International Journal of Law, Policy and Social Review
www.lawjournals.net
Online ISSN: 2664-6838
Received: 20-01-2026, Accepted: 19-02-2026, Published: 06-03-2026
Volume 8, Issue 1, 2026, Page No. 144-153

Is international law truly law? beyond sovereign command and coercive enforcement

Madhumitha Gopinath
Advocate, Bar Council of Tamil Nadu & Puducherry Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract
The theoretical controversy on the jurisprudential status of international law has a long history. Classical legal positivists, especially John Austin, rejected its nature as a form of law based on the reason that it does not have a sovereign defining its authority and a centralized sanctioning mechanism. In contrast to the domestic legal system, international law has a decentralized system that includes sovereign states, voluntary jurisdiction and enforcement of the law that is politically contingent. The lack of an international legislature, the mandatory hearing by the International Court of Justice, and the identical tools of coercion still stokes doubts about its legal nature. The command theory basis of law is however disputed through modern jurisprudence. The re-conceptualization of law beyond sovereign command in thinkers like Hans Kelsen and H. L. A. Hart gave more importance on normativity and rule-structure and institutional recognition. The modern international practice, including the adherence to treaties, the regulation of the trade, and relations between states, proves that international norms are always considered binding by states. The present paper revisits the classical debate considering institutional developments and compliance theories in the current modern context. It holds that even though there is no central authority to enforce international law, it is a normative legal order to which consent and reciprocity, along with legitimacy and interdependency, uphold it. The paper finds that, the problem of dismissing the international law cannot be approached using a tight definition of law as coercion, but rather as a decentralized, but functional form of law.

Keywords: International law, jurisprudential debate, Legal Positivism, John Austin, decentralized legal system

Introduction

The issue on whether international law is indeed law is still one of the most debatable issues in legal theory. The international law is in a horizontal system of formally equal sovereign states, in contrast to municipal law systems, which are governed by a recognizable sovereign power and legislative capability, and which enact laws that are enforced by coercive mechanism. There is no global parliament, there is no central executive power, there is no global court of justice that has the binding authority.

This structural deficient encountered by classical positivists, who most prominently included John Austin, to refute the legal nature of international norms. The Austinian command theory states that law is the order of a political superior supported by punishments. As states are not subject to a world sovereign, international norms in this perspective are nothing but positive morality, but not law as it were. The exercise of such skepticism is supported by the facts on the ground. The jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice is in most cases on the consent of states. States can make reservations, withdraw optional clause declarations, or even non-compliance with adverse judgments. The interpretation of these rules usually relies on political institutions including the United Nations Security Council whereby geopolitical interests can override the ruling of law. These characteristics seem to undermine the force of bond that law is usually linked to. Nevertheless, even with these structural constraints, an international law governs a rather wide scope of state behavior: treaty duties are continuously fulfilled; diplomatic immunity is taken into consideration; international systems of air and water transportation operate with great frequency; and states often defend their actions, legally. Recent legal theoreticians like Hans Kelsen and H. L. A. Hart have challenged the necessity of coercion as a part of law and have suggested more general normative models that can accommodate international law in the sense of legality.

The apparent contradiction of this weak centralized enforcement and consistent norms of operation requires a new analytical investigation. Is international law just a system of moral or political principles or is it a real legal system operating by decentralized means? An aim of the paper is to reconsider the classical debate and assess the modern position of international law in the jurisprudential and functional perspective.

Research Objectives

- To critically examine the classical positivist rejection of international law as a law.
- To analyse contemporary jurisprudential defenses supporting its legal status.
- To evaluate institutional and structural impediments such as jurisdictional constraints and implementing efforts.
- To assess the state involvement on international norms as explained by the contemporary compliance theories.
- To develop an analytical model that would bring to bear theoretical challenges and the realities of practice.

Research Questions

- Whether international law qualifies as “law” under classical positivist jurisprudence, particularly the command theory propounded by John Austin?
- Does the absence of a centralized sovereign authority, compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, and uniform enforcement mechanisms negate its legal character?
- Can modern jurisprudential theories and contemporary state practice justify recognizing international law as a decentralized yet normative legal system?

Hypothesis

This paper has a hypothesis that the international law, which is not centralized in terms of its sovereign authority and does not have coercive measures on enforcing the law, is a legitimate and functioning legal system. Its legitimacy and efficacy are not based on hierarchical command structures but consent, normativity, institutional recognition, reciprocity and global interdependence. In this respect, coercion-based conventional definition of law falls short in excluding international law of the category as a legal system.

Classical Denial: The Austinian Critique

a. The Command Theory of Law

The analytical positivism of John Austin has been most famously linked to the classical rejection of international law as law. Austin sought to distinguish law properly so called from morality, custom, and social norms. For Austin, the content of law was incidental; its validity derived from its source. Justice, fairness and ethical merit were not the criteria of law instead, it found its legitimacy in its creation by a determinate political authority. Austin is famously known to have defined law as a command of a sovereign and supported by sanctions. This formulation involved three factors:

Command: An instance of a superior to an inferior which is a declaration of desire.

Sovereign: A determinate political superiority, who is habitually obeyed by the greater part of the society, and is not habitually obeyed by any other earthly political superiority.

Sanction: The penalty that has to be used in case of non-compliance.

