

Feasibility Study on the Establishment of Uniform International Rules: Forms, Necessities, and Challenges

Ali. Jalilian¹, Dariush. Shahriari^{2*}, Hamid. Azizi Moradpour³

¹ PhD student, Department of International Law, Kish International Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kish Island, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of International Law, Bandar Abbas Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bandar Abbas, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of International Law, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: shahriari137@gmail.com

Received: 2025-01-20

Revised: 2025-04-15

Accepted: 2025-04-23

Published: 2025-10-01

Laws and regulations, aimed at regulating social relations and maintaining public order, vary according to the characteristics and needs of societies. The convergence of laws through unification or harmonization, by means such as the establishment of conventions, the creation of international organizations, or reliance on the rulings of international judicial bodies, is a legal, economic, social, and international necessity in today's world. Embracing such harmonization fosters international peace and security and ultimately enhances human welfare. Despite the emergence of obstacles and challenges that have slowed this process, they have never been able to halt it. This study, relying on legal doctrine, library and field research, a descriptive-analytical method, and international events and documents, critically analyzes and responds to ambiguities regarding the feasibility of legal convergence and the establishment of uniform laws among the subjects of the global community. It examines the forms of implementation of such a system, its validation in the international community, as well as its necessities and challenges. The study concludes that the creation of uniform international rules is a multidimensional phenomenon and a platform for enhancing human awareness, improving international trade, fostering greater proximity and coordination among international actors, developing global information dissemination and information systems, and advancing diplomacy. Ultimately, it is an inevitable and highly significant international issue at present and will remain complex and influential in the future.

Keywords: Uniform international rules, legal convergence, necessities and challenges, international treaties, international organizations.

How to cite this article:

Jalilian, A., Shahriari, D., & Azizi Moradpour, H. (2025). Feasibility Study on the Establishment of Uniform International Rules: Forms, Necessities, and Challenges. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics*, 4(4), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.4.4.16>

1. Introduction

Law, as a set of instructions issued by competent authorities acting as intermediaries in social relations among individuals, has a long-standing and fundamental historical background in human society and thought. This historical background is inherently linked with human reasoning. In general, the concept of law has

always been at the core of human perception of the world and humanity's position within it. The historical legacy of various civilizations reflects this reality.

In all countries, laws are enacted by national legislators with the common goal of establishing justice and are then implemented in society. Individuals within a society are obliged to comply with enacted laws; otherwise, they are considered offenders and subjected to punishment.



While in the past, laws were confined within national borders, in today's world, where national boundaries have lost much of their significance, globalization has brought about inevitable consequences. The free movement and rapid exchange of individuals, goods, and information necessitate the facilitation of legal relations at the international level, the expansion of international trade among nations and institutions, and the enhancement of cooperation and coordination among countries for the sake of public welfare and the unification of civil laws. Additionally, it requires the recognition and acceptance of international legal frameworks and the increasing development of international interactions to address challenges such as nationalistic self-interest, defense of sovereignty, and resistance to supranational regulations. Therefore, in order to protect individual interests in transactions and facilitate international legal relations, measures must be taken to recognize and enforce rights beyond national borders.

Consequently, the establishment of universal legal norms and the necessity of uniform regulations at both domestic and international levels have long been of interest to various groups, schools of thought, and legal scholars. Significant efforts have been made to shape such a legal framework.

To achieve this goal, the contemporary legal landscape commonly employs conventions, bilateral or multilateral treaties, and even global agreements between states, as well as the establishment of international organizations, whether governmental or non-governmental. Additionally, adherence to the regulations approved by these entities and, to some extent, compliance with judicial precedents and the rulings of international courts have facilitated the development of transnational legal rules. This process aligns with the principle of cooperation, which unites nations and fosters an international community, and with the principle of mutual will, which ensures the continuity of such cooperation for the attainment of shared interests. The voluntary and consensual nature of acceptance and implementation further strengthens the formation of these transnational legal frameworks.

Accordingly, after a thorough examination of documents, existing laws, and expert opinions, as well as an analysis of data gathered from credible sources, the author of this study concludes that, despite the numerous obstacles

identified, the idea of legal convergence is advancing rapidly through various means. Supported by the global community, which is shifting away from traditional beliefs and adapting to contemporary needs, this movement continues to progress. However, these efforts remain insufficient. All international actors must work towards eliminating barriers and challenges to expedite the realization of global uniform legal frameworks.

