IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)
An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

COMPARING MONISM AND DUALISM: THEORIES ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

Divya S Nair

Maharashtra National Law University, Mumbai

Abstract: In modern society, the government plays a wide range of roles. Legal doctrine holds that each nation is both equal and powerful. This dualist idea holds that there exist two unique, distinct judicial directives: international law plus the civic laws of various nations. International law is not considered an element of a nation's internal laws as distinct structures; rather, the regulations of global law are incorporated by that country's own laws and used as a component of the nation's local laws, rather than as global law, to the size they can be utilized in a given situation inside the country's borders. Since every system of law is better in its own domain and does not share an overall area of usage, this viewpoint does not address whether legal systems is better than another. The renowned German scholar Triepel created the dualism viewpoint in 1899. According to him, there are two distinct types of law: global law governs foreign interactions, while internal or local law regulates interactions between people and the government at large. The 18th century saw the publication of the monism doctrine. Both German scientists, Moser (1701–85) and Martens (1756–1821), introduced it. But their ideas didn't become a whole theology until the 19th century. This idea states that there's just one system of law, which is the domestic system of law. The monist approach holds that both domestic and international law are components of a single, global legal framework that, in any manner or a different one, meets the requirements of humanity. neither theory adequately explains how international legislation functions inside nations, many academics contend that both of them in particular lack explanation. Notwithstanding the aforementioned claim, force is taken into account is a means of analysis in both "monism and dualism theories". Both of these made it possible to observe how municipal law and international law interacted.

***Index Terms* -** Monism, Dualism, transformation, incorporation, municipal law, international law

I. INTRODUCTION

In modern society, the government plays a wide range of roles. Legal doctrine holds that each nation is both equal and powerful. In actuality, even the most powerful countries are unable to enjoy complete sovereignty because to the extraordinary expansion of communication and understanding as well as the ongoing reminding of international rivalry. Its mutual reliance and dense nature of today's international business and political society ensures that almost all state actions can have profound effects on the entire system and decisions that other states consider. As worldwide law grows and develops, concerns about the country's place in the structure and the connection among its domestic legal framework and the norms and values that guide the worldwide community as a whole also surface. While global law mainly concentrates on relationships involving nations, local law controls local elements of governance and addresses problems among persons and official apparatus[1]. That being said, this remark is oversimplification. These are numerous situations in which issues may emerge and cause challenges among the two entities.

II. ANALYSIS : MONISM, DUALISM

Monism:

Origins: In the viewpoint of dualists, who the foundations of local regulations grew within the limits of the statutes established by the respective state and sovereign, the sources of international law grew between states and law. - conclude contracts with them. (b) Regarding subjects of study. - Dualists believe that the subjects of international and municipal law are different. Municipal law regulates relations between individuals and companies and The law of nations primarily governs relationships among nations, but local legislation deals with state institutions and people[2]. (c) Regarding the act's main ideas. There are also differences in the substance of the regulations in both regimes. Although international law is a contract among sovereign nations, local law is the supreme rule of persons. Its topics i.e., nations with agreements that impose a premium on nations' wills being compatible or other issues covered by international law, establish its standards. (d) In accordance with fundamentals. According to Anzilotti, international law is upheld due to the " pacta sunt servanda "concept, whereas local and state laws are respected as fundamentals of

[1] Laws John, *Monism and dualism*, 53(2) La Revue administrative. 17, 18-22 (2000).

[2] Crane T, *Dualism, monism, physicalism*, 1 Mind & Society. 72, 73-85 (2000).

the state's constitution. State adherence to global law is motivated by moral obligation, even though local law has legal integrity. On topic factors, see (e). Both of these systems also have different themes. While local law has a narrow application, international law has always been a vibrant field. Starke has noted that whereas local laws remained to focus on a narrower spectrum of subject-matters after 1945, international law has grown to a point where it extends into numerous additional domains; They are the places where both of these theories diverge, which is why they are utilized differently in various contexts. According to Anzilotti, there can be no disagreement among both systems because they are so different from one another[3]. That is not to say that local courts will never be able to apply international law principles. If international norms are regarded as national law, then regional courts will undoubtedly implement them. This may occur when a worldwide norm is applied domestically solely due to it is an international legal rule. Unless a court in your country is prohibited from applying a global norm by a specific local clause, like an act or ruling of the court, simply being admitted is considered to be in effect.

