

DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW: BALANCING FUNCTIONAL NECESSITY, STATE SOVEREIGNTY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY UNDER THE VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS (1961)

***Jahanzeb Ali,**

Department of Law, Dadabhoy Institute of Higher Education, Pakistan
(jahanzaiba226@gmail.com)

****Dr. Tansif Ur Rehman,**

Teaching Associate, Department of Sociology, University of Karachi, Pakistan; and Visiting Faculty, Department of Law, Dadabhoy Institute of Higher Education, Pakistan
(tansif@live.com) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5454-2150>)

*****Zainab Effendi-Haqqi,**

Advocate High Court of Sindh; and Head of Law Department, SZABIST, Karachi, Pakistan
(zainab.effendi@szabist.edu.pk)

Abstract

The research explores the legal system of diplomatic immunity, which is one of the main principles of international law, due to which diplomatic missions can successfully work. The doctrine is derived from the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961) which provides immunity for diplomats, against criminal, civil and administrative jurisdiction of the receiving state. Such immunity should not confer any personal privilege, but simply the immunity of the diplomatic functions from interference or coercion. The research provides a description of the core legal provisions, including those relating to the inviolability of the premises, immunity of the representatives and states' obligations to respect and protect missions. It also brings out restrictions, e.g., waiver of immunity and applicability to official acts versus personal acts. The contemporary issues such as abuse of immunity, human rights and accountability are mentioned briefly. On the whole, the governing law would aim at balancing between the sovereignty of the state and the need to have stable and secure diplomatic relations, as this is essential for the harmonious interaction structure.

Keywords: challenges, historical context, laws, opportunities, theoretical context

Introduction

The principle of the international law is "free action of the diplomats", meaning that they have "freedom of action", regardless of their nationality (Shi, 2021). In Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961) this is reflected (Talmon, 2024). The doctrine has a number of constitutional protections including immunity from prosecution, immunity from courts and sanctity of diplomats and sanctity of mission property (Simpson & Cryer, 2023). Though it might be possible to transfer the correct information during political unrest, it helps in peaceful coexistence and good relations between the parties (Farooq et al., 2024).

They are inspired by the world trends nowadays – cooperation, respect and predictability in interstate relations, which is an old customary law, and already existing a hundred years ago (Liu, 2023). But when a question about diplomatic immunity is raised, for example, when something amiss or violation of human rights has been observed, it is likely to give rise to complex legal and ethical dilemmas (Mushtaq, 2024). But critics could argue too much of a good thing can be as much a problem as a solution, while supporters could argue that diplomatic independence is an important protection to be used even in the event that politics is in an unstable position (Gul et al., 2025).

The waiver of immunity of the consular officers and the restriction on immunity of the doctrine are the modus operandi of the doctrine, which demonstrates the efforts towards balancing privilege and responsibility (Zhang, 2023). Thus, diplomatic immunity can be considered one of the monumental tools to understand the connection between sovereignty, international obligations and diplomatic missions in the globalized world. This introduction

will be followed by a discussion of the development of this doctrine, its limitations and issues faced in practice and its application in international law.

Research Justification

One phenomenon, which may have a special academic interest, connects international law, state sovereignty and global justice, and is the main point of intersection between those legal fields: the phenomenon of diplomatic immunity. The appropriate performance of diplomatic agents is necessary for good relations between states, and as the degree of diplomatic participation increases in political, economic and security issues, the duty of diplomats becomes increasingly important. The purpose of diplomatic immunity is to protect these agents, but the use of immunity can also raise legal and moral questions, especially when it is alleged that they committed wrongdoing. Such complexities have to be grasped to assess whether the existing legal frameworks are achieving the balance between diplomatic independence and accountability that is needed.

What's more, in today's global affairs, there are far more actors involved, flow of people across the globe and demands for transparency. The above developments render it important to evaluate the relevance of the existing laws that are mainly based on the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations in terms of their suitability in solving contemporary issues. Studies in this field are valuable contributions to the understanding of the role of immunity in maintaining justice to victims and the faith of populations in international law.

The reason why this study is necessary is further elaborated by the fact that there is a shortage of analysis that encompasses both the historical development of diplomatic immunity and its theoretical and practical ramifications. The combined study of these dimensions will bolster academic knowledge and provide informed insights that can inform future changes and improve responsible diplomatic behavior in the world.

Literature Review

Literary sources on diplomatic immunity always focus on the history of diplomatic immunity and how the doctrine was formed as a result of the ancient traditions aimed at providing diplomatic security and uninterrupted communication between states (Talmon, 2024). It is a well-known fact among researchers that the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961) is the main law that codified the protections of inviