

Authority Under Contestation: Institutional Legitimacy of International Law and Human Rights

Mohd. Ruhul Amin

Mar 23, 2025

Abstract

This article discusses how international human-rights institutions maintain authority when their decisions, procedures, and legitimacy are contested. It describes institutional authority as dependent not only on formal legal mandates but also on consent, expertise, impartial procedures, consistency, participation, transparency, and demonstrated problem-solving capacity. The article mentions that contestation does not automatically weaken legitimacy. Constructive disagreement may expose poor reasoning, encourage procedural reform, and strengthen accountability. However, credibility declines when powerful states selectively apply international standards against opponents while resisting equivalent scrutiny of their own conduct. The analysis also examines domestic mobilization, multilevel implementation, civil-society advocacy, legal integration, and the role of national institutions in translating international obligations into practical protection. It concludes that international authority becomes more persuasive when institutions explain decisions clearly, correct errors, treat strong and weak actors consistently, permit meaningful participation, and connect international recommendations with domestic budgets, administration, monitoring, and accessible remedies.



Authority is a key element in operational influence, and in fact international law requires this authority in the absence of a global police force. In April 2025, challenges are directed towards specific decisions, as well as the presence of human-rights interpreting bodies. The invocation of sovereignty, democratic decision, security and the constitutional identity serve as a means of resisting outer criticism on the part of the states. Those arguments might not only be sign of differing ways of looking at law, but also resistance. The key one is whether contestation leads to better reasoning and accountability or whether it simply serves as an overall blanket for the lack of common standards.

International institutions' legal power comes only where the relevant actors deem the decisions to be of binding, persuasive or worthy of deference nature. Legitimacy can be based on consent or expertise, impartial procedure, consistency, participation and proven problem-solving ability. Legitimacy is not necessarily undermined by disagreements disagreement may reveal failings in reasoning and spur institutional reforms. The problem only arises in the case of the kind of criticism which goes from an attack on a particular decision to an attack on every kind of external constraint.

Selective acceptance also undermines credibility particularly if strong states police the use

of international law vis-a-vis opponents, and they are not necessarily held to such standards when it comes to their own faults. The more often standards are applied and the more procedures are clear and easy to understand and the more significant avenues to question error exist between the persons and events affected, the greater the authority.

There is more than external enforcement of human rights through international law. Beth Simmons' work on treaty effects focuses on how "domestic mobilization" can be achieved through a treaty, including language, procedure and leverage that can be extended to local actors. Broad obligations are interpreted by courts, lawyers, legislators, journalists, union, professional and advocacy organizations into claims which are suitable for national institutions. The idea is that, ratification opens possibilities and doesn't automatically result in compliance.

Governments can take treaties for face but can come up with reservations and at the domestic level, limit its enforceability or delay reporting or implement selectively. The pragmatic one is whether the local coalitions are able to trigger the commitment and what institutions have the capacity to translate the commitment into regular decisions.

Compliance is not "one size fits all". A government may take various shapes and offer direction and establish a coordination unit and report, without having to engage in greater devolutions of authority. Measured compliance might be tactically adapted when it is externally monitored with an emphasis on visible procedures without it being internalized. Capacity and effectiveness for compliance hold in the middle, where budgeting, training, judicial argument, administrative review and frontlines incentives are all lined-up on the side of the norm.

Even when international interest wanes, public officials are more apt to go with the rule. Ultimately, to differentiate between conviction and convenience, one must look at things longitudinally and carry out implementation audits, conduct interviews, consider various litigation outcomes, and look at formal policy versus lived reality. Surface compliance may yet yield benefit, but it is that reliability is fragile compliance that still resides with any political reversal.

Multilevel institutions involve multiple determinations of responsibilities, as international responsibilities are passed through national, regional, state and municipal and organizational levels. Each level has the possibility to validate a right, to modify it, to adjourn it, or it can excuse it and throw it onto someone else's lap. The challenge is further complicated by federal systems with national treaty authority and subnational ongoing, law and administration required for implementation. International monitoring bodies can

help to clarify standards, but these are typically under the control of domestic institutions as is the budget, staffing, remedies and enforcement.

For good governance to be effective, there is a need for specific focal points, reporting lines, common indicators, readily-available data and mechanisms for resolving vertical confliction. In the absence of such architecture, compliance efforts can end up as a portfolio of individual initiatives, instead of a system in place.

Legal integration is referred to as a process of international-to-domestic conformity but that process in reality is not uniform. There are varying constitutions there are varying there are differing legislatures there are varying capacities of agencies. There are many ways to incorporate a norm, such as a legislative way, a judicial way and an administrative way. Convergence in language can thus be achieved through integration, and divergence in enforcement.