2. Forms of Establishing a Uniform Legal System

In general, the unification of laws stems from two major theoretical perspectives: the "Minimal State" theory and the "Collective Rationality" theory. According to the "Minimal State" theory, traditional state responsibilities must be defined in alignment with international standards and norms. The "Collective Rationality" theory, on the other hand, argues that collective reasoning is less prone to errors, whereas individual decision-making is more fallible. This theory upholds collective wisdom as a distinct and superior form of rationality compared to individual reasoning. From this perspective, a gathering of intellectuals and a global assembly of legal scholars can minimize errors in the application of laws and significantly reduce potential damages ([Tavakolifard, 2001](#)).

The response of states to the creation, acceptance, and adherence to uniform laws varies depending on the specific subject matter regulated by such laws. For instance, if uniform laws contain substantive rules and indirectly eliminate conflicts of laws, they can gain legal effect in two ways. First, they may become binding merely by a state's membership in the law-creating entity, without requiring separate domestic approval. Second, they may be formally recognized through legislative ratification by domestic authorities. Subsequently, these laws can influence national legal systems in two ways:

1. **Direct effect** – The state is obligated to incorporate uniform rules verbatim into its legal system, making them an integral part of its domestic law.
2. **Indirect effect** – The state retains the freedom to harmonize its laws with uniform rules, applying them to the extent that they align with its internal legal framework ([Kadkhodaei, 2001](#)).

A third possibility is voluntary adoption, where states choose to adhere to uniform laws and integrate them into their domestic legal system, even in the absence of formal obligations.

The most common and significant forms of establishing a uniform legal system include the conclusion of various international treaties and agreements under designations such as conventions and accords, as well as the establishment of international organizations, whether governmental or non-governmental. The regulations adopted by these bodies and the provisions outlined in their statutes, which are accepted by member states, contribute significantly to the creation of a uniform legal system.

Among the mechanisms for establishing a uniform legal system, international conventions have been the most effective in promoting legal unification. Under a comprehensive convention, signatory states commit to legal provisions proposed by the initiating organizations. As previously discussed, achieving a uniform legal system in contract law can be facilitated by identifying commonalities among different legal systems. This approach minimizes state sensitivities regarding sovereignty and ensures smoother implementation.

According to Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, one of the sources of international law is international treaties, whether general or specific, through which legal rules and regulations have been established and explicitly accepted by the parties in dispute. The most formal definition of a treaty is provided in Article 2(1) of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Treaty-based legal rules, often referred to as “law-making treaties,” are legal instruments that reflect the collective will of the parties involved. These rules hold objective validity, independent of the specific characteristics of the contracting parties. Their essential attributes include being the outcome of state consent, aimed at creating legal obligations, exclusively deriving from subjects of international law, governed by international legal norms, and existing in written form with standardized content. A prominent example of such a treaty is the Charter of the United Nations, adopted in 1945. These treaties are typically multilateral, contain fundamental legal principles, and function as binding international rules applicable to all states and international organizations (Falsafi, 2016).

One of the most practical classifications of treaties, based on their impact on domestic legal systems, divides them into three categories:

1. **Treaties establishing minimum legal standards** – These treaties set a basic framework for state obligations. They not only prohibit states from enacting conflicting laws but also require them to introduce new regulations or amend existing ones to ensure compliance. Treaties related to human rights, children's rights, women's rights, and minority rights fall within this category.
2. **Treaties partially modifying national regulations** – These treaties only affect specific sections of national laws. For example, the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG) of 1980 exclusively governs international sale of goods transactions among member states, without altering broader aspects of their domestic legal systems (Shiravi, 2005).
3. **Treaties with extraterritorial application** – These treaties extend beyond their explicit jurisdiction and, in some cases, apply even to non-signatory states. In such instances, the rules formulated within these treaties are widely recognized and accepted by non-contracting parties as governing principles for their international agreements, provided that domestic legal frameworks do not prohibit their application. This phenomenon is particularly evident in modern commercial contracts between states (Good, 2007).

Despite the numerous advantages and the widespread acceptance of law-making treaties, states continue to prioritize national sovereignty and domestic legal supremacy over international law. Their reluctance to accept binding international norms often results in refusals to join treaties or the imposition of reservations that limit the scope of their application. This explains the preference of states for regional agreements, which allow for greater negotiation flexibility, given the economic, political, and cultural commonalities among regional actors.