Therefore, under Austin's scheme, law presupposes a hierarchical structure; a political superior commanding and subjects obeying through the threat of coercion. The effect of law being binding is based on the fear of punishment and not on the compliance with a moral obligation. This theory emerged in the framework of domestic legal systems especially the English state whereby the parliament acted as a sovereign body and courts applied the rule of law using coercive means. The command theory can thus be seen to be a model of centralized government whereby legal validity is pegged on the presence of an identifiable law-making body and punitive sanctions that are enforceable. Under this strict formulation, anything lacking these structural features cannot properly be termed law.

b. International Law Application

As soon as the framework introduced by Austin is applied to international law, one runs into trouble. The international society lacks a centralized sovereign authority. States are formally equal and autonomous; none is legally subordinate to another. No international legislature can make universally binding mandates, nor is there an executive authority in the world that can coerce all states. Moreover, global adjudication is rooted much on agreement. The jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice rests upon state consent. States can either make submissions, or make reservations and can even renege on the declarations of mandatory jurisdiction. This absence of automatic and universal judicial power adds to the sense of structural weakness. Mechanisms of enforcement also seem to be scarce. Although the United Nations Security Council has the mandate to make decisions when there is a threat to international peace, its decisions are influenced by political considerations and subject to the veto power of permanent members. The enforcement of international judgment and treaty commitment is usually based on diplomatic pressure, economic implications or reputational expenses instead of coercion. In addition, states are not habitually submissive to a superior world power. Rather, they are likely to engage in a decentralized and horizontal system. The international norms in Austinian language do not have a determinate sovereign and are thus similar to positive morality - rules followed through convenience, courtesy, or ethical disposition and not through a sense of legal duty.

In this view, international law seems lacking in all of the three major components of the command theory: it is not a sovereign of the world, there is no superiority, and a sanctioning mechanism is not guaranteed. Austin therefore decided that what we call international law is not in fact law as such, but rather a system of moral rules that regulate the relationships between states.

c. Jeremy Bentham and his Position

Even though most closely linked with the rejection of the legal nature of international law, the intellectual origins of the discussion can be traced back to Jeremy Bentham, who famously coined the term of international law. Bentham substituted the previous term law of nations with a more specific term, namely, the consensuality of interstate obligations. Bentham did not develop the systematic denial in the Austinian sense, but his utilitarian and positivism made the basis of legal obligation legislative power. Because there was no international legislature, the international norms were seen as the result of agreements and mutual understandings of sovereign states as opposed to being dictated by the higher authority. Therefore, although it is true that Bentham gave the terms that have defined the discussion of modernity, the positivist tradition that he inspired failed to resolve the conceptual issue of sovereignty and the supranational normativity. When law is required to derive from a superior law, it will appear that a system of equal sovereigns will not accomplish the production of binding law in the strict analytical sense.

d. Criticism of the Austinian View

This theory of Austin has been widely criticized as overly rigid and reductionist rigid and reductionist, though it is logically clear. Its main complaint is that it defines law as nothing more than coercion and hierarchical command, thus overlooking other facets of normativity and institutional practice.

To begin with, not every rule in the domestic legal system can be categorized in the command-sanction model. Customary practices, judicial precedents, and constitutional conventions often operate without explicit sanctions. For example, constitutional conventions in parliamentary systems are regarded as binding political rules despite lacking enforceable penalties in courts. Their force lies in political morality and institutional expectation rather than coercive punishment.

Second, the legal systems of the modern world appreciate the existence of different types of soft law and rules of regulation that operate without the regular use of coercion.

The social acceptability and institutional legitimacy are not the only factors that contribute to the daily compliance of citizens with traffic laws or tax regulations.

Third, the command theory finds it hard to explain how the constitutional constraints on the sovereign power are binding. How do the principles of constitution restrict Parliament when it is sovereign? The circle is complete: the law comes into being by the sovereign, but what justifies the authority of the sovereign himself? These limitations suggest that law might not be characterized by coercion. Rather, law can be based on recognition, institutional practice and normative acceptance. This criticism gains momentum especially when the concept of international law is revisited. When the domestic systems themselves have norms operating without formal sanctions, the lack of a centralized coercion factor cannot in any way of necessity deny the international norms their legal status. The international treaties, custom and diplomatic rules are frequently considered as binding based not only on moral courtesy but also due to the fact that states understand it as a legal obligation.

Observation

The model by Austin is indicative of the politics of the centralized nation-states in the nineteenth century. But it presupposes that law has to exist in an obligatory form of a vertical hierarchy. Although this is an assumption that might apply to the domestic legal systems, it is not clear that hierarchy is a mandatory characteristic of law. Austin will have a limited conceptual capacity to support the requirement of decentralized normative orders by giving precedence to centralized authority.

Austin's critique exposes not only perceived structural limitations of international law but also the conceptual rigidity of his own framework. The lack of a sovereign in the world is accepted as conclusive with no inquisition on whether or not sovereignty should always be centralized. The international law is governed by horizontal form of coordinated authority and not subordinated authority. The important question to ask, then, is whether or not coordination can produce binding normativity, or whether or not subordination is a necessary aspect of law. State practice and opinio juris suggest that coordination may indeed generate normative obligation even in the absence of hierarchical command.

The implicit acceptance of the existence of organized rules that governed the relations between states was also an innovation in terms of terminology by Bentham. But by basing obligation purely on consent, the positivist tradition narrowed the conceptual range of autonomy of international law as a law. Although consent is the reason why international norms were created, it fails to sufficiently explain how they persist and their authority across the system.