Consequently, after proving the existence of an obligation of global law which would apply to the present situation, international rule is automatically applied in domestic courts. Local courts apply the rules of international law even when the latter has been transformed into national law, i.e. when states expressly accepted them. Consequently, unless a specific principle of international law was purposefully and suitably incorporated into the laws of the country, for instance by legislation, a court in your country is unable to enforce it. The process varies from local one to another since the translation of international law into municipal law may be accomplished in accordance with state constitutions. The distinction between "transformation" and "incorporation[4]" is the fact that the first adds international law to local law just by virtue of its status as international law, whilst the latter necessitates particular action through the state in issue. Furthermore, transformation denotes that international legal norms become a part of municipal law only when they have been intentionally adopted, whereas inclusion suggests that foreign legal standards remain a part of domestic law until excluded. It ought to be mentioned that views of how international law is applied in local settings include "incorporation and transformation". They are not explanations of the relationships connecting both structures in any sense. It is feasible to establish links among both systems of justice, but doing so requires the government to apply international law directly or implicitly. Whenever local legislation and international law clash, the dualists contend that local courts must apply to local laws. Thus, such decision states that local law supersedes international law. Furthermore, in the event that a global court hears the case, it will follow international law in the event of a dispute rather than local law. "The Permanent International Court of Justice " stated in the "Greco-Bulgarian Communities" decision that there is a commonly recognized rule of international law that municipal law does not have precedence over other laws among subscribing nations.

"The International Court of Justice" declared stated the primacy of universal law above local laws is an essential principle of international law in its advisory position of April 27, 1988, in the applicability of arbitration commitments pursuant to the 1947 UN Headquarters Convention. The dualistic idea has a lot of detractors. First, according to the distinction between local and international laws, international law may not be incorporated into municipal law or serve as the supreme law of the country until it is expressly approved or altered by national administration practice or law. This is untrue since a nation is bound by some core "principles of international law" regardless of whether it chooses not to. Secondly, it is untrue to claim that ties among nations are the only things governed by international law. At the moment, it also controls some of the private affairs of people. People may face penalties in accordance with international law when they violate specific norms[5]. Lastly, while "pacta sunt servanda" is unquestionably a foundational concept of global law, it is unable to be the exclusive one. The nation is legally bound by a number of norms

Dualism:

Since international regulations are created by the nations oneself, it follows that there was obviously no need to incorporate them into local legislation. subsequently, in the early 20th century, Austrian lawyer Kelsen created the monistic view. The monist approach holds that both domestic and international law are components of a single, global legal framework that, in any manner or a different one, meets the requirements of humanity. Its proponents contend that the two together make up a single legal system. Thus, international legislation is interdependent from sovereign domestic law and can only have significance when it is a component of a global legal system. These distinctions result from the common basic conception of international law as a global legal system, meaning that they are merely different expressions of similar law governing families. In the view of monism, every law are created only for people, one national and international forms are merely tangible examples of the one and only rule. Although international law ties people via states, local legislation ties themselves immediately. Both of these Laws are similar as they aim to address issues that people face in various domains[6]. Some think that international law functions as a single, cohesive part of the overall legal framework. As a result, none national or local law exists outside of the framework of law.

