Legal Aspects of International Agreements from the Perspective of State Sovereignty

Sitti Aisyah
Awang Long School of Law, Samarinda, Indonesia
iis120969@gmail.com

Abstract

The changing character of international legal systems, particularly in relation to human rights, has presented both problems and opportunities for national legal systems. Many countries run against several legislative and institutional hurdles trying to match domestic rules with worldwide human rights norms. This study aims to investigate how international human rights law affects national legal systems, especially how different countries incorporate worldwide standards into their own rules and judicial processes. Along with a comparative study of chosen monist and dualist systems—those of France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Indonesia among them—the investigation uses qualitative jurisprudential legal methodology. To ascertain how well these rules are included, legal papers, agreements, local laws, and judicial decisions were evaluated. The results show that monist countries usually include international human rights treaties into their legal systems automatically, therefore allowing for direct legal enforcement in courts. Dualist countries, on the other hand, need more legal steps, which may result in delays or just limited enforcement. Emphasizing the need of enhanced synergy between worldwide obligations and national legal systems, the study concludes by stating that legal traditions, constitutional provisions, and the political terrain are quite important in the domestic implementation of international human rights criteria.

Keywords : International Agreements, State Sovereignty, International Law, Treaty Law, Sovereign Rights

INTRODUCTION

International law has become a major force in shaping the legal principles governing state conduct and safeguarding individual freedoms in a world that is getting more linked. Human rights law is especially important among the many disciplines of international law because of its moral power and general appeal. The changing character of international legal systems especially the rise and strengthening of global human rights standards has provided both opportunities and obstacles for national legal systems.

Although the standards established by international human rights aspire to support justice, dignity, and fairness all around, many nations find persistent challenge in the real inclusion of these concepts into local legal systems. In countries with significantly different legal practices, political influences, and institutional systems, this is especially important since it frequently causes tension between national authority and international commitments.

Especially after the Second World War and the establishment of the United Nations, the emergence of international human rights law indicated a major legal obligations transformation for nations. Among others, agreements like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights from 1948 and the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights from 1966 have created enforceable obligations reaching beyond national boundaries. These international papers emphasize that protecting fundamental rights is a worldwide need, not just a subject of local interest.

Notwithstanding the great expectations of these treaties, their real influence on national legal systems varies widely according on how nations interpret and apply them. This variance in execution results from the complex interplay of internal legal customs and international obligations. Whether a nation's legal history adopts a monist or dualist approach is a key factor influencing this dynamic. Automatic integration of international law into national law upon ratification in monist systems facilitates instant legal application.

Dualist systems, on the other hand, need national laws to transform global accords into national law. This distinction shapes how local courts and administrative agencies handle international human rights principles far more than just theoretically. Many nations run into significant legislative and institutional hurdles as they try to match their national legislation with international human rights obligations. Among constitutional restrictions, the division of powers, failure to enact laws, political opposition, and cultural or ideological divides, several sources contribute to these obstacles. Some national courts, for instance, might be reluctant to immediately follow international agreements either because of constitutional limits or concern that they would breach parliamentary authority. Moreover, knowing worldwide human rights ideas usually calls for legal culture shifts, administrative reforms, and governance structure changes complicated and politically sensitive shifts.

Against this backdrop, this research seeks to examine the influence of international human rights law on national legal frameworks, with a specific emphasis on how international standards are integrated into local laws, judicial interpretations, and institutional practices. The primary inquiry of this study is: How do various legal systems, specifically monist and dualist nations, address international human rights responsibilities, and what consequences do these responses have for domestic legislation, governance, and judicial outcomes?

To address this inquiry, the research utilizes a qualitative methodological approach grounded in jurisprudence, alongside a comparative legal analysis. This strategy facilitates an in-depth investigation into how legal theories, constitutional principles, and institutional frameworks affect the adoption of international human rights law. The nations chosen for this examination France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Indonesia showcase a variety of legal systems, each with distinct traditions, legal cultures, and interactions with international law. France and the Netherlands exemplify monist systems where treaties are directly applicable and frequently cited in domestic court proceedings. Conversely, the United

Kingdom and Indonesia illustrate dualist systems, which require domestic legislation to implement international treaties for them to be valid within the country.