3. Establishment of International Organizations

International organizations are among the most influential actors in the process of unifying international laws. Since the Netherlands hosted the first Hague Conference on Private International Law in 1893, numerous international organizations and institutions have been established with the objective of legal unification.

An international organization refers to an assembly of states formed based on a founding document, with its members pursuing common objectives within specialized institutions and agencies through continuous and sustained activities (Mousazadeh, 2016).

All international organizations, regardless of their classification or category, require legislative authority within the scope of their duties. This legislative power, which results in the adoption of the organization's statute, establishes binding laws and regulations for all members. Consequently, upon the establishment of an organization, all its members are subject to uniform and harmonized legal provisions (Voitovich, 1994).

The process of creating uniform and harmonized rules through international organizations, compared to other mechanisms such as treaties, offers several advantages, including greater speed, closer alignment with contemporary needs and necessities, a stronger legislative nature with precedence over domestic laws, and the ability to secure the broadest possible consensus among members. As a result, although the International Court of Justice does not recognize the decisions of international organizations as sources of international law under Article 38 of its Statute, it acknowledges their definitive legal value. This recognition extends to resolutions issued by the United Nations General Assembly and the United Nations Security Council.

Thus, international organizations have become instrumental in addressing challenges arising from international relations, assisting states to the extent that they now actively participate in nearly all spheres of international relations. Issues related to global and regional peace and security, international trade and economy, human rights, and any other matters affecting the interests of the international community are generally regulated within the framework of international organizations. Undoubtedly, the remarkable quantitative growth of international organizations has been one of the most prominent developments in international relations in recent times.

This expansion has been so significant that, in the second half of the twentieth century, the number of international organizations exceeded that of the original subjects of international law—sovereign states (Alizadeh & Rahmani, 2016).

Since membership in these organizations is considered a privileged position due to the high political and economic benefits involved, states are implicitly compelled to align their legal systems with the process of legal unification to protect their interests. The United Nations and the World Trade Organization serve as global examples of such organizations, while the European Union represents a regional example (Kelly, 2008).

Studies indicate that the ongoing legal unification programs pursued by international organizations, regardless of whether they follow traditional or modern approaches, operate under two primary methodologies: the comparative approach and the creative approach.

Organizations and institutions engaged in legal unification through the comparative approach base their efforts on comparing national legal systems. As a result, before drafting legal provisions, representatives from different legal traditions and systems participate in study groups within these organizations. This approach aims to harmonize national legal rules as much as possible by drawing upon common legal principles and fundamental legal concepts across societies. The primary objective is to design rules that are compatible with the legal and economic conditions of member states and are broadly acceptable to all. Currently, most legal unification efforts, including the activities of the Hague Conference on Private International Law, the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT), the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), the International Chamber of Commerce, the European Contract Law Commission, and various legal harmonization institutions within the European Union, follow this comparative approach (Červenková, 2008).

In cases where the subject of legal unification lacks a similar concept across legal systems, the creative approach is applied. Some uniform legal provisions cannot be derived from national legal commonalities and must instead be innovated to align with contemporary needs. Such legal norms are developed through the creative approach, with the expectation that states will

show less resistance to them and will not perceive their adoption as a compromise of national legal sovereignty in favor of another system. The fundamental source of the creative approach lies in transnational customs and practices that have emerged in response to international necessities and requirements. In other words, when a particular legal behavior or practice is consistently repeated at the international level, it eventually evolves into an independent international norm, distinct from its original national concept. These norms can then be adapted, implemented, or modified in response to the changing conditions of the international environment. It appears that in the process of drafting uniform legal instruments, a combination of both the comparative and creative approaches has been utilized in certain cases (Jalali & Shakouri, 2011, 2013).

4. Necessities of Establishing a Uniform Legal System

The necessity of uniform regulations at both domestic and international levels has long been a subject of debate and disagreement. While some scholars argue that the existence of different legal systems does not necessarily cause difficulties for societies, Montesquieu contends that one of the key signs of human ingenuity is the ability to distinguish between areas where laws should be uniform and those where they should remain diverse (Montesquieu & Mohtadi, 1983).