As a consequence, local courts are not required to modify the international rules in order to take effect. The purported distinctions among both theories with regard to of topics, substance, and resources made to the dualists were denied by proponents of the monistic theory. They contend that people are essentially the focus of each of the legal systems. Upon hearing that global law governs the relationships between countries rather than people, proponents of the monist approach inquire as to exactly what constitutes a state. They argue that because a state is composed of people, it is only inasmuch as municipal law affects the conduct and welfare of the people that the tenets of global law eventually govern everyone. Secondly, irrespective of the subjects' will, the law in both locations is fundamentally a law which must be followed. Thirdly, according to the monist approach, both international and local laws are only expressions of the same legal idea and are therefore essentially distinct from one another. Global law, according to monists, is superior even in local government. Regarding the interaction between local legislation and international law, the two aforementioned ideas have long been in the lead. Which among the aforementioned theories is true, one wonders? One could argue that no one theory is comprehensive and flawless. National history demonstrates that, on occasion, international law

[3] Dewey J, *Realism without monism or dualism--I.: Knowledge involving the past*. The Journal of Philosophy. 308, 309-317 (1922).
[4] Jonson E, *Monism and dualism,* The Monist. 623 ,624-629 (1918).
[5] Drake D, 1929. *Beyond monism and dualism*, 26(15) The Journal of Philosophy. 401, 402-407 (1929).
[6] Supra note 2 at 30-40.

has taken precedence over local law, particularly when cases are adjudicated in international institutions. For instance, the " Greek-Bulgarian permanent international court[7] " stated that it is a commonly recognized precept of international law that the conditions of municipal law cannot supersede the agreement in the interactions among the signatory parties. Nonetheless, in numerous instances, particularly when an issue is addressed by local law and local laws conflicts with international law, municipal law takes precedence over international law[8].

III. FINDINGS

i. When it comes to municipal law's standing under international law, the basic rule is the fact that an entity which has broken a norm is unable to employ its own legal system to defend its position
ii. Arguing that a state acted in this way because it followed the provisions of its own municipal laws is no defence to a breach of an international obligation.
iii. It is evident why local laws can't be used as a justification for evading international obligations. In any other case, local laws would be a straightforward means of circumventing international laws.
iv. International law governs whether a conduct by a State qualifies as globally illegal, according to Article 3 of the International Law Commission and the rules on Government accountability.
v. According to "Article 27" of the "Vienna Convention" on the Legal Status of Treaties, adopted in 1969, the party in question cannot use its own legal system's rules as an excuse for breaking a global contract[9].
vi. The issue regarding global law's place in local legal frameworks becomes more intricate, though. Naturally, countries possess an overall duty to uphold international law but were accountable for any transgressions of it, no matter if the guilt lies with the "legislative, executive, or judicial branches" of government or with their own laws.
vii. Furthermore, states that are parties may be required to comply with domestic legal obligations by international agreements, and legally binding Security Council resolutions may mandate particular actions inside a nation's borders.

IV. CONCLUSION

According to Article 46(2), a violation is considered evident if it is realistically noticeable in a Government that is working in an honest manner and in conformity to standard procedures. In "Cameroon v. Nigeria, the International Court of Justice" addressed this clause in relation to Nigeria and the claim that the 1975" Maroua Declaration", which had been signed by both heads of state, was void because it had not been approved. According to the "Vienna Convention", leaders of power belong to those who are seen as representing their nation by virtue of their positions and lack of full authority. The Supreme Court further determined that nations are rarely obligated by law to stay updated on legislation and legal changes in other nations which have or might grow significant for those nations' relationships abroad. In fact, there's a discernible trend to the application of international standards within domestic legal frameworks, and national courts are increasingly having authority over cases with an international element. As a result, there is now less differentiation among both of the formerly dominating independent domains by domestic and global law[10]. Additionally, global legal standards are being reevaluated, and local courts are being more inclined to consider this when evaluating the conduct of their governments. Furthermore, local courts frequently have the authority to interpret international norms that are pertinent to the issue at hand and to try to reconcile treaty disputes and also disputes among international laws like immunity for states and the ban against torturing. Human rights and legally enforceable "resolutions of the Security Council. "Throughout both of these structures, the local government the system's global choices are treated differently from national choices, with the former having no "res judicata" (or binding or final consequence) at the international level until explicit instruction is provided on the subject. Local courts may enforce arbitration judgments made both domestically and internationally and frequently grant these choices enforceable force.