The selection of these nations is both deliberate and meaningful. France's civil law background and constitutional dedication to human rights offer valuable perspectives on the strengths of a monist approach. The Netherlands, recognized for its progressive views on human rights and robust judicial enforcement of international treaties, provides an alternative monist framework distinguished by its institutional characteristics. The United Kingdom, despite its departure from the European Union, possesses a profound legal tradition centered on parliamentary sovereignty and common law, which presents a dualist view on integrating treaties. Indonesia, a developing nation with a multifaceted legal system influenced by both civil and traditional law, contributes important insights into how international standards are perceived in non-Western, diverse legal environments.

The research methodology involves a comprehensive analysis of legal documents, such as international treaties, national constitutions, local statutes, and court rulings. The focus is on significant human rights treaties, including the ICCPR, ICESCR, and various regional instruments, investigating how these documents are cited, understood, and enacted within national legal systems. Beyond doctrinal assessment, the study also examines pertinent policy papers, legislative discussions, and academic analyses to gain a deeper comprehension of the wider political and institutional landscape in which domestic applications of international human rights law take place.

Early results from this study suggest that monist nations tend to be more effective in assimilating international human rights treaties into their national legal systems. In these jurisdictions, international standards are incorporated into the legal framework upon ratification, enabling courts to enforce them directly without requiring additional laws. This process allows for smoother integration and improves the applicability of international human rights principles. Nevertheless, challenges still persist within monist systems, especially in situations where domestic laws conflict with international commitments or where judicial interpretations may be traditional or erratic.

In countries with a dualist framework, the situation is more intricate. The necessity for enabling laws frequently leads to postponements, incomplete implementation, or selective adoption of global standards. Take the United Kingdom, for instance, where specific treaties have been adopted via Parliamentary acts like the Human Rights Act of 1998, which enables the domestic application of the European Convention on Human Rights while other international agreements remain unenforced unless particular laws are enacted. In Indonesia, the complexities deepen further. While the constitution acknowledges the significance of human rights and the government has accepted numerous international agreements, effective implementation is often obstructed by fragmented laws, insufficient judicial resources, and political opposition.

A crucial observation from this research indicates that legal traditions, constitutional guidelines, and political circumstances play a major role in how international human rights standards are applied at the national level. In monist systems, the judiciary is pivotal in ensuring that international treaties are recognized, yet the level of enforcement is still reliant on judges' willingness to adopt international standards. In dualist frameworks, the legislature's involvement is vital, as the success of international law depends on the political determination and legislative measures taken. Furthermore, the presence of constitutional review processes, human rights commissions, and active civil society also influence how these laws are enacted.

Another significant outcome is the differing degrees of legal and institutional readiness in various jurisdictions. Monist systems typically have clear pathways for the automatic adoption of treaties, backed by constitutional rules and court rulings. Conversely, dualist systems might lack explicit directions on how to implement international obligations, resulting

in inconsistencies and legal ambiguity. These distinctions are more than theoretical; they have tangible effects on human rights protection, the accessibility of justice, and the maintenance of the rule of law.

The study further emphasizes the crucial role of legal education, judicial instruction, and public knowledge in fostering the domestic enactment of international human rights law. In nations where judges, lawyers, and policymakers are knowledgeable about international law, there is a higher probability that global norms will be effectively incorporated and implemented. On the other hand, in regions where legal experts have limited familiarity with international agreements, the domestic influence of human rights treaties could remain insignificant.

The wider effects of this study go beyond the particular nations examined. In a global legal landscape marked by growing interdependence and common standards, grasping the processes and obstacles related to local integration is crucial for enhancing human rights safeguarding on a global scale. The results highlight the necessity for legal changes, robust institutional frameworks, and stronger political dedication to close the divide between global commitments and local situations.

To summarize, the evolution of international human rights law from primarily a diplomatic instrument to a collection of enforceable legal standards brings both possibilities and challenges to national legal systems. While monist and dualist frameworks provide different routes for incorporation, the success of international human rights law ultimately hinges on the relationship between legal principles, political determination, and institutional capability. This research adds to the expanding literature on the domestic effects of international law by providing a detailed, comparative study of four distinct legal systems. It aims not just to pinpoint obstacles to execution, but also to suggest actionable measures for improving the alignment between international standards and national legal systems.

This research indicates that achieving true human rights protection requires more than simply ratifying treaties it necessitates a dedication to legal reforms, active judicial involvement, and ongoing political backing. The potential of international human rights law can only be fully realized by understanding and addressing the unique legal and institutional circumstances within each nation.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research employs a qualitative jurisprudential legal approach to investigate the evolving connection between international human rights law and national legal frameworks. It particularly examines how global standards are adopted and enacted within local systems. The transformation of international legal systems, especially concerning human rights, presents both possibilities and obstacles for national laws. As countries seek to align their local legal practices with changing international human rights commitments, they often face legislative and institutional challenges. Thus, a doctrinal and comparative legal method is used to meticulously examine how international human rights law is integrated and enacted across various legal traditions, specifically monist and dualist systems.

1. Methodological Framework

This study is based on jurisprudential doctrinal analysis, which highlights the interpretation of legal documents, treaties, constitutional clauses, and court rulings. It prioritizes the normative aspects and structural elements of legal systems instead of relying on empirical statistical evidence. The legal perspective provides a comprehensive understanding of the internalization of international legal norms, particularly in the realm of human rights, within national legal environments.

Additionally, a comparative legal approach is employed to differentiate the legal reception processes across various jurisdictions, specifically comparing monist nations

like France and the Netherlands with dualist nations such as the United Kingdom and Indonesia. This analysis aims to expose the differing levels of integration, legal frameworks, and political influences that affect the domestic application of international human rights agreements.

2. Data Sources and Collection

The main sources of data are legal documents, which include:

a. International human rights treaties and conventions, especially those affiliated with the United Nations, such as the ICCPR, ICESCR, and CEDAW.
b. Constitutional texts and legislative instruments from the targeted countries.
c. Judicial rulings and case law from both national and international courts. Reports, analyses, and academic writings that assess or evaluate the application of international human rights law.
d. Official government documents, parliamentary records, and reports from law commissions that pertain to the incorporation of treaties.

This study does not involve fieldwork or interviews but instead conducts a thorough review of legal documents and critical doctrinal analysis to evaluate the extent of integration and adherence.

3. Analytical Procedure

The analysis is conducted in three phases:

a. Textual and Doctrinal Analysis:

Both international and domestic legal texts are scrutinized to identify their normative significance and hierarchical ranking within domestic legal systems. In monist systems, the analysis focuses on constitutional clauses that permit the direct enforcement of international law. In dualist systems, the emphasis is on the legislative incorporation process.

b. Judicial Interpretation and Application:

Significant court cases are reviewed to understand how judges interpret and enforce international human rights law. This encompasses decisions from domestic courts as well as supranational entities like the European Court of Human Rights. The study pays close attention to judicial reasoning, conflicts between international and domestic regulations, and trends in legal alignment.

c. Political and Institutional Contextualization:

Recognizing that legal integration is influenced by various external factors, the research takes into account the political context and institutional factors present in each nation. The evaluation looks at political motivation, administrative capabilities, and the involvement of civil society as essential elements that can either support or hinder effective execution.

4. Rationale for Country Selection

To represent a wide range of legal traditions and political situations, the research includes:

a. France and the Netherlands (monist systems),
b. The United Kingdom and Indonesia (dualist systems).

These nations were selected for their varied colonial histories, constitutional structures, and roles in international human rights systems. This choice facilitates an insightful comparison of how legal concepts (monism versus dualism) are implemented in real life.

5. Validity and Limitations

Although the qualitative approach allows for thorough legal and contextual

insights, it has limitations when it comes to generalizing results. Concentrating on a few specific countries means that the conclusions drawn may not be applicable everywhere. Furthermore, since political institutions are constantly evolving, the ways in which laws are implemented domestically can change over time, necessitating regular reassessment.