International legal unification, in this context, refers to all efforts aimed at overcoming differences among multiple domestic legal systems through the development of a legal framework that replaces national laws for the regulation of a specific issue (Carolis, 2010). This process simplifies and systematizes scattered laws, leading to legal coherence. Moreover, a single legal framework reduces disputes and contributes to international peace and security. The gradual convergence of legal rules eliminates existing differences between legal systems and establishes a shared standard—whether mandatory or optional—for the drafting, formulation, and enactment of laws. In essence, legal unification paves the way for a future in which achieving a single global legal system across all domains becomes one of the fundamental objectives of certain international institutions and organizations.

The necessity of uniform rules arises from the fact that in today's world, the expansion of international relations is inevitable. The survival and advancement of each

country depend on the extent of its interactions with other states, while individuals play a crucial role in fostering these relations through migration, business, education, and other cross-border activities. Additionally, governments derive their legitimacy from citizen satisfaction, which motivates them to establish relations with other states to facilitate their citizens' affairs and ensure their contentment.

The need to respect and protect legal rights in all their forms at the international level stems from the fact that the creation of uniform laws not only ensures order in the global community but also fosters international peace and security. The existence of varied national laws corresponding to each state leads to legal conflicts, ambiguity, and ultimately, lawlessness in the global community, thereby resulting in violations of individual rights and a failure to uphold social justice. Granting international recognition to individual rights in all their forms and ensuring their enforceability worldwide on equal terms with the country of origin fosters trust and psychological security for rights holders while alleviating their concerns.

The protection of acquired rights, which individuals have fully and definitively obtained under the competent legal system of their home country or a third country, has become unavoidable in the modern era, especially with the rise in migration, the presence of foreigners in different states, and changes in nationality or residency—whether voluntary or forced (Fernandez & Lopez, 2017).

Today, such rights are universally accepted by states and international judicial bodies based on the principle of respecting the sovereignty of the originating state and mutual respect among nations, as well as the practical benefits involved. The only exceptions arise when these rights conflict with public order or contradict national laws in the host country. Furthermore, the human rights aspect of acquired rights classifies them as fundamental and natural human rights, making them an essential component of international human rights law. The significance of respecting acquired rights was emphasized by the Permanent Court of International Justice in 1926 when it declared that "the principle of respect for acquired rights constitutes a generally accepted part of international law" (Perrone, 2014).

The necessity of protecting private property—including both tangible assets and intellectual creations in

scientific, industrial, literary, and artistic fields under intellectual property rights, such as patent rights, copyright, and trademark rights—is closely tied to the credibility of ownership records across jurisdictions. The recognition of property rights established in one jurisdiction with the same validity as in the originating country highlights the importance and necessity of harmonizing laws. The protection of acquired rights to property under international law has been reinforced by the principle of state responsibility for damages inflicted on foreign nationals. If violated, the host state is deemed responsible and liable for compensation. The protection of private property is recognized as a fundamental legal principle across all legal systems (Nicholson, 1965).

One notable effort in this field is the Hague Conference on Private International Law (HCCH), which aims to promote legal and judicial security in personal relationships by facilitating transactions and gradually harmonizing national laws. An example of this is the Convention on the Law Applicable to Matrimonial Property Regimes, which allows individuals to choose the governing law applicable to their matrimonial property, and this choice is recognized across all convention member states.

Another example is the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, which examines the impact of migration law on private international law. This convention explicitly recognizes migrants' rights to own, use, and act upon their property (subject to the host state's laws) and prohibits unlawful confiscation while mandating fair and appropriate compensation in cases of expropriation.

Additionally, international conventions on refugees and stateless persons, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, and the ASEAN Comprehensive Investment Agreement oblige member states to protect acquired rights in all dimensions. The European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), particularly Protocol No. 1, explicitly guarantees the peaceful enjoyment of possessions and mandates member states to recognize and uphold private property rights. This principle was first affirmed by the European Court of Human Rights in the case of *Marckx v. Belgium*, where the court relied on Article 1 of the convention to declare that the right to peacefully enjoy one's property, provided it was lawfully acquired, is a protected right

that extends to various aspects of property ownership (Gergia, 2007).

