

Correlation between two versions of the rule of law principle: dynamic for the target determination

Author: Reminska Yu. Yu.

Affiliation: Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

Publication: Конституціоналіст · 2018

Publication date: 2020-10-27

Permanent URL: <https://constitutionalist.com.ua/correlation-between-two-versions-of-the-rule-of-law-principle-dynamic-for-the-target-determination/>

Author information

Reminska Yu. Yu.

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

Abstract

UDC 340.12

PQNKNHPQNKSQ vuh vuh Reminska Postgraduate Student at the Department of Theory of Law and State 7 aras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

CORRELATION BETWEEN 7:2 VERSIONS OF THE RULE OF LAW

PRINCIPLE

DYNAMICS FOR THE TARGET DETERMINATION

The article constitutes an initial attempt to combine all existing in modern scientific literature approaches devoted to the interconnection of two rule of law versions – international and national. Accordingly, the article illustrates the contextual interplay between two levels of legal orders. Viewing interfaces between international rule of law principle and its domestic analogue through the prism of their correlation, the author marks out three important aspects in such synergy. On the basis of comparative research, it is concluded that among most substantive correlation aspect is the dialectical nexus between rule of law principles that are operated both at the international and national levels.

Key words: rule of law principle, legal order, correlation between international and national versions of rule of law principle. **Problem statement and some introductory remarks:** Rule of law, as the universally recognized ideal, had not been immune from the intensive expansion of theoretically-methodological scientific investigations. This is mainly due to the fact that this principle provides civil society with an appropriate forum for motivating action by public authorities in the different areas of human activity, and thus promoting its essential values. Sometimes the inconsistency of national government's action towards its citizens hinders successful development, whereby nationbuilding requires

time efforts and commitment in order for the process to make a positive contribution. Nevertheless, inverse relationships between international community and national societies have shown product of such cooperation has significant impact on legislative transformation processes for both international and domestic legal systems. That is why issues related to the development of the rule of law standards are still relevant and serve as a focal point in almost all modern scientific researches. Recent trends in scientific researches. It is hard enough to reflect all existing academic works related to the investigation of the rule of law principle. But in the past decade the number of researches has also

risen sharply owing to a certain changes in international legislative system. Consequently, new aspects of the rule of law principle have emerged. Particularly, among such aspects is the rule of law functioning at the international

level its linkages and mutual interference with the corresponding national analogue. At the same time, an overwhelming majority of scientific investigations is mostly devoted to the “pure international law”, while general theoretical “synergy” parameters of abovementioned mutual influences remain “invisible” for the modern rule of law scholarship. However, there are some academic works which are of the special theoretic interest, namely among them are scientific articles

of AK Nollkaemper who focuses on the result of the interrelationships between international rule of law and its national versions. Another researcher from Netherlands – MK Kenatake has also drawn her attention to the existing interfaces between two variants of the rule of law principle. Additionally, abovementioned issue of “coexistence” had been the subject of scientific inquiry of such well-known scholars as BK Chimni (NK eachezf) . Keate (HK lwadaf JK taldrnf AK tatsf JK touter) At the same time, contemporary general theory of law is badly in need of a complete structural and categorical overhaul in our thinking about the rule of law importance. □ Reminska vuh vuhf 2018

in the context of current global reformation processes. Analyzed above recent trends in scientific investigations regarding the rule of law principle have provided the author with an opportunity to highlight the following principle objectives of the research to identify what interfaces are between two versions of the rule of law – international and national, exactly what aspect of such interactions is crucial for the further substantive modification of the rule of law principle. Major ideas presentation. Present developments in the rule of law field show there is a growing trend in scholar's world to use in academic literature two formulations – international rule of law and its national analogue. This tends to suggest there

are some substantial differences between two abovementioned categories. Essentially, the concept of international rule of law accumulates historical legal and sociocultural features of both international organizations law and the law of different countries all over the world including certain national legal traditions .

