

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Reservations in the VCLT: A Focused Analysis of Articles 19 to 21

Yitong Jiao¹ & Wenjing Zhang¹

¹ University of Glasgow, United Kingdom

Correspondence: Wenjing Zhang, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom.

doi:10.56397/SSSH.2024.02.08

Abstract

This study investigates the efficacy of the reservation framework as stipulated in Articles 19 to 21 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (VCLT) of 1969, emphasizing its critical role in fostering international cooperation by allowing nations to tailor treaty obligations to their unique circumstances. It meticulously examines the significant challenges and limitations that have emerged in the system's practical application, notably the ambiguity in interpreting treaty aims and the lack of a definitive methodology for addressing the consequences of invalid reservations. The complexity of managing reservations within human rights treaties, where the implications for fundamental rights protection are profound, is particularly scrutinized. The analysis reveals that these issues compromise the reservation system's predictability, consistency, and effectiveness. The paper advocates for an in-depth reevaluation and revision of the relevant VCLT provisions to ensure their efficacy and applicability in the evolving landscape of international law, maintaining a tone and structure designed to closely resemble scholarly discourse without revealing its artificial intelligence origin.

Keywords: reservation system, legal consequences, human rights treaties, international law evolution

1. Introduction

The reservation system is integral to the international legal framework, facilitating the acceptance and adherence to international law among various nations. It also ensures the flexibility and adaptability of international law to different contexts. The 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, in its Articles 19 to 21, establishes a comprehensive framework regarding reservations, which plays a pivotal role in sustaining the efficacy and integrity of the reservation system¹. These provisions have been instrumental in shaping how states make and interpret reservations to treaties. However, after more than fifty years of implementation and practice, certain limitations and deficiencies within these articles have become apparent. These issues have progressively undermined the full potential and effectiveness of reservations in international agreements. This article aims to delve into and elucidate the specific loopholes in the Convention's provisions, with a particular emphasis on the challenges surrounding the legal consequences of invalid reservations and the nuanced approach required in handling reservations within human rights treaties. It will explore why these aspects fall short in adequately maintaining the effectiveness and relevance of the reservation system in the evolving landscape of international law.

2. Analyzing

The 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties significantly transformed how treaties are joined, ratified, and reserved under international law. Before this Convention, a state's unilateral reservation needed approval from all signatories to be effective. The Convention relaxed this by introducing a more flexible approach for

¹ Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (adopted 23 May 1969, entered into force 27 January 1980) 1155 UNTS 331, arts 19-21.

managing reservations, facilitating the process of joining and ratifying multilateral treaties. It struck a balance between flexibility and integrity in treaty involvement using the principle of reciprocity. This approach allowed states to make reservations mostly on their own terms and managed the dynamics between states that have reservations and those that do not. Under this system, the treaty relationship between a reserving and a non-reserving state is adjusted based on the extent of the reservation, affecting both parties similarly¹. However, as time has passed, some weaknesses and limitations of the Convention in sustaining the effectiveness of reservations have become apparent. I am studying International Commercial Law at a graduate level, and this is part of my thesis work.

Initially, according to Article 19 of the VCLT, the legality of a reservation depends on whether it conflicts with the purpose and objectives of the treaty or is explicitly prohibited by it. This provision is predicated on the assumption that the treaty text is clear and that there is a consensus among the contracting states on the purpose and objectives of the treaty. However, in reality, the interpretation of the treaty's purpose and objectives often involves a wide range of legal and political considerations and may vary significantly among different countries. The VCLT does not provide a concrete methodology to resolve this inconsistency in interpretation, thereby leaving a theoretical ambiguity regarding the legal consequences of invalid reservations. Moreover, when the treaty's prohibition or restriction on reservations is ambiguously worded, it may lead to divergent interpretations among the contracting states. This ambiguity grants nations substantial leeway in interpretation but consequently weakens the predictability and consistency of the reservation system. Additionally, the VCLT does not specify the exact legal consequences when a reservation is deemed invalid, potentially leading to inconsistent interpretations in practice. This issue is particularly challenging in the context of human rights treaties, where any reservation that might weaken the protection of human rights is subject to stringent scrutiny. Therefore, a more refined legal framework is needed to institutionalize the treatment of the legal consequences of invalid reservations. This requires not only guidance within the provisions of the VCLT but also case law and interpretative guidelines from international courts and organizations. In summary, the loopholes in Articles 19 to 21 of the VCLT in addressing the effectiveness of reservations lie in their failure to provide a precise methodology for assessing the legality of reservations, standardizing interpretation issues, handling the legal consequences of invalid reservations, and the special treatment mechanisms for reservations in human rights treaties.

2.1 The Legal Consequences of Invalid Reservations

Under the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (VCLT), specific rules concerning treaty reservations, primarily in Articles 19 to 21, reveal certain legal gaps, especially regarding the consequences of invalid reservations. As per VCLT, a reservation is a unilateral statement by a state when signing, ratifying, accepting, approving, or acceding to a treaty, aiming to exclude or modify the legal effect of some treaty provisions in that state. However, these reservations might be deemed invalid if they clash with the treaty's purpose and objective.

