out the substance of [the parties'] mutual understanding honestly and loyally." Contractual performance is dictated by contractual interpretation, and the dual inquiries into what a contract requires and how it must be fulfilled often collapse into one. The principle of good faith stands with, and informs the application of, other canons of contract construction. It becomes the "major interpretative principle that is applied ancillary to [the] principle of obligation" of pacta sunt servanda. In this sense, the principle of good faith is as applicable to the judge or arbitrator charged with interpreting a contract as it is to the parties that executed it.

The most elementary interpretive canon emanating from this general principle is that the common intention of the parties at the time of contracting should dictate the obligations of a contract. Because contracts are borne of consent of both sides, the test appropriately focuses on those points of mutual agreement.

An offshoot of this principle is to interpret an agreement as a whole to achieve its purpose and aim, which ensures that individual words or phrases within the agreement are given meaning, force, and effect (known as the principle of effectiveness).

Another interpretive principle recognized by Cheng was that of contra proferentem in the interpretation of agreements, which precludes the party who proposed a provision from not honoring it on the ground that it is ambiguous and which interprets ambiguous phrases against their author. This, too, derives from the general principle of good faith.

The principle of good faith has also been applied to affirm the existence of a contract—whether through the parties’ contemporaneous conduct or their past course of dealings.

2. Good Faith in Excusing Contractual Performance

The general principle of good faith has also guided courts and tribunals on when to excuse adherence to a contract. For instance, under most legal systems, one party may be entitled to treat itself as discharged from its obligations if the other has committed a substantial breach—exceptio inadimplenti contractus.

B. Abuse of Rights and the Principle of Proportionality

The negative corollary of the good faith exercise of a legal entitlement is the universal prohibition on abuse of rights. This principle relates not to how rights are obtained (viz., by law or contract), but to how they are exercised.
C. Estoppel

There is broad consensus that, as a "general principle, no party may rely upon its own inconsistency to the detriment of another." This principle has been traced back through 12 centuries of Islamic jurisprudence and has deep roots in Roman law, common law, and modern civil law. Its "mandatory implication" occurs where a party "tries to undo what he previously undertook";

D. The Prohibition on Advantageous Wrongs and Unjust Enrichment

Nemini dolos suus prodesse debet and nemo auditur propriam turpitudinem allegans: these central tenets mean, inter alia, that a party cannot build a case upon a fraud, cannot cause the nonperformance of a condition precedent to its own obligation, and cannot invoke its own malfeasance to diminish its liability. Although expressed in myriad ways, it is basic that "[n]o one can be allowed to take advantage of his own wrong."

E. Corporate Separateness and Limited Liability

Corporate personhood is recognized to allow asset partitioning among related entities. In all legal systems, corporate entities have "rights and obligations peculiar to themselves," separate and apart from their constituent owners. This concept of "limited liability" allows owners to separate corporate assets and liabilities from their own. For both private and public corporations, "[l]imited liability is the rule, not the exception." Given its widespread acceptance, separation of legal identity between different companies, and between a company and its shareholders, is a general principle of law.

F. The Principles of Causation and Reparation

It is impossible to speak of liability without causation. An elusive concept, causation nevertheless encompasses an inviolable requirement to hold a party liable: a connection between its alleged act and the damage claimed. As Cheng observed, "[i]n jure causa proxima non remota inspicitur" —the proximate, and not the remote, cause is to be considered, and only those losses so occasioned are to be compensated. The requirement that persons are obliged to redress the damage they cause is a general principle of law recognized by all civilized nations.
process is the idea that adjudication cannot be considered legitimate if it does not prevent arbitrariness from the standpoint of the parties.”

As noted in the discussion of the prohibition on advantageous wrongs in chapter 2.D, the tribunals in *World Duty Free v. Kenya*, *Inceysa v. El Salvador*, *Plama v. Bulgaria*, and *Metal-Tech v. Uzbekistan* arrived at similar conclusions affirming that fraud, bribery, and official corruption are contrary to “international bones mores” and “the international public policy of most, if not all, States.” International law thus denies protection to an investment procured by bribery or by the submission of doctored financial statements. According to Emmanuel Gaillard, “[t]here is now little doubt that . . . a transnational rule has been established according to which an agreement reached by means of corruption of one of the signatories...is void.”

### E. Evidence and Burdens of Proof

Allegations not admitted, noticed, or presumed must be proven. The traditional formulation of the principle governing the burden of persuasion is *actori incumbit onus probandi*. This rule is universal save where, as noted, the burden is removed by the provisions of a statute or other evidentiary presumption.

But sometimes the best evidence may not be all that good. Where direct evidence is unavailable, “it is a general principle of law that proof may be administered by means of circumstantial evidence.” Appropriate inferences may be drawn from; “a series of facts linked together and leading logically to a single conclusion.”

### F. The Principle of Res Judicata

The final principle is, according to Cheng and early twentieth century jurists, the least controversial: “There seems little, if indeed any question as to res judicata being a general principle of law.” It serves both a general and specific purpose. Generally, “the stability of legal relations requires that litigation come to an end”; specifically, “it is in the interest of [all] parties that an issue which has already been adjudicated...be not argued again.”
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Referring Principles:

I.1.1 - Good faith and fair dealing in international trade

I.1.4 - Abuse of rights

I.1.2 - Prohibition of inconsistent behavior

IV.1.2 - Sanctity of contracts
IV.5.1 - Intentions of the parties
IV.5.3 - Interpretation in favor of effectiveness of contract
IV.5.4 - Interpretation against the party that supplied the term
IV.5.2 - Context-oriented interpretation
IV.7.2 - Invalidity of contract due to bribery
V.1.4 - Principle of simultaneous performance; right to withhold performance
VII.2 - Principle of foreseeability of loss
IX.6 - No restitution in case of knowledge of illegality of performance
X.1 - Foreign corporate entities
XII.1 - Distribution of burden of proof
XII.3 - Circumstantial evidence
XIII.3.1 - Arbitral due process
XIII.4.5 - Conclusive and preclusive effects of awards; res judicata