However, among contemporary rule of law researchers, different approaches may prevail regarding the interaction between two versions of this principle. In this vein, former Judge of the International Court of Justice HK Owada once pointed out “<> analysis of the role of the Rule of Law as applied at the international level requires a reconceptualization of the principle in such a way as to take account of systematic differences between the domestic and international legal order” >1, ph 155@. With special emphasis on this, in an attempt to understand the operation of rule of law in practice, it is alleged in the literature that the linkages between national and international rule of law can be analyzed from

three different positions, among which, particularly, are how the concept of national rule of law understands, accepts and resists on its international version, how the concept of international rule of law understands, accepts and opposes the national concept and 3 in what way can be assessed and appreciated such interaction by the international community. Combining formal and material requirements, the rule of law both at the level of national public law and international human rights law can be defined as the regulator of governmental power . In other words, the rule

RIO a ZVHUYHV a V a WRROIRUUHJXO a WLQJWKH

conduct of the government, the exercise of its authority over individuals and legal entities within its jurisdiction. At the same time, it must be taken into account that the international rule of law is intended to regulate not only intergovernmental relations, but also legal relations between international organizations and states or individuals. However, it should be borne in mind that the rules of international and national law may regulate the same legal relationship in a slightly different way. Such simultaneous regulation creates a number of situations when the subjects of law are circumvented, which in its turn resulted in a conflict of law >2, ph 2–3@.

Within this range of issues, position of BK Chimni can be deemed as reasonable one. In particular, KH believes that the conceptual formulation of comprehensive international rule of law definition is complicated enough as the very idea of this principle was first articulated within the framework of national legal systems with those characteristics, for example, the existence of a constitution, the limited nature of the executive power, judicial system with compulsory jurisdiction, certain forms of manifestation of the principle of separation of powers, which are either absent at all or incompletely presented at the international level >3, ph 2 2@.

Against this background NK Hachez emphasizes on the multifaceted and complex nature of the international legal order. Thus two premises should be taken into account when addressing the issue of existing next XV between two versions of the rule of law principle formal differences between international and domestic legal orders where the rule of law principle is actively functioning primarily in national context presupposes rule of law's essential task is to create appropriate and effective mechanisms aimed at protection of the citizens legal subjects from governmental abuse along with this international framework implies the existence of such-called "horizontal relationships"

between states that is there is QR government in its common sense substantial differences between international and domestic legal orders which is reflected in the structures of legal orders themselves there are limitations imposed on the legal subjects to exercise their governmental power in this regard the question arises about the legality which the rule of law embodies hence not all formal rule of law requirements can be transposed to the international legal order >4, pp 316–317@.

This has inspired the author to talk about the correlation between international and national rule of law which can be considered from the following perspectives significant discrepancy and issue of the balance possibility of the transposition of one version to another and vice versa F dialectical interrelations between two versions of the rule of law principle NK Significant discrepancy and issue of the balance between international and national rule of law principle In one of his scientific works JK Waldron has stressed the difference between national and international rule of law lies primarily in different methods and ways of applying this principle The absence of an "international sovereign power as such is greatly

complicated by attempts to understand the purpose of international rule of law since the absence of centralized power means that international governmental bodies as well as the international legislative process may in some cases not comply with the requirements of the researched principle" >5, pp 317@.

The author agrees to a certain extent with this thesis and indicates the following thing like the national rule of law a key objective of the international version is not to protect individuals from arbitrary actions of the state its agencies and officials At this level the rule of law is intended to create conditions for equal and independent functioning of all countries in the world as full-fledged subjects of international law furthermore international rule of law serves as a toolkit for protection of the human rights and freedoms which have been violated within the national legal system here international institutions are among the key actors that actively operate and develop the rule of law

principle during their "operations". 7 R support above-mentioned idea further, well-known theorist AK Watts believes differences between international rule of law and the rule of law operated within the national DO legal system framework includes the objectives inherent in the rule of law principle at the national level in this context commonly the rule of law includes the protection of the individuals rights against arbitrary actions of state authorities more specific requirements of the rule of law principle at the national level often reflect particular historical and constitutional evolution of state given this international rule of law cannot be equated with its national analog

logue >6, pp 16@. It has been already mentioned above that the differences between international and national rule of law predominantly are analyzed from the perspective of national and international legal orders namely their institutional distinction indeed in comparison with national international legal order is characterized by a pretty weak institutionalization level and the complete lack of a centralized and hierarchical organization of the exercise of power. Instead such connections are themselves horizontal >7, pp 2 UI pp 12–1, pp 75@. In this vein some authors add that lawmaking process is in itself at the international level differs by a certain diffusion dispersion. However,

both in practice and within theoretical science there is a clear division into a soft and hard law which helps to define the norms that are mandatory and norms that are not binding on subjects of international law >3, pp 22–23@.

Extending this approach IK Hurd in his scientific article "International rule of law and the domestic analogy" argues following In reliance on the instrumental approach to the essence of international law the author notes the certain differences between national and international rule of law are based on distinct functions they perform

Within the national legal system the rule of law principle aims to establish restrictions on the exercise of state power and to ensure the stable functioning of the law norms of which will be applied equally to all citizens

of the particular state. The concept of international rule of law is based on a slightly different model of the relationship between actors and international law which is based first of all on the legitimacy of the obligations transfer through consent. In spite of these differences from a theoretical point of view both versions of the rule of law are ideologically united around a liberal normative view on politics and society. In particular, the rule of law ensures the activities of the authorities both at the international and national levels in supporting securing and developing other legal values. Against this background rule of law is an alternative to arbitrary exercise of power and presupposes

the subordination to universally accepted rules of conduct existed both at the international and national levels >10, ph 366–367. OK Possibility of the transposition of one version to another and vice versa. In the majority of cases the issue of transposition of the rule of law characteristics into another legal level is boiled down to the scientists' negative response. For instance AK Watts believes there are at least two reasons why direct transposition of the national rule of law namely its content to the international level is impossible. First the purposes served the rule of law at the national level typically the protection of human rights and the limitation of public authorities' power, significantly differ from those formed within the international legal space. Secondly it must be taken into account that the requirements of national rule of law are not identical with those requirements that exist at the international level >6, ph 16.

Another prominent scholar HK Aust is of the opinion that it is not a constructive approach of scholars who develop the notion of international rule of law on the basis of a "common denominator" of the various concepts of the rule of law existing in national legal systems. Characteristic features of domestic rule of law variations cannot be fully borrowed when constructing an international model. At the same time it is reasonably considered that within the international law framework unique concept of the rule of law should be clearly defined >11, ph 55.

In this regard some authors stress on a number of theoretical, methodological and practical issues related to the transposition of the three basic rule of law components into the international level namely public and state power, limited by law, the uniform and consistent application of the law. That is why the international rule of law formula cannot be simply deduced from the concept of national rule of law. These two versions of rule of law are developed separately addressing various political challenges and needs and they are based on different principles of political power organization >10, ph 376. Moreover, when transposing the rule of law to the international level its concept should cover

not only the process of adopting the law its application and enforcement but also the material aspect of what this law constitutes by itself >8, ph 13. As can be seen from the conducted above analysis most scholars considering the possibility of transposition make an appeal to the structural differentiation of the rule of law components at this two levels. Against this background AK Watts marked out the elements which are necessary for the rule of law principle to be employed in international community. Essentially among them are – completeness and certainty of the law to employ and respect the rule of law principle in a certain community means that law is primarily capable to govern all situations

that might arise talking about "completeness" of law means two premises it means that "every international situation is capable of being determined as a "matter of law" along with this there must be a comprehensive mechanism for the application of already existed legal rules additionally this law enforcement mechanism should be accompanied by well-known and universally recognized legal techniques other legal rules or transnational principles of law the formal requirement of application must be followed by fact that such law is applied to all members of the certain community – equality before the law in the international context predominantly is manifested in so-called "principle of sovereign equality

of States" all States which come within the scope of a rule of law must be treated equally in the application of that rule to them without any exceptions in these circumstances. it is not asserted that there is only one way of application the law to all states without taking into consideration some specific features of such states the main idea is that there should not be any discrimination between States in

their subjection to rules of law which in principle apply to them further more States should have equal standing in the formulation of rules of international law including the making of changes to the law – absence of arbitrary power there should be a well-defined set of limits of action as in which international law allows a State to act at its pleasure without having to account for its actions internationally – effective application of the law with full

lowing three aspects judicial settlement – there must be an ability of a State which finds itself with a legal difference with any other State to have recourse to a judicial tribunal to have that difference resolved enforcement – the ability of the international community to ensure that if a State refuses to comply with the law the law can nevertheless be enforced against it Application in practice – regular application of the law by States in their day-to-day dealings with each other as part of regular pattern of their international relations >6, pp 27–33@.

PK Dialectical interrelations between two versions of the rule of law principle This third aspect is usually analyzed through the approach according to which the particular forms of the rule of law manifestation should be considered from the perspective of following three levels of legal relations between national and international legal orders The first level of relations envisages the least significant interconnection between national and international rule of law since the latter is defined precisely as a tool for regulating horizontal relations between states as what has been mentioned at the beginning of the current research . As the crucial goal of this principle is to create con

ditions for limiting the national governments actions and protecting individuals inside the national legal system the regulation of relations with the national rule of law much differs from those relations that are intended to regulate its international version They differ from each other by the subjects to which such powers are exercised by the nature of decisions based on the rule of law principle with broader legal and political context From this perspective international rule of law should not be designed as a set of means serving to protect sovereign states analogously to the national version aimed at protecting individuals' rights and ensuring their autonomy At the second level the linkages between

national and international rule of law is much stronger due to the fact that the international rule of law is used to regulate the exercise of power by the state and its bodies in relation to individuals and non-governmental organizations A striking example is the international human rights law since a large number of international treaties and customary laws are intended to regulate relations related to ensuring the protection of human rights and freedoms by national governments The functional interaction between two versions of the rule of law principle most fully manifests itself at the third level of relations since international institutions review the powers exercised by the government

on the basis of standards that may differ materially from those that exist in national legislation For example judicial human rights institutions in particular , the European Court of Human Rights examines national governments decision to ensure that they conform to the norms and standards on human rights and freedoms In exceptional cases international criminal courts and tribunals the International Criminal Court the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia etc have actually substitute government decisions by reversing them and taking further decisions in order to withdraw the indictments against these individuals Under limited circumstances international political authorities may also

to a certain extent replace the competence of national governments for example the United Nations Security Council sanctions committees >2, pp 5–7@. Final remarks and recommendations of the current research The formalization of the rule of law principle at the international level shows that existing scientific researches tend to illustrate one of two options

posing trends The essence of the first is to operate the rule of law principle in the international legal arena as an indicator of the equal relationships between the states as the independent subjects of international law The second trend continues the ideological origins of the first and consists

LQFRQWU a VWLQJWKHFRQWHQWFK a U a FWHULVWLFV

of the observed phenomena on the basis At the same time this contrast is revealed through the parametric differences between the legal orders itself international and national . It seems necessary to expand existing directions of research with the methodological clarification on the variability of the targeted heteronomy of the rule of law principle at the international level This is primarily expressed in the dialectical interaction of the national

law or the constitutional basis of the functioning of national legal systems. The value and purpose nature of this principle involves meaningful interpenetration of international DO and national law and order, convergence of national legal systems. Therefore, the theoretical and legal study of the process and the results of such interpenetration necessarily lead to the urgent need to find the appropriate occurrence of the interaction between national legal systems with the international, taking into account relevant trends in the field of globalization and integration processes. Aspects analyzed in the context of Augsthor's research have shown correlations between international and national rule of

law principles are strong enough especially those related to the dialectical interrelations. Interfaces between national and international rule of law are predominantly manifested in fact that debates regarding the effectiveness of international rule of law are related primarily to the concern of the international community to overcome the shortcomings in the rule of law functioning within a particular state especially in the context of postconflict situations. It is significant that despite substantial differences international and national rule of law variants interact quite closely with each other.