The general flaw of the strategy used by Austin is that law is equated with coercion. Although coercion might be a strengthening element of law, it might not be a definition of the law. In case coercion was considered to be the only standard of legality, most constitutional and soft law processes of systems in the domestic context would not be regarded as law. This introduces a contradiction in the command theory itself. Furthermore, the Austinian approach assumes that sovereignty has to be indivisible and absolute. In the modern international system, however, shared, overlapping, and distributed functional authority is manifested in contemporary global governance. The development of international institutions indicates that law can even operate as binding normative order in a decentralized system without degenerating into a matter of morality.

In the end, the Austinian rejection of international law is based on a limited conception of legal authority. By equating law solely with centralized coercion, it overlooks the potential for normative obligation to arise from structured coordination among sovereign equals. The idea that hierarchy is the only basis for legality is called into question by the enduring and successful application of international norms.

The Positivist and Normativist Defense Of International Law

The weakness of the Austinian command theory forced subsequent jurists to rethink the question whether the fact that the international law lacked an international sovereign was a necessary result in depriving the law of legal form. Twentieth-century positivist and normativist scholars developed more sophisticated reconstructions of legality, moving beyond coercion as the defining essence of law.

These theories do not deny the structural peculiarities of international law; rather, they reinterpret them within broader conceptions of normativity and validity. This discussion thus transforms the question of enforcement to a further question of what is the legal validity itself.

Pure Theory of Law by A. Hans Kelsen

The best and the most orderly justification to consider international law as true law is in the work of Hans Kelsen. Kelsen attempted to disassociate legal science with sociology, politics, and morality in his Pure Theory of Law and gave it a normative basis, structured in hierarchies. For Kelsen, law is not a command backed by force but a normative order structured through relations of validity.

1. The Grundnorm of the International Law

Kelsen assumed a hypothetical basic norm, the Grundnorm, at the basis of any legal system of law-making subordinate norms valid. At the international level, he held that the fundamental norm might be delineated to the effect that states should act even as they have traditionally acted. This interpretation gives the binding force of customary international law its foundations. In this perception, international law has no demand of a sovereign legislator. Its validity derives out of the presumed basic norm that has the authority to create norms by custom and treaty. It is not the coercive implementation that makes treaties binding but rather pacta sunt servanda as the norm that is confirmed in the framework of the hierarchical system of international law. The lack of centralized force, therefore, does not disapprove of legality. For Kelsen, validity is a matter of normative authorization and is conceptually distinct from empirical effectiveness.

2. Hierarchy and the Primacy Debate

Kelsen also maintained that, international law could be considered as being hierarchically superior to the domestic law. In his theory of monism, the legal systems of the country are justified by the international legal order. When a state contravenes international law, then the breach in its

domestic legality cannot cancel the higher normative violation.

This is important as it turns the Austinian hierarchy upside down. Rather than the international law relying on the state sovereignty as an ideal, the state sovereignty becomes an invention of the international legal system. The possibility of law in the absence of a centralized sovereign is, therefore, conceivable since the normativity is in itself authority.

3. Validity Independent of Effectiveness

Kelsen recognized that there are sanctions in the law of international law, including reprisals and countermeasures, but denied that the centralization of enforcement was a prerequisite of validity. Not every norm is supported by direct force even in domestic systems. The most important difference is between the presence of a norm and effectiveness in implementing it. In parting the way between validity and effectiveness, Kelsen has solved the major objection of Austin. The international law is not as effective yet it still has a chance to be valid provided it is a part of the same normative system.

H. L. A. Hart – The Concept of Law

Kelsen had defended international law by use of normative hierarchy whereas a problem was viewed by H. L. A. Hart using the analytical jurisprudence. In the Concept of Law, Hart objected to the objectification of law to command, made by Austin, and introduced the primary and secondary rules.

1. Primary and Secondary Rules

Primary rules are those that have obligations (e.g., prohibitions or duties), whereas secondary rules are those that make it possible to recognize, to change, and to adjudicate. An adult legal system is one that is full of both.

There are plainly primary rules in international law rules that regulate the conduct of the state, the employment of force, treaties and diplomatic relations. The more challenging question is on secondary rules. The international law does not have a completely central legislature, judicial system, and enforcement mechanism. Hart however, said that such a lack does not make it ineligible to be law.

2. The Rule of Recognition

A rule of recognition points at valid legal norms in domestic systems. Hart proposed that rule of recognition could be in the practice of states recognizing some sources of international law such as custom, treaties and general principles are accepted by the states as authoritative. This common acceptance, though less formalised, works more or less like a rule of recognition. States explain their actions on a regular basis, using legal terminology, resorting to the appeal to treaties, and citing customary rules. The practice indicates an internal viewpoint on international norms, which is one of the major criteria of legality as defined by Hart.

3. A "Primitive" but Legal System

Hart had notoriously outlined international law as being like a primitive legal system since it does not feature centralized secondary rules. But he categorically denied the conclusion that it is not law. There are primitive societies even that are lawful, even though their institution is simple. Lack of a global legislature is not synonymous with lack of legality; This merely indicates structural decentralization rather than absence of legality. In this way, Hart narrows down the argument: international law is not a morality which is less institutionalized than law.

Oppenheim and the Positivism Tradition

Previous positivists like Lassa Oppenheim were advocates of pragmatic defense of international law. Oppenheim insisted that international law is law since states acknowledge that it is a binding law and they mostly abide by it. In the case of Oppenheim, centralized sovereignty is not the decisive point but the belief of states that they have a legal duty. The adherence to the international standards on a regular basis, diplomatic protest, arbitration and judicial settlement all prove that states perceive the international standards as law and not as a political comfort. This method changes the questions of metaphysical definitions to practice. The system is functional as law when states invoke legal justification, accept responsibility in case of breaches and offer reparations.

Analytical Observation: Evolution Beyond Command Theory

The positivist and normativist defenses show that law should not be vertically structured to be binding. Rather, legality can be based on common normative undertakings, formalized processes of recognition and a consistent life practice of the state. These defenses however are not tensionless. The fact that Kelsen uses a hypothetical Grundnorm puts into doubt empirical grounding. Institutional weakness comes in implicitly through the description of international law as primitive by Hart. The use of state acceptance by Oppenheim is a threat to reducing law to consent. However, altogether, they tear apart the Austinian argument that international law is nothing more than morality. They demonstrate that legality does not require that the global sovereign exists as long as there is a normative framework that is accepted by the participants as legitimate.

Transitional Insight

Whether international law meets theoretical conditions of validity and recognition, then the only question that remains is whether it is law in principle or whether it effectively serves to meet its practical functions. The discussion therefore becomes one that focuses not on conceptual legitimacy but on structural enforcement and institutional power, which is the theme that will inform the further analysis.

Observation

The positivist and normativist arguments in defense of international law not only surpass the challenge given to Austin but actually change the parameters through which legality is determined. By reversing the thinking on the command theory and taking the focus off coercive enforcing to normative validity, these scholars are revealing the conceptual inability of the command theory. The clear-cut point that can be derived out of Kelsen and Hart is that the law is not what is enforced by whom; it is the way norms are created, identified, and internalized in a system. The framework by Kelsen shows that legal validity is a structural aspect of a normative hierarchy and not a result of being

centralized by force. Assuming that validity requires authorization in a system of norms, then international law can be seen as law to the extent the rules are based on accepted sources of international law, e.g. custom and treaty. The institutional irrelevance of the lack of a global sovereign becomes conceptually relevant, but institutionally secondary.

The contribution of Hart is further enhancing this realization by placing more weight on the interior point of view. The international law is not the one that is simply followed because it is convenient to do so; it is also referenced, construed, critiqued and justified in the language of law. States rationalize their actions by referring to legal duty, accept responsibility of violation and undertake adjudicatory measures. Such practice of reflection implies that international norms do not serve as moral aspirations but as legal norms. Nevertheless, there are some limitations to the positivist defense as well. This may look abstract by Kelsen using a presupposed Grundnorm and through the explanation of international law as being primitive, Hart is implicitly acknowledging institutional frailty. The insistence of Oppenheim in state consent can easily turn state consent to an obligation to law. These internal tensions suggest that although international law satisfies theoretical standards of legality, its institutional structure differs from domestic legal systems. What is more persuasive, however, is not the fact that international law is a reflection of municipal law, but rather that legality, per se, accepts various institutionalizations.

Law does not necessarily have to be vertically imposed in order to be binding, it can also be generated horizontally through the coordinated normative performance of sovereign equals. Such a system depends not primarily on coercion but on legitimacy, reciprocity, and reputational accountability. In this regard, the positivist and normativist traditions are able to replace the Austinian denial at the conceptual level. They determine that even in the absence of a centralized establishment of international law, international law may have validity, structure and characters of bindingness. The theoretical issue that remains is the empirical one, when the issue of decentralized normativity is adequate to achieve the overall existence of compliance in the politically fragmented international order.

Institutional and Jurisdictional Challenges

Even in the situation when international law meets the theoretical requirements of validity, institutional constraints generate serious practical challenges. The most unrelenting criticisms do not refute the fact that there exists the concept of international law, but they argue that the decentralized structure of international law weakens its authority in practice.

These concerns can be grouped under three interrelated headings: Jurisdiction, enforcement, and compliance.

a. Jurisdictional Limitations.

Adjudication is voluntary in nature, which is one of the key structural weaknesses of international law. However, unlike a domestic legal system, in which the courts have a compulsory jurisdiction over the individuals within a territory, international tribunals highly rely on the consent of the states. The apparent example is the jurisdiction of the international court of justice (ICJ). States may declare that they recognize the Court's jurisdiction as mandatory in relation to other states accepting the same obligation under Article 36(2) of the ICJ Statute, also known as the "optional clause." But this is purely on a voluntary basis. States need not recognize the jurisdiction of the Court at all, may have reservations which restrict its jurisdiction or may revoke their declarations. The result is a fragmented jurisdictional environment. Even in the case when two states have signed the optional clause, wide reservations can omit the disputes of national security, domestic jurisdiction, or previous treaty agreements. These reservations may greatly limit the jurisdiction of the Court. There are two institutional implications of this voluntary form of structure. First, we have no general compulsory adjudication, as we have in the domestic systems. Second, strong states have the ability to cushion themselves against the judicial review through withholding or revoking consent. The lack of an automatic jurisdiction gives strength to the notion that international law is more of a diplomacy than an adjudication tool. But this restriction is not so much the result of accident; it is the principle of sovereign equality. Since states are not subject to a higher political authority, adjudicative competence must derive from their consent.

The jurisdictional weakness is thus set structurally in the international legal order. The issue of whether this feature is a fatal flaw or a constitutional characteristic is a debatable one.

b. The Enforcement Problem

The second institutional issue is the issue of enforcement. Even in cases where legal requirements are well defined and ruled, the international law does not have a centralized executive body that can strongly impose compliance.