Backlash also has a role to play in cases where political players dramatize threats to sovereignty or democratic option as emanating from outside. comparative analysis be done by the tracking of sequences, institutional veto points and distributional effects and ratification be not the ultimate end.

Human rights organizations establish a link between local experience and legal, political and international fora. These groups write reports, help get victims to tell their side of the story, inform themselves of legal technicalities, brief oversight agencies and keep issues top-of-the-line once the media shows their interest in a different issue. However, agendas can still be skewed due to reliance on donor priorities, access barriers and security concerns, along with differential representation. Credibility is built on open approaches, verifying, conflict-sensitive practices, and affected community participation.

Legislative recommendations that name an institution to be charged with implementing the recommendation, a legal means to get the recommendation to that institution, a budgetary impact statement, and measurable date or time limit are also the best approaches when advocating for a recommendation to be made under the law. Moral urgency contributes to attracting attention but the process of institutional specificity gives the sense of reform.

A well-developed evidence approach is a mixture of macro and micro (institutional) comparisons. Event data can determine when and where there were clusters of events, administrative data can allow us to see where areas were prioritized for enforcement and how organizations responded. This means that survey experiments can also be used to

measure public tolerance and process tracing can be used to identify key decisions. Other indicators include court's judgments, directives, procurement books, staff changes, disciplinary action and budget changes.

There is no single measure that can be used to identify either democratic eroding or accountability. The necessity of triangulation is that there is a danger of the public being tricked by "dangerous" rhetoric, a danger of the official statistics being under reported, and a danger of a change of the law and yet not being put into practice. When the multiple sources of confidence point to the same mechanism at the different layers of governance, it gives added confidence.

The notion of legitimacy analysis should be demarcated from opposition to institutional logic, and resistance to override scrutiny. When it comes to the issue of authority, affected communities often look at access, fairness and quality results rather than at formal manifestations of expertise and experience. Treatment of powerful states is key as selective scrutiny will be viewed as hierarchy of the law.

Implementation indicators should focus on results and remedy, rather than just meetings, reports, focal points, etc. or mention of legislation. There are elements of integration to be strengthened in domestic courts, but often it is the administrative bodies that have more influence in implementing the protected rights in real life. Civil society networks can assist to bring the international into an understood local language, bringing the issues to a platform where they could be acted upon.

When institutions are able to clearly articulate legal argumentation and rule equally on friends and foes, political backlash fades in importance. Comparative studies must be able to differentiate between a lack of capacity and unwillingness as different institutional issues require their remedies. The foundations of legitimacy are built only over the long-term, where consistency, error-correction, due process and tangible improvements for the communities affected help to establish long-term legitimacy.

Although gaps may be revealed through Treaty reporting, follow-up plans are required for reporting cycles within the country and this plan has to name institutions, have deadlines and have measurable responsibilities. Particular care should be taken with reservations and declarations these do not preclude substantial limitations on domestic obligation, but are the result of formal ratification. The influence of Parliaments on implementation is through legislation, appropriations, and looking at how committees operate, as well as appointment powers and scrutiny of Executive reporting.

It is possible to link the international recommendations with the domestic investigations, education, monitoring and complaint mechanisms provided by national human-rights institutions. Even where services are internationally responsibility is at state level, local level control may have important impact on the practical rights. Professional training is best conducted when standards are in context of evaluation, supervision and promotion not solely conducted in the classroom.

The potential sources of conflict of distributional nature originate in the changes in access to resource, authority, status or institutional discretion associated with legal integration. There is too much uncertainty in the direct effect, interpretation and hierarchy of domestic legal process in relation to the international norms. The use of the authority of international institutions to recognize error, explain rationale and act subject to similar analyses regarding powerful and weak states buttresses this authority.

Implementation offices should have access to the highest decision-makers otherwise they are symbolic location and coordination becomes non-focal.

When external norms are internalized, it is international law that really counts. Domestic actors have the majority of the walking to be done; open pathways through treaties, monitoring bodies, courts, and through diplomatic pressure. Commitment beyond a report or ceremony depends upon the legitimacy, capacity, the political incentives for, and the design of the institutions. Thus, in terms of integration, there can be no measurement solely on the basis of the number of ratifications.

The more robust test is whether normal decision-making processes are affected, remedies are made available, there is official tacitly acceptability of a complaint being heard, and vulnerable groups gain more protection in light of it. If laws are administered equitably repeatedly, they can be rendered more authoritative, and their selective use can render the law more problematic and subject to another level of challenge.