V. SUGGESTIONS

Monism:

i. Create an distinct structure of standards inside the monistic legal structure to guarantee uniformity and coherence in the implementation and comprehension of the law
ii. Bolster local frameworks for carrying out duties under international law.
iii. Judges and attorneys should get instruction and training on the fundamentals and applications of monism in worldwide law. This improves their ability to successfully implement international law in country settings.
iv. Encourage the public's involvement and knowledge of global legal problems in order to strengthen support for monistic ideas. This entails holding talks about the significance of international law with the press, universities, and civil society groups.
v. For the purpose of upholding international legal commitments, develop international cooperation structures. This could entail strengthening the UN's and other global organizations' capacity to oversee conformity and mediate disputes.

---

[7] Haigh E.L , T*he vital principle of Paul Joseph Barthez: the clash between monism and* dualism*, 21(1) Medical History. 1, 1-14 (1977).
[8] Velmans M, *Reflexive monism psychophysical relations among mind, matter, and consciousness.* Journal of Consciousness Studies. 142, 143-165 (2012).
[9] Finegan Thomas, *Neither dualism nor monism: holism and the relationship between municipal and international human rights law*, 2(4) *Transnational Legal Theory* 476, 477-503 (2011).
[10] Stent G.S, *Epistemic dualism of mind and body*, 142(4) *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. 576, 578-588 (1998).

Dualism:

i. Within the dualistic structure, keep a clear separation among domestic legal regimes and international standards of law. By doing this, jurisdictional disputes are avoided and the independence of the two legal domains is upheld.

ii. Provide procedures that will allow international legal standards to be incorporated into national law while adhering to dualism concepts. Legislative actions, court rulings, and administrative laws that implement international responsibilities while supplanting local laws under international law may fall within this category.

iii. To make it easier to apply and understand international legal rules inside the dualistic structure, promote communication and cooperation among domestic courts and international tribunals. This encourages unity and uniformity in the application of the law throughout various legal systems.

iv. Encourage countries to enter into bilateral and multilateral agreements to elucidate the interplay among domestic and international legal principles. These kinds of agreements might cover topics including regulation, authority, and collaboration in subjects of shared interest.

v. Acknowledge and enable legal plurality inside the dualistic paradigm so that different legal frameworks and customs may co-exist. This encourages admiration for the independence of other legal systems and various cultures.

vi. Under the dualistic structure, mediate disputes among national and international laws diplomatically. States can resolve conflicts between objectives and establish mutually beneficial resolutions to legal problems through diplomacy involvement.

vii. Encourage continued legal growth to handle new problems and growing issues within national and international legal systems. This could be international pacts, court rulings, or modifications to legislation that modify legal structures to reflect evolving situations.

REFERENCES

[1] Laws John, *Monism and dualism*, 53(2) La Revue administrative. 17, 18-22 (2000).

[2] Crane T, *Dualism, monism, physicalism*, 1 Mind & Society. 72, 73-85 (2000).

[3] Dewey J, *Realism without monism or dualism--I.: Knowledge involving the past*. The Journal of [4] Philosophy. 308, 309-317 (1922).

[4] Jonson E, *Monism and dualism,* The Monist. 623 ,624-629 (1918).

[5] Drake D, 1929. *Beyond monism and dualism*, 26(15) The Journal of Philosophy. 401, 402-407 (1929).

[6] Haigh E.L , T*he vital principle of Paul Joseph Barthez: the clash between monism and* dualism*, 21(1) Medical History. 1, 1-14 (1977).

[7] Velmans M, *Reflexive monism psychophysical relations among mind, matter, and consciousness.* Journal of Consciousness Studies. 142, 143-165 (2012).

[8] Finegan Thomas, *Neither dualism nor monism: holism and the relationship between municipal and international human rights law*, 2(4) *Transnational Legal Theory* 476, 477-503 (2011).

[9] Stent G.S, *Epistemic dualism of mind and body*, 142(4) *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. 576, 578-588 (1998).