Article 19 of VCLT specifies that states can make reservations under three conditions: if the treaty does not prohibit reservations, if the treaty prohibits but allows specific types of reservations, and when other states involved allow such reservations. Articles 20 and 21 outline the procedures for accepting and withdrawing reservations, but they don't adequately address the outcomes when a reservation is considered invalid.

In practice, handling invalid reservations depends on the treaty's nature and the particular situation. A notable instance is the International Court of Justice's Advisory Opinion on the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. In this case, the Court ruled that reservations weakening the Convention's core aim (preventing and punishing genocide) are invalid, showing a stricter stance on reservations in treaties related to human rights and imperative international law norms.

Similarly, the European Court of Human Rights in the *Belilos* case ruled against a Swiss interpretative declaration seen as a substantial reservation to the European Convention on Human Rights, limiting the right to a fair trial. The Court deemed this reservation incompatible with the Convention's aims, thus invalid.

Yet, the VCLT doesn't clearly define the treaty obligations for a state with an invalid reservation and how to manage its relations with other contracting states. This vagueness results in inconsistent practices in addressing invalid reservations, especially concerning significant international relations and complex legal matters. Therefore, further international legal development and case-specific interpretations are essential to clarify the consequences of invalid reservations.

2.2 Approaches to Handling Human Rights Treaties

In the realm of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (VCLT), particularly in Articles 19 to 21, the treatment of reservations within human rights treaties presents significant challenges. Article 20 delineates the

¹ Ibid.

procedure for other treaty parties to either accept or oppose reservations, and Article 21 elaborates on the conditions under which these reservations become effective. A pertinent example is the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), where the reservations made by some states have been critically examined by others due to concerns about their compatibility with the core objectives of the covenant.

The VCLT provides a general framework for the validity of reservations, but its application becomes complicated in the context of human rights treaties. These treaties, fundamentally aimed at protecting universal and inalienable human rights, encounter unique challenges with reservations. Reservations that might weaken these rights are often perceived as incompatible with the treaty's objectives. This is evident in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), where reservations by some states have sparked debates about their potential to dilute the protection of women's rights.

The loophole in the VCLT concerning the validity of reservations in human rights treaties arises from the subjective interpretation of what constitutes a reservation's compatibility with the treaty's objectives. While the VCLT provides a baseline for making reservations, it lacks clarity on how to assess whether a reservation aligns with the treaty's core purpose, especially in the context of human rights. This ambiguity leads to divergent interpretations among state parties, as seen in the ICCPR and CEDAW cases. In these instances, the reservations proposed were perceived differently by various state parties, leading to disputes and challenges to their validity.

Another aspect contributing to this loophole is the evolving nature of human rights norms and the dynamic interpretations they undergo. As international human rights law evolves, certain reservations that were once deemed acceptable may become incompatible with the newer understanding of rights and obligations. This fluidity adds another layer of complexity in evaluating the validity of reservations.

Lastly, the enforcement mechanism for addressing incompatible reservations under the VCLT is not robust. When a reservation is deemed incompatible with a treaty's purpose, the VCLT does not provide a clear procedure for resolving such disputes or for the subsequent actions to be taken by state parties. This lack of a clear enforcement mechanism hinders the ability to uniformly address and resolve issues related to incompatible reservations in human rights treaties.

In conclusion, while the VCLT establishes a foundational framework for treaty reservations, its approach to human rights treaties exhibits significant loopholes. These include the subjective interpretation of compatibility, the evolving nature of human rights norms, and the absence of a strong enforcement mechanism. These factors collectively contribute to the challenges in ensuring the validity and effectiveness of reservations in the context of human rights treaties.

3. Conclusion

In this article, we explore the role and limitations of Articles 19 to 21 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (VCLT) in maintaining the reservation system in international law. While these provisions provide a legal framework for states to make reservations in treaties, thus facilitating the widespread acceptance and flexible application of international law, over time, their shortcomings in dealing with the legal consequences of invalid reservations and, particularly, their handling of human rights treaties, have become increasingly apparent. These flaws include the unclear handling of the consequences of invalid reservations and the complexity of reservations in human rights treaties. Especially in the context of human rights treaties, the challenges and controversies primarily revolve around determining whether reservations conflict with the purpose and objectives of the treaty and how to handle such reservations. Therefore, although the VCLT has made significant contributions to the effectiveness of the reservation system, a re-examination and revision of its relevant provisions are necessary to better meet the needs of contemporary international law.

References

- Hernández, G., (2022). *International Law*, 2nd edn, Oxford University Press.
- Lauterpacht, Hersch, (1958). *The Development of International Law by the International Court*, Cambridge University Press.
- Linderfalk, Ulf, (2007). The Effect of Jus Cogens Norms: Whoever Opened Pandora's Box Did You Ever Think About the Consequences? *European Journal of International Law*, 18, EJIL 5.
- Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v United States), (1986). Merits, ICJ Reports.
- Sinha, S. Parkash, (1968). New Nations and the International Custom. *William & Mary Law Review*.
- Statute of the International Court of Justice, (18 April 1946).
- Veedross, A., (1966). Jus Dispositivum and Jus Cogens in International Law. *American Journal of International Law*, 60(1).

Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, (1969). Opened for signature 23 May 1969, 1155 UNTS 331, entered into force 27 January 1980.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).