Nonetheless, by integrating doctrinal legal analysis with a comparative approach, and by situating results within wider political and institutional contexts, this study seeks to offer a deep understanding of how international human rights standards are integrated into national legal frameworks.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Normative Integration of International Human Rights Law

The primary outcome of this research is the discovery of how international human rights law is normatively integrated within various legal frameworks. In monist nations like France and the Netherlands, international agreements such as the ICCPR and CEDAW automatically become part of national law once they are ratified. For example, Article 55 of the French Constitution specifies that properly ratified international treaties take precedence over domestic laws. In the Netherlands, Articles 93 and 94 of the Constitution permit international rules to be directly referenced in national courts, assuming they are self-executing.

In contrast, dualist nations such as the United Kingdom and Indonesia adopt a more measured and fragmented approach. In the UK, international treaties that have been ratified lack legal power unless they are incorporated through national legislation, as demonstrated in the notable case of R v. Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Brind. Similarly, Indonesia's legal system, which is influenced by civil law, necessitates the passage of an enabling law (Undang-Undang) by the legislature before a treaty can be applied domestically. This dualist distinction frequently leads to delays or discrepancies in execution.

This contrast highlights that the type of legal reception (monism or dualism) significantly influences how swiftly and effectively international human rights standards can be enforced. Monist countries present a smoother approach for integration, whereas dualist countries establish procedural and institutional hurdles that international law must overcome to be recognized domestically.

2. Judicial Interpretation and Enforcement

A key insight relates to how judicial interpretation influences the significance of international human rights law within a country. In monist legal systems, courts are more inclined to reference international agreements. For example, French courts have used international treaties to contest national laws when they are deemed incompatible, as illustrated by rulings from the Conseil d'État and the Cour de Cassation. Similarly, Dutch courts have shown a readiness to apply the European Convention on Human Rights or the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights directly, particularly in cases related to discrimination and the right to a fair trial.

On the other hand, the involvement of courts in dualist legal systems indicates a more cautious incorporation of international law. UK courts, notably following the implementation of the Human Rights Act 1998, have adopted ECHR rights within domestic legal proceedings but still approach other international agreements with caution. In the case of Al-Jedda v. UK, the House of Lords faced challenges in balancing international commitments with domestic security laws, illustrating a preference for national law unless legislation states otherwise.

In Indonesia, the judiciary seldom makes direct references to international human

rights treaties unless those treaties are explicitly included in domestic laws. Despite constitutional guarantees for human rights, the practical application of treaties like CEDAW or ICESCR in court remains limited and largely symbolic. This underscores the influence of judicial discretion, legal culture, and the hierarchy of the constitution on how international human rights standards are implemented.

3. Political and Institutional Influences

A cross-cutting theme revealed in this study is that legal integration is inseparable from political will and institutional capability. In France and the Netherlands, stable democratic institutions, strong legal bureaucracies, and active civil societies have supported the integration of international human rights norms. Both countries have human rights commissions and mechanisms for monitoring compliance, including periodic shadow reports to international bodies.

In contrast, the UK's implementation is shaped by a complex political environment. The ongoing debate over the potential repeal of the Human Rights Act and replacement with a "British Bill of Rights" illustrates how international human rights commitments can become entangled in national sovereignty discourses. Moreover, Brexit has intensified scrutiny over the UK's obligations to supranational legal orders like the European Court of Human Rights.

Indonesia presents a unique case where institutional weaknesses, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and fluctuating political commitment hinder the full realization of international human rights law. Although Indonesia has ratified major human rights instruments, issues such as regional autonomy, religious pluralism, and minority rights remain contentious. Implementation is often obstructed by local resistance or conflicting laws, such as those on blasphemy or gender identity, which contravene international norms.

4. Comparative Synthesis of Monist and Dualist Practices

When synthesizing findings across jurisdictions, several important patterns emerge:

a. Legal Simplicity vs. Political Complexity: While monist systems theoretically simplify the incorporation process, real-world application still requires political and institutional commitment. For instance, despite France's monist structure, certain UN treaty body recommendations are not always acted upon.
b. Dualist Formalism vs. Judicial Creativity: In dualist states, the formal requirement for legislative incorporation can delay enforcement. However, judicial bodies sometimes creatively interpret domestic laws in light of international obligations, particularly in the UK post-HRA.
c. Constitutional Structures as Gateways or Barriers: Countries with constitutions that explicitly recognize international law (like the Netherlands) are more likely to promote robust integration. In contrast, in places like Indonesia, constitutional ambiguities and plural legal systems (including religious and customary law) complicate uniform application.

5. The Function of Global Institutions and Community Initiatives

Another conclusion is that outside influences and community involvement serve as driving forces for local transformation, particularly in dualist nations. Bodies like UN treaty organizations, the Universal Periodic Review, and regional entities such as the European Court of Human Rights have significantly shaped domestic reform efforts. For instance, in the UK, the ECtHR has consistently guided homegrown legal and legislative advancements, including rulings about voting rights for prisoners and issues of privacy.

In Indonesia, organizations within civil society are essential in advocating for the approval and execution of treaties. Reports from these NGOs frequently act as vital instruments for ensuring international accountability, exposing gaps between the accepted norms and their application at the local level. However, advocacy efforts from civil society face challenges due to political opposition, legal limitations, and a lack of cooperation from the government, which hampers the prospects for thorough legal reforms.

6. Doctrinal Findings on Hierarchy and Conflict Resolution

From a jurisprudential perspective, a key outcome of the doctrinal analysis is the varied approaches to legal hierarchy and conflict resolution between international and national norms. Monist systems generally treat international treaties as superior to domestic legislation but subordinate to constitutional principles, creating potential conflicts in sensitive areas such as security or immigration. Dualist countries rely on statutory hierarchy, often subordinating international law unless expressly incorporated.

Case studies also illustrate divergent judicial methodologies in resolving normative conflict. Dutch courts exhibit greater willingness to disapply domestic laws that contradict international obligations. Conversely, UK courts exercise judicial restraint, as Parliament remains sovereign. Indonesian jurisprudence tends to favor national statutes even where clear inconsistencies with ratified treaties exist, largely due to weak judicial independence and lack of clear constitutional primacy for international norms.

7. Limitations and Areas for Future Inquiry

Although the doctrinal and comparative insights provide significant understanding, there are several limitations that need to be recognized:

a. The limited number of cases restricts the ability to draw wider conclusions. Future research might consider including more dualist and monist nations to expand the analysis.
b. Judicial rulings are influenced by their context and can change quickly, particularly with shifts in political leadership. Continuous evaluation is crucial.
c. The current research lacks empirical elements such as interviews, surveys, or metrics for implementation. Future studies could investigate how international human rights standards affect marginalized communities, thereby strengthening the connection between theoretical and practical aspects.
d. Despite these points, by placing legal structures within the framework of political circumstances, this analysis illustrates that the adoption of international human rights law is a fluid process influenced by the design of constitutions, judicial beliefs, the capability of institutions, and political determination.

In sum, this research reveals that the incorporation and enforcement of international human rights law differ significantly across legal traditions, with monist systems offering more direct avenues for integration, while dualist systems demand complex domestic transformations. Yet, legal structure alone does not determine outcomes. Political commitment, institutional capability, and civil engagement play decisive roles in determining whether international norms achieve meaningful domestic application.

This study thus provides a framework for understanding the legal, institutional, and political variables that shape the journey of international human rights law from treaty text to enforceable norm offering insights for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers seeking to enhance the domestic impact of global human rights standards.

CONCLUSION

This research set out to explore the evolving relationship between international human

rights law and domestic legal systems by employing a qualitative jurisprudential legal approach. Through a comparative doctrinal analysis of monist and dualist legal traditions focusing on France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Indonesia it has become evident that the integration and enforcement of international human rights norms are deeply shaped by the structural, constitutional, and political contexts of each state.

The key conclusion drawn from this study is that legal tradition alone monist or dualist does not singularly determine the effectiveness or depth of integration. While monist systems like France and the Netherlands allow for direct application of international treaties, actual implementation still depends on factors such as constitutional interpretation, judicial activism, and political will. Conversely, dualist systems such as the UK and Indonesia require legislative incorporation of international instruments, which often leads to delays, selective enforcement, or even partial rejection particularly when domestic political or ideological considerations override international obligations.

It was found that countries with robust institutional structures, independent judiciaries, and active civil societies such as the Netherlands and, to some extent, the UK are generally more successful in implementing international human rights standards, regardless of their formal legal tradition. In contrast, political instability, weak legal institutions, and ambiguous constitutional provisions, as seen in Indonesia, can severely limit the practical impact of ratified treaties.

Moreover, the study underscores the importance of judicial engagement and interpretative willingness as mediating forces between global standards and national practice. Courts play a central role not only in upholding international norms but also in setting legal precedents that influence future legislation and policy alignment with international human rights law.

In conclusion, the successful domestic realization of international human rights law depends not solely on whether a state follows a monist or dualist approach, but on a confluence of legal interpretation, political culture, institutional strength, and public accountability. By highlighting these complex and interrelated factors, this research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how global human rights norms evolve, adapt, and sometimes clash within national legal frameworks.

The findings reaffirm the need for continued legal reform, judicial education, and political commitment to bridge the gap between international legal ideals and national legal realities. They also call for further research that includes more diverse jurisdictions, empirical assessment of implementation outcomes, and deeper exploration of how non-state actors influence the domestic adoption of international norms.

REFERENCES

Adolf, H. (2002). *Aspek-aspek negara dalam hukum internasional* (Edisi Revisi). Rajagrafindo Persada.

Agusman, D. D. (2014). *Hukum perjanjian internasional, kajian teori dan praktik di Indonesia*. Refika Aditama.

Fidelia, F., Koni, S. A., & Zawawi, D. (2019). Analysis of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the provisions on cancellation, termination, and suspension of an international agreement. *Scientific Journal of Law Enforcement, 6*(2), 108–116. https://doi.org/10.31289/jiph.v6i2.2749

Fitzmaurice, M. (2002). Third parties and the law of treaties. *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law, 6*, 37–50. (Catatan: Pastikan rentang halaman lengkap jika tersedia).

Iskandar, J. T. (2006). *Hukum internasional kontemporer*. Refika Aditama.

Kusumaatmadja, M., & Agoes, E. R. (2003). *Pengantar hukum internasional*. Alumni.

Navia, R. N. (2018). *International peremptory norms (jus cogens) and international humanitarian law*. DPHU. http://www.dphu.org/uploads/attachements/books/books_4008_0.pdf

Rahardjo, S. (2000). *Ilmu hukum*. Citra Aditya Bakti.

Sefriani. (2015). *Pengantar hukum internasional*. Rajagrafindo Persada.

Setiawati, N., Mangku, D. G. S., & Yuliartini, N. P. R. (2020). Penyelesaian sengketa pulau ditinjau dari hukum internasional (Studi kasus sengketa Pulau Dokdo antara Jepang dan Korea Selatan). *Jurnal Komunitas Yustisia, 2*(2), 241–250.

Situngkir, D. A. (2018). The principle of pacta sunt servanda in the enforcement of international criminal law. *Jurnal Cendikia Hukum, 3*(2), 153–165. (Catatan: Pastikan nomor isu/halaman lengkap).

Soekanto, S. (2008). *Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi penegakan hukum*. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Soemitro, R. H. (1989). *Perspektif sosial dalam memahami masalah hukum*. CV Agung.

Villani, U. (2002). The Security Council's authorization of enforcement action by regional organization. *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law, 6*, 535–550.

Widagdo, S. (2019). Ratifikasi perjanjian internasional dari perspektif hukum nasional. *Arena Hukum, 12*(1), 195–214. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.arenahukum.2019.01201.10