In the field of intellectual property, international agreements such as the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), the Paris Convention, and the Berne Convention establish minimum standards for intellectual property protection. One of the most important acquired rights of contemporary society is citizenship rights, which are inherent and fundamental human rights that impose obligations on states to recognize ethical responsibilities toward all citizens worldwide. This concept promotes the idea that individuals, regardless of racial, cultural, political, or religious differences, can be interconnected and share responsibilities for one another's destiny. Despite the close relationship between human rights and citizenship rights, one of the most significant international documents addressing citizenship rights is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which affirms the equality of all people without discrimination based on age, gender, race, religion, or other factors. The UDHR preamble emphasizes the universal recognition of certain rights, reinforcing global human solidarity.

International human rights treaties consider both the values of state governance and the values of human rights, while the United Nations Charter recognizes global citizenship movements as an integral part of international cooperation. Article 1(3) of the UN Charter states that one of the United Nations' objectives is "to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." These efforts exemplify the formation of unified legal frameworks for the global community.

From another perspective, modern transnational social life necessitates legal unification to facilitate and expedite cross-border interactions. Legal uniformity balances the diversity of legal norms, regimes, and institutions that have long been intertwined with international law. While these variations may appear contradictory, they have been integrated into international law in a manner that prevents them from posing systemic threats (Casanovas, 2021).

Although the growing number of treaties, international organizations, and international courts has intensified legal pluralism due to globalization and deeper interdependence, states must adopt strategies to regulate legal diversity and promote legal unification. This would enhance the advantages of a cohesive international legal order while mitigating the risks of excessive legal fragmentation.

Economic considerations further emphasize the necessity of international legal unification. Trade relations among nations have long driven efforts toward legal harmonization, prioritizing commercial law. States gradually recognized that trade-related legal frameworks must evolve to facilitate and safeguard international business activities under their jurisdiction. Legal harmonization ensures the legal security of economic activities, as the absence of clear and predictable legal standards could undermine economic stability (Jalali & Shakouri, 2011, 2013).

Ultimately, legal unification is an outcome of economic globalization, which promotes economic freedoms, trade expansion, technological advancements, and scientific development. Economic integration leads to growth and poverty reduction by reducing barriers to cross-border transactions, facilitating business operations, and aligning domestic and international transaction costs (Safari Pajooh, 2015).

5. Challenges of Establishing a Uniform Legal System

Opponents argue that factors such as distinct civilizations, cultural diversity, and differences in legal foundations and principles will always pose significant obstacles to legal unification.

At a minimum, a nation's national interests include ensuring security, protecting its physical (territorial), political, and cultural identity from threats posed by other states. The common elements and factors defining national interests in a scientific and contractual context include national security, national sovereignty, independence and its preservation, territorial integrity, protection of national wealth, social welfare, international reputation and global credibility, the establishment of a proper and capable governmental and political system, national strategy, national objectives, national unity, public cohesion, the promotion of unifying national aspirations, and the use of historical

precedence and cultural heritage to reinforce national identity (Izadi, 2007).

Preserving these national interests in the international environment requires pre-designed strategies and actions, which are collectively referred to as a state's foreign policy. Therefore, understanding and examining the concept of conflict of interest in governance is crucial. The international community is fundamentally built on conflicting interests, and diplomacy is the art of reconciling these opposing interests. Consequently, in international relations, both war and peace serve as instruments for securing national interests (Salehi & Razavi Mobarqa, 2017).

As a result, national interests frequently clash with international interests, and efforts to find alternatives to this conflict preserve the guiding value of foreign policy while affirming national interests as an objective and significant reality.

As previously mentioned, drafting and designing uniform rules must be based on common benefits or the prevention of a shared harm to achieve maximum acceptance. Experience has shown that unless legal harmonization is absolutely necessary, states are reluctant to accept uniform laws if they consider their existing legal system comprehensive and sufficiently protective of their interests. Successful legal unions, such as those established among European countries or within regional integration frameworks, result from safeguarding the shared interests of all member states at various levels while addressing their contemporary needs and eliminating unnecessary issues (Shapira & Askini, 1992). Compliance with the principle of shared benefits requires that non-essential issues be removed from proposed agreements or handled separately (Jalali & Shakouri, 2013). One of the most prominent examples of this is the Commonwealth of Nations, a voluntary association of 56 independent states and territories that primarily includes former British colonies and their dependent territories.

Another major challenge in establishing uniform international rules is the phenomenon of legal pluralism, which was discussed earlier. According to some scholars of international law, this phenomenon threatens the unity of international law and the effectiveness of the global legal system by creating parallel or conflicting norms and laws. It has led to an increase in the number of international courts and tribunals, requiring

legislators to determine legal standards and judicial authorities to interpret laws while facing complex decision-making dilemmas.