The United Nations Security Council has a partial role of enforcement as stipulated in the United Nations Charter. Under Chapter VII, the Security Council has the discretion to establish whether there is a threat to international peace and security, and the adoption of binding measures, including sanctions and, in principle, the authorization of force. Nevertheless, this process is politicized. The veto power is carried by the five permanent members, namely China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Any material decision must be agreed upon. This veto design tends to result in selective implementation where geopolitical affiliations decide whether violation attracts collective action. This leads to unequal enforcement. The system of sanctions or collective actions can be applied as a result of some of the violations, and the diplomatic statements can be produced without any material impact. This selectivity is the source of criticism that international law is susceptible to power politics and can work unequally on cases. In addition, the authorization of actions by the Security Council relies on the member states even in the cases where the Security Council authorizes actions. Sanctions are to be taken at home, troop contribution is to be met out in peacekeeping efforts, and coerciveness of measures depends on the political will. The lack of an enforcing bureaucracy with a centralized body checks homogeneity. Such realities lead to a conflict with positivist and normativist defenses as in the case above. Assuming that the validity is conceptually independent of effectiveness, the empirical weakness of enforcement will not nullify legality. But continued lapses in enforcement can undermine the credibility of the system. A legal order which cannot be successful in ensuring compliance may suggest appearing inspirational but not binding.

c. Compliance and Functional Effectiveness

The empirical record makes the pessimistic narrative complex in spite of jurisdictional and enforcement limitations. Some of the most common areas of routine compliance are evidenced by international law. The greater part of treaties is considered in practice. States do not often simply reject treaty commitments, they will excuse breaches of the law, use exceptions, or request negotiation amendment. This tendency is an inward recognition of the normative constraint.

This is evident in the international trade. The World Trade Organization dispute settlement system has in the past settled many disputes using a structured adjudication and sanctioned countermeasures. Although there are some periods of political tensions that tend to strain the system, the whole structure has been conducive to predictable trade relations and legal resolution mechanisms. Equally, diplomatic relationships operate on a day-to-day basis based on the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations where the immunities and privileges are codified. Offenses are committed, but the overall pattern of diplomatic interaction remains fixed and has a very high level of recognition.

In addition to high politics, there are technical regimes that have a great degree of regularity. The international civil aviation is based on standards that are coordinated by the International Civil Aviation Organization. The maritime navigation relies on the treaties like the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The postal systems globally operate with cooperative structures which are enabled by the Universal Postal Union. These regimes control very complex cross border operations and the control is not centralized through coercive power. This kind of day to day functioning implies that the international law is quite effective in carrying out several of its functions, especially where there is a symbiotic relationship and technical coordination. Nonetheless, not all areas of international law have the same degree of compliance. While areas involving core security interests and the use of force are more susceptible to selective compliance, technical and coordination-based regimes typically show higher levels of adherence. This variation implies that the political sensitivity of the subject matter has a significant impact on the efficacy of decentralized enforcement.

Reciprocity, reputational issues, economic interdependence and need to have stable expectations on the part of the parties are some of the reasons why compliance is sought. This factual fact moderates the enforcement criticism. Lack of world sovereign does not create collapse in the system. Rather, there are decentralized processes, such as retorsion, countermeasures, diplomatic pressure and reputational costs which help to preserve order.

Structural Tension: Decentralized Authority

The institutional and jurisdictional issues are thus of a dual nature. On the one hand, the voluntary jurisdiction, political veto institutions and selective enforcement stands out to be the major characteristics of international law that contrast with the domestic legal systems. Such characteristics reveal that it is susceptible to power imbalance and power politics. Conversely, the compliance prevalence on technical, economic, and diplomatic levels proves that centralized coercion is not the only law effectiveness mechanism. The international law is driven by a combination of consent, coordination, institutionalization and reputational discipline. The central question is no longer whether international law qualifies as law in a conceptual sense, that issue has been addressed by positivist and normativist theory, but whether decentralized enforcement mechanisms are sufficient to sustain authority in areas involving high political stakes and major power interests.

Modern Compliance Theories

The traditional approach of viewing law as a system that was upheld mostly through coercion has been questioned in the present-day scholarship. When applied to the framework of international law, where the centralized implementation of the laws is structurally constrained, contemporary theories of compliance attempt to describe the reasons why states act in line with legal norms with relative regularity. These theories transcend the force concept of law and focuses on consent, reciprocity, reputation, economic implications and institutional interdependence. Combined, they imply that the international law is supported not only by threats of punishment but by validity and reciprocal advantage.

a. Consent and Obligation of Goodwill

Consent is one of the explanations of compliance as its foundation. To a great extent international law is founded on the voluntary recognition of commitments by treaties and custom practice. States will also perceive norms as binding and legitimate since they are part of the formulation of norms. This is a consent model unlike the domestic legal systems where people are under the law regardless of whether they have agreed explicitly or not. Obligation in international law is normally based in state will. In the process of negotiation and ratification of a treaty, the states adhere to the standards that they think are congruent with their interests and values. Conformity is, thus not a mere outcome of the exertion of pressure but is rather the act of a commitment undertaken willingly.

Although critics claim that consent will result in diminishing law to contract, the current theory understands consent as a legitimacy source. The reason as to why states comply is because they understand the normative authority of obligations they contribute to building. This dynamic is supported by internalization of rules by means of diplomatic practice.

b. Reciprocity and Interactive Intervention

A second process of compliance is reciprocity. The international relations are hardly single encounters, they are marked with repeated encounters in a variety of issue areas. In this type of setting it is tactically rational to cooperate. One reason why state act as they do is because they are bound by the law and therefore acting against the law can be countered. Breaches may be followed by countermeasures, retorsion or withdrawal of cooperation. Decentralized responses create incentives to compliance even in the absence of centralized implementation. This is especially dynamic in trade relations within the WTO. It has a dispute settlement system that permits proportional countermeasures in the event of violations. Though the force is not coercive, there are organized retaliation systems that bring about predictable effects which maintain compliance.

Reciprocity therefore changes decentralized enforcing into a web of reciprocity. Compliance is a form of maintaining

constant collaboration and not just as a method of dodging punishment.

c. Reputation and Audience Costs

Reputation is an informal but effective regulating tool. The states are not only appreciative of their position in the international community, but also because of diplomatic, economic, and strategic advantages. The continued breach of the international commitments may hurt credibility, the impact of future negotiations, coalitions, and entry to the market. According to the reputational model, compliance increases reliability. A state that is familiar with not fulfilling its treaty obligations can be doubted in future treaties, it can have lower bargaining power and its associates will have less trust.

Notably, reputational costs are not limited to governments but also to domestic and other transnational audiences. Monitoring compliance behaviour is done by international bodies, investors, players in the civil society, and even the allied governments. Even in the absence of a military penalty, reputational effects would create long-term incentives to comply.

In this regard, law defines expectations and identity. States are worried about preserving an image of legality; in many instances, contentious acts are defended as being based on law, as opposed to being made outright rejection of the normative system.

d. Economic Penalties and Material Rewards

International law does not have a centralized police force although it does not have no material enforcement tools. The trade restrictions, the economic sanctions, and financial measures are the coercive leverage that is not military force. The United Nations Security Council is empowered under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter to impose binding sanctions as a response measure to the threat to the international peace and security. Also, treaty regimes tend to incorporate internal compliance measures, including the suspension of privileges or conditional market access. States use specific sanctions and coordinated economic actions to react to violations even in the absence of formal institutional structures. In a globalized economy where it is interdependent, non-membership in trade or finance or technology networks may be very expensive.

The effect of material consequences is thus to reinforce reputational rewards, forming comprehensive compliance forces that are not solely based on centralized coercion.

e. Institutional Interdependence

The contemporary international law is functioning in thick institutional networks. States are members in several regimes concurrently such as trade, finance, environmental protection, aviation, maritime navigation and telecommunications. Such interdependence with institutions makes defections more expensive. Exit or continued breach of one regime can have an influence on the membership in others. The structural incentives of cooperation are created through cross-issue linkages. Indicatively, the adherence of the maritime systems like the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea helps in the avenue of navigation rights and resource regimes which are beneficial to all the actors. International law therefore becomes an embedded cooperation system as a result of interdependence. The willingness to comply is the only requirement to remain integrated into the wider international order.

Observation

Combined, such modern theories of compliance dispute the idea that law must have centralized coercive power to work. International law exists not because states are intimidated by some global sovereign, but because compliance in most instances is in their rational self-interest, reputational concerns, institutional affiliation, and feels legitimate. This does not mean that there are few cases of violations or there are insignificant power imbalances. Instead, it proposes that decentralized systems may produce consistent patterns of obedience as obligations are seen to be legitimate, reciprocal and mutually advantageous. The change in the view of compliance as a force-based to legitimacy and benefit-based paradigm reformulates the previous criticism of enforcement. Lack of a centralized executive does not make international law ineffective; on the contrary, it changes the means by which power is maintained. Conclusively, the contemporary compliance theory supports the larger thesis of this discussion: it is not a fear of penalty that keeps the international law afloat, but a network of consent, reciprocity, reputation, material incentives and institutional integration. Legality exists in form of a coordinating model as an economically interdependent world that is politically fragmented instead of being hierarchical.

Analytical Evolution: Re-Examining the Nature of Legal Authrity In International Law Is Coercion Necessary?

The classical Austinian model describes law as a command of a sovereign backed by sanctions. In this view, coercion is not merely supportive but constitutive of legality. In the event that coercion is eliminated, so is the law.

This definition however portrays a limited definition of legal power. Coercion is not the only way that law can work even in a domestic system. The legal status of international law is consequently denied on the ground that it lacks a centralized sovereign capable of imposing obligatory sanctions. Constitutional norms and conventions often operate without continuous coercive enforcement yet retain strong normative authority within the legal system. An illustration is the institutional behaviour of constitutional morality, which is the subject of constitutional democracies, although it is not continuously penalized. Compliance is maintained by judicial review, political accountability and normative expectations. The legitimacy of constitutional principles is not based on the coercive power in the present moment but on their recognized normative character in the justice system. The same applies to legal conventions, like parliamentary practices using a constitutional system, followed not because of threats of sanction, but because of institutional expectation, legitimacy, and stability of the system. These norms govern behaviour in an efficient way that does not apply to the model of command listed by Austin. The use of even the mechanisms of the soft law including guidelines and non-binding resolutions adopted in international institutions affect the state behaviour. Although they might not have formal penalties, they can establish organised expectations and manage behaviours using reputational and institutional punishment. The analogy at home establishes the fact that coercion is not the sole basis of legality. Instead, coercion is just one of the enforcement mechanisms. Institutional acceptance, normative internalization and systemic interdependence may also provide legal power. When this expanded definition is taken internally, it is hard to decline international law on the

basis that it does not make use of centralized coercion. The issue is not then whether there is coercion or not but whether normative bindingness is nullified by the fact that the absence of such coercion is centralized. The data indicates that it does not.

Does International Law Suck or Differently structured?

The weakness of the international law assumes that the only legal system that is valid is the centralized hierarchy. This assumption is also something to be questioned. The international law exists in a horizontal framework made of sovereign equals. There is no ultimate sovereign as in the case of domestic systems. Rather, normative authority is generated through treaty consent, customary practice, and institutional coordination. Such structural difference is not supposed to be immediately associated with legal deficiency.

Decentralized but Normative and Binding

The positions and the obligations are divided between the workers and the company, and the company is more authoritative. It is most appropriate to see international law as decentralized but normative. State treaties are agreed to voluntarily yet when they are bound they are in a legal obligation. It is based on the principle of pacta sunt servanda. Even strong states support the exceptions in the law as opposed to rejecting the applicability of the law. This discursive practice is an appreciation of the legal authority.

Adjudicatory mechanisms are offered by institutions like the International Court of Justice but on a consensual basis. Although in some situation's jurisdiction is not a compulsory requirement, the states often present cases, and the judgments are adhered to. The lack of obligatory compulsory jurisdiction is not an erasure of the presence of a legal system. Besides, the regimes, which control trade, aviation, maritime navigation, postal and diplomatic relations, work with a high level of regularity. These areas show that international norms are functioning, foreseeable and integrated within the state practice. Therefore, decentralization does not mean that it is not legal. It shows a very particular mode of legal ordering.

Evolution on the way to a Quasi-Constitutional Order

Another way of looking at it is that the international law is moving beyond pure horizontality. The emergence of peremptory norms (jus cogens), obligations erga omnes, and institutional organizations including the United Nations are indicators of the growing complexity of the structure. The power of the United Nations Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter reveals the aspects of centralized decision making especially on international peace and security. Even though enforcement is currently a politically conditioned state of affairs, the presence of binding resolutions points to the shift towards the institutional hierarchy.

On the same note, the international criminal tribunals and human rights regimes imply a progressive transition between rigid state consent to the community-based responsibilities. Such a direction is not yet a domestic global constitution. Nevertheless, it questions the argument that the international law is irrevocably stuck in a primitive framework. The system has constitutionalizing tendencies.

Law with Politically Conditioned Enforcement

A third and, perhaps, more realistic view is that the international law is real law but its application is mediated politically. Power imbalance, geopolitics, and institutional imperatives tend to play important roles in influencing compliance. This conflict of law and politics is depicted in the veto power in the Security Council. There is no even application of enforcement. Nevertheless, legal character does not disappear due to the existence of political conditioning. Selective enforcement, prosecutorial discretion and political influence are felt even in domestic systems. This is because, imperfect enforcement cannot make domestic law non-law. The enforcement gap of international law must therefore be regarded as a limitation but not a disqualification.

Arguments

The Austininan denial of the international law is based on the equation of law with centralized coercion. This equation lacks the analytic insufficiency. It can be seen that law embodies the use of coercion, legitimacy, institutionalization, reciprocity, and normative acceptance as shown in domestic and international frameworks. The international law does not have an international sovereign but has organized structures of norm making, interpretation and enforcement. The international law can thus better be termed as: Instead of weak, decentralized, politically conditional as opposed to non-binding, Evolutionary but not primitive. The endurance, functionality and institutionalization of global norms makes the argument that hierarchy is the only source of law hard to accept. The international law might not reflect the domestic law but structural dissimilarity does not imply the lack of law.

Conclusion

The Austinian adversary of the international law is one of the most powerful in jurisprudence. Austin reveals the inherent structural difference between the domestic and the international order by describing law as the command of a sovereign supported by sanctions. International law lacks centralized authority, universally compulsory jurisdiction, and uniformly applied enforcement mechanisms. To that narrow sense of the structure, the Austinian framework does well in determining the weak points of institutions in the international system. Nevertheless, its applicability should not imply the legitimacy of this reproach. Modern legal theory has moved beyond the narrow equation of law with centralized coercion.

Law was redefined by thinkers like Hans Kelsen as a normative system not based on force but on validity and by H. L. A. Hart, who distinguished between primary and secondary rules, in a way that showed that it could be the case that legal systems could exist in the absence of a single commanding sovereign. Even classical international lawyers like Lassa Oppenheim acknowledged that law could emerge within a community of states through mutual acknowledgement and through common practice.

The objection based on coercion is also further weakened by institutional reality. The operations of regimes that regulate trade, aviation, maritime navigation, diplomatic relations, and international communications show that the international norms are functioning in a very regular fashion. Although such adjudicatory bodies as the International Court of Justice rely on the consent of the

states, they present an element of interpretative stability and resolution of disputes. In the meantime, the power of the United Nations Security Council in peace and security matters, indicates some slight but concrete hierarchical characteristics in a strictly horizontal organization.

Enforcement in international law is undeniably politically influenced and uneven. However, the imperfect enforcement does not take away the legal character. Domestic systems also have some selective enforcement, prosecutorial discretion, and politics. The law is not distinguished by perfect coercion but rather the existence of institutional creation of norms, accepted authority and overall patterns of obedience.

International law should thus not just be seen as a failed imitation of a domestic law, but an order of law of a different structure. It is not hierarchical and is decentralized, not imposed and consensual and not institutionally fixed. Its authority is grounded in normative acceptance, mutual expectation, reputational consequences, and institutional interdependence, alongside limited coercive mechanisms. The fact that there is no global sovereign does not imply that there is no law. The conception of the law which reduces legality to centralised force is too narrow to explain the complexity of the law in modern times. International law may lack a sovereign authority, but it is not devoid of normativity, legitimacy, or practical force.