This interaction is reflected in followingh first international law affects and often defines the content of national rule of lawh secondly the effective application of the international law as one of the requirements of the rule of law at the international level directly depends on the national rule of lawh In this regard there cannot be question about the efficiency or ing efficiency of international rule of lawh if it does not exist at all within the stateh Such dialectical interrelations are develo ped due to the fact that national practices regarding the rule of law principle constitute peculiar directions for modification of this principle within the framework of the ing ternational communityh subsequently such

modification processes shape the priority trends in the reformation of international law system itself its readiness to meet current global society challenges

1. NK Neate) . The Rule of iawh Perspectives from Around the dlobeh iundong United Kingdom Lexisnexus UKI OMMUK 270 ph OK Kanetake MK The Interfaces between the National and International Rule of Law \$ Framework Paper . Amsterdam Law School Research Paper . OMNMQ q QK 30 ph URL <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/mipapersh>
2. FIP?DEVWUDFWBLG 2480
3. SRK PK Chimni BK Legitimizing the international rule of lawh The Cambridge Companion to International iawh Cambridge University mressh OMNNK 3 . 2 0–PMUK QK Hachez NK What elements of the rule of law can be put to use at international levelh Revue Belge De Droit fnternationalh OMNPK q QTK 3 . 307–POQK RK Waldron JK Are sovereigns entitled to the benefit of the international rule of ODZ?
4. The European Journal of International iawh
5. OMNNK q OOK 3 . 315–PQPK
6. SK Watts AK The international rule of lawh German Yearbook of International iawh
7. PK q PSK 3 . 15–QRK
8. TK Wouters JKI Burnay MK fntroductionh The international rule of law European and Asian perspectivesh Revue Belge De Droit fnternationalh OMNPK q OK URL <http://iir.hbruyanthlarciergrouph.com/resources/extrai> TUOUMOTQSQQL RBCEB 2',B1B13B2BZHE%20LQWUR.SGI.
9. UK Owada HK The rule of law in a globalizing world – an Asian perspectiveh Washington University Global Studies Law oeviewh . solh UK Issue OK 3 . 187–OMRK . Nollkaemper AK The internationalized rule of lawh Hague Journal on the Rule of iawh
10. . q NLMNK 3 . 74–TUK
11. NMK Hurd IK The international rule of law and the domestic analogyh Global Constitutionalismh OMNRK q QK 3 . 365–3 RK NNK Aust HK Complicity and the law of state responsibilityh Cambridge Studies in International and Comparative iawh Berlin Freie niversitt Berlinh OMNNK 522 ph NòÜöüszRl Ê. Ê. DzÜŞöraHöa ÜöÖ ÖlÜÜl İöŞşöaÜR İöŞşÜİöüştİİ üŞİİ ÖRüİÜöRl Öra İRöüİhövüa HörZÜİRş öİlÖİüZ nTİTİa ö şşŞÜİÜA ÜİöÖüİTİ İşö üİaİüö İ şthİşüöİ üİRÜİöİ röTöŞİTİŞö üöÖşÜÖR, üŞRşİaİüö İöİöÜöİöİöRİ ÖİÜş İöŞşöİ üŞRüHÖİ İöŞşÜİöüştİİ üŞİİ – ÜöÖüİŞşÜöüÜİ ö üİHöÜüİrZüÜİ. HÜÖö, şTİTİa ÖöÜÜüŞTİŞö RÜöTöRşTİrZü İöİöÜÜöÖöa ÜöÖ ÖİÜÜİ ŞöİüaÜR üŞİİÜöÜŞaÖÖRt. á üŞÜHöşö İRİhövüa İöİöÜİöİrİt ÜöÖ üŞRüHÖÜÜ

ÙÒÔùÌŞÛÖùÛİÛ İòŞÿÛİòùşŦİİ

- [illegible]

Material files

Original author file