These scholars further argue that discrepancies among legal systems arise not only from their structural differences but also from fundamental variations in their foundations, sources, and objectives, all of which hinder legal convergence. A legal system, as an extensive framework of rules and institutions that maintains a degree of logical and rational coherence, develops according to factors such as ontology, anthropology, historical background, economic status, political structure, cultural identity, and religious traditions. Despite certain similarities in human societies' challenges and legal issues, different legal systems employ distinct solutions (Shiravi, 2005).

In light of the increasing interdependence of states, international law has entered an era of legal plurality, with new dimensions emerging daily and an increasing need to regulate a wider range of issues. Subjects such as international economic law, environmental law, development law, criminal law, and communication law contribute to this legal plurality. The process of legal unification is thus challenged by temporal and spatial factors—both advancing international law and, at the same time, posing a threat to its coherence. The negative perception of legal pluralism in international law stems from the general belief that law must serve as an instrument of unity in contrast to politics, ensuring that societies do not descend into disorder and are guided toward stability and security.

Another key issue in this discussion is state sovereignty and equality. International law is founded on the principle of sovereign equality, which encompasses respect for territorial integrity, political independence, recognition of state existence, compliance with international obligations, and the right of states to establish their own political, economic, and social systems. These principles are explicitly affirmed in the United Nations Charter. Any interference in the internal affairs of a state, regardless of the intention—whether to assist the state or to maintain international peace and security—is considered unacceptable and contrary to international law.

Today, several factors impose restrictions on state sovereignty, including the evolution of international laws and regulations, technological advancements that

create new legal complexities, human rights obligations, international criminal law, reciprocal threats, common interests, and globalization. Globalization, characterized by the compression of time and space, the erosion of borders, and the interconnectedness of people worldwide, has resulted in the emergence of global markets, new communication tools such as the internet and mobile networks, and economic integration. However, these developments have also led to resistance among states, making them hesitant to adopt or join international legal frameworks, thereby presenting significant obstacles to legal unification (Hassanpour, 2017).

Furthermore, as is well known, a state's accession to uniform international legal frameworks, such as international human rights laws, must be approved by its domestic legislative institutions. This requirement means that states do not accept these laws unconditionally. Even when international authorities are given the power to introduce certain legal principles into a national legal system, these decisions must undergo domestic political processes for validation, ensuring that national decision-makers remain accountable. As a result, the necessity for international laws to pass through domestic legal filters undermines their absolute authority and effectiveness.

The principle of consensual treaties further demonstrates the voluntary nature of international law, which is itself derived from the fundamental principles of state sovereignty and equality. States are not obligated to comply with legal norms to which they have not given their explicit consent. The theory of voluntarism in international law reinforces state sovereignty and independence by asserting that states are only bound by legal commitments that they have voluntarily accepted, rather than being subjected to imposed obligations. This principle directly limits the scope of legal unification by reducing states' willingness to join uniform international legal frameworks.

6. Conclusion

The international community is composed of states, and the legal system governing it is based on the principle of equality among states. This structure does not recognize any legislative authority beyond states themselves. Consequently, states are both the creators and the subjects of international law.

During the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, there has been a growing tendency among states to bring their laws closer together—whether through legal unification or harmonization—with the objective of aligning national laws while preserving state sovereignty and domestic legal frameworks, or by enacting uniform laws that establish common legal standards applicable to all states. Initially, this trend was more noticeable and successful among states with shared intellectual, cultural, religious, and economic backgrounds. However, as states increasingly encountered global challenges that could not be effectively managed through national laws alone—such as human rights violations, drug and human trafficking, the production and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and money laundering—they recognized the necessity of adopting harmonized and uniform international regulations.

Furthermore, the pursuit of a positive international reputation and democratic governance encouraged states to acknowledge that establishing consistent, coordinated, and international legal frameworks could address these challenges. This legal convergence has contributed to the simplification and systematization of scattered laws, the preservation and recognition of property rights, personal status laws, acquired rights, and commercial transactions, and has enabled states to achieve their intended legal and economic objectives through cooperation. More importantly, such cooperation facilitates the resolution of disputes among states, ultimately promoting international peace and security.