References

1. Martti Koskenniemi, The Politics of International Law, 1 Eur. J. Int'l L. 4 (1990).
2. Statute of the International Court of Justice art. 36, June 26, 1945, 59 Stat. 1055, https://www.icj-cij.org/statute (last visited Feb. 27, 2026).
3. Gregory Shaffer & Tom Ginsburg, The Empirical Turn in International Legal Scholarship, 106 Am. J. Int'l L. 1 (2012).
4. Anthea Roberts, Comparative International Law? The Role of National Courts in Creating and Enforcing International Law, 60 Int'l & Comp. L.Q. 57 (2011).
5. Jan Klabbers, The EJIL Foreword: The Transformation of International Organizations Law, 26 Eur. J. Int'l L. 9 (2015).
6. U.N. Charter art. 27,, https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter (last visited Feb. 27, 2026).
7. Jutta Brunnée & Stephen J. Toope, Interactional International Law and the Practice of Legality, 46 N.Y.U. J. Int'l L. & Pol. 1133 (2014).
8. Jean d'Aspremont, The Professionalization of International Law, 25 Eur. J. Int'l L. 219 (2014).
9. Monica Hakimi, The Work of International Law, 58 Harv. Int'l L.J. 1 (2017).
10. David Lefkowitz, (Dis)Obedience to International Law, 27 Eur. J. Int'l L. 363 (2016).
11. Andrew T. Guzman, Compliance-Based Theories of International Law, 90 Calif. L. Rev. 1823 (2012).
12. Tom Ginsburg, Political Constraints on International Courts, 44 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 1643 (2011).
13. B.S. Chimni, Customary International Law: A Third World Perspective, 112 Am. J. Int'l L. (2018).
14. Martti Koskenniemi, What Use for Sovereignty Today?, 1 Asian J. Int'l L. 61 (2011).
15. International Court of Justice, Declarations Recognizing the Jurisdiction of the Court as Compulsory, https://www.icj-cij.org/declarations (last visited Feb. 27, 2026).
16. Surabhi Ranganathan, Global Commons, International Law and Sovereignty, 21 Eur. J. Int'l L. 37 (2010).
17. Tom Ginsburg, Political Constraints on International Courts, 44 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 1643 (2011).
18. Prabhakar Singh, Indian International Law: From a Colonized Apologist to a Subaltern Protagonist, 23 Leiden J. Int'l L. 79 (2010).
19. Oona A. Hathaway & Scott J. Shapiro, Outcasting: Enforcement in Domestic and International Law, 121 Yale L.J. 252 (2011).
20. World Trade Organization, Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU), https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/dsu_e.htm (last visited Feb. 27, 2026).
21. Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Apr. 18, 1961, 500 U.N.T.S. 95, https://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/9_1_1961.pdf (last visited Feb. 27, 2026).
22. David Lefkowitz, (Dis)Obedience to International Law, 27 Eur. J. Int'l L. 363 (2016).
23. International Civil Aviation Organization, Convention on International Civil Aviation (Chicago Convention), https://www.icao.int (last visited Feb. 27, 2026).
24. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, Dec. 10, 1982, 1833 U.N.T.S. 397, https://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_e.pdf (last visited Feb. 27, 2026).
25. Universal Postal Union, Acts of the Universal Postal Union, https://www.upu.int (last visited Feb. 27, 2026).
26. Daniel Bodansky, Legitimacy in International Law and International Relations, 1 Interdisciplinary J. Int'l L. 1 (2011).
27. Upendra Baxi, What May the "Third World" Expect from International Law?, 27 Third World Q. 713 (2012).
28. Joost Pauwelyn, Ramses A. Wessel & Jan Wouters, Informal International Lawmaking: Framing the Concept, 25 Eur. J. Int'l L. 733 (2014).
29. Karen J. Alter, Laurence R. Helfer & Mikael Rask Madsen, How Context Shapes the Authority of International Courts, 79 Law & Contemp. Probs. 1 (2016).
30. Andrew T. Guzman, Compliance-Based Theories of International Law, 90 Calif. L. Rev. 1823 (2012)
31. Balakrishnan Rajagopal, International Law from Below: Development, Social Movements and Third World Resistance, 2 Globalizations 1 (2015).
32. Tom Ginsburg, Political Constraints on International Courts, 44 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 1643 (2011).
33. Jacob Katz Cogan, Representation and Power in International Organization: The Operational Constitution and Its Critics, 103 Am. J. Int'l L. 209 (2010).
34. U.N. Charter ch. VII (arts. 39–51)
35. Nico Krisch, The Decay of Consent: International Law in an Age of Global Public Goods, 108 Am. J. Int'l L. 1 (2014).
36. James Crawford, Chance, Order, Change: The Course of International Law, 365 Recueil des Cours 9 (2013).

37. Aniruddha Rajput, India and International Law: Navigating Sovereignty and Global Governance, 34 Indian J. Int'l L. 45 (2022).
38. Anne Peters, The Constitutionalization of International Law: A Reassessment, 19 Ind. J. Global Legal Stud. 1 (2012).
39. Gráinne de Búrca, Developing Democracy Beyond the State, 46 Colum. J. Transnat'l L. 221 (2012).
40. Joost Pauwelyn, Ramses A. Wessel & Jan Wouters, Informal International Lawmaking: Framing the Concept, 25 Eur. J. Int'l L. 733 (2014).