A uniform legal rule must provide a comprehensive and well-defined solution to a legal issue. These rules must be capable of direct incorporation into national legal systems without being subject to modification or conditional application by states. The success of legal unification depends on its design and implementation by specialized legal institutions to ensure a scientifically guided process.

Despite these considerations, legal convergence remains a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. While some critics perceive it as an imposed project, driven by Western dominance through control over media, information, and communication channels, others view it positively as an opportunity for enhancing global awareness, improving international trade, fostering greater coordination among international actors,

developing global information structures, and strengthening multilateral diplomacy.

Ultimately, given the realities of today's world, legal convergence and the establishment of uniform legal rules have become inevitable. As we witness the increasing adoption of uniform legal standards across various fields, it is clear that this trend will continue to grow. Numerous examples affirm this development, particularly in human rights law, international trade law, and private law, all of which have played a crucial role in advancing and dynamizing international law.

Authors' Contributions

Authors contributed equally to this article.

Declaration

In order to correct and improve the academic writing of our paper, we have used the language model ChatGPT.

Transparency Statement

Data are available for research purposes upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to all individuals helped us to do the project.

Declaration of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

Ethical Considerations

In this research, ethical standards including obtaining informed consent, ensuring privacy and confidentiality were observed.

References

- Alizadeh, M., & Rahmani, I. (2016). The necessity of understanding the transformation of the concept of the international community in law and international relations. *Contemporary Political Essays*, 7(4), 39-21.

- Carolus, D. D. (2010). Some features of the harmonization of international trade law in the third millennium. *Uniform Law Review*, 15, 37-72. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ulr/15.1.37>
- Casanovas, O. (2021). *Unity and Pluralism in Public International Law*. BRILL.
- Červenková, L. (2008). *Europeanization and unification of private international law*
- Falsafi, H. (2016). *International law of treaties*. Tehran: No Publishing.
- Fernandez, T. A., & Lopez, G. D. (2017). The impact and consequences of Brexit on acquired rights of EU citizens living in the UK and British citizens living in the EU-27.
- Gergia, A. (2007). *The right of property under European Convention on Human Rights: A guide to the implementation of the European Convention on Human Rights and its protocols*. Human Rights Handbook No 10 Council Of Europe.
- Good, R. M. (2007). Acceptance of custom in international commercial law. *Legal Journal*, 36, 241-201.
- Hassanpour, J. (2017). An analysis of the conflict between the principles of humanitarian intervention and national sovereignty. *Specialized Quarterly of Political Science*, 13(41), 107-185.
- Izadi, B. (2007). *An introduction to the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran*. Busatan Ketab Publishing.
- Jalali, M., & Shakouri, M. (2011). Analysis of the theory of harmonization of international commercial contract law. *Legal Research Journal*, 20.
- Jalali, M., & Shakouri, M. (2013). The process of harmonization of contract law at the international level. *Private Law Research*, 2(3), 177-151.
- Kadkhodaei, A. (2001). *Structure and law of the European Union*. Tehran: Mizaan Publishing.
- Kelly, C. (2008). Institutional alliances and derivative legitimacy. *Michigan Journal of International Law*, 29.
- Montesquieu, & Mohtadi, A. A. (1983). *The spirit of the laws*. Tehran: Amir Kabir Publishing.
- Mousazadeh, R. (2016). *International organizations*. Tehran: Mizaan Publishing.
- Nicholson, F. J. (1965). The protection of foreign property under customary international law. *Boston College Law Review*, 6(3), 391-415.
- Perrone, N. M. (2014). The international investment regime and foreign investor rights: Another view of a popular story. *Journal of International Economic Law*.
- Safari Pajooh, M. (2015). *The right to peace and economic globalization*. Tehran: Payam Publishing.
- Salehi, J., & Razavi Mobarqa, S. K. (2017). National interests in theoretical perspective. *Political and International Studies Research*, 8(30), 149-125.
- Shapira, J., & Askini, R. (1992). *International commercial law*. Tehran: Islamic Revolution Publishing and Training.
- Shiravi, A. H. (2005). *Comparative law*. Tehran: Samt Publishing.
- Tavakolifard, M. (2001). The process of globalization in criminal law. *Modares Quarterly*, 5(4), 58-37.
- Voitovich, S. A. (1994). *International economic organizations in the international legal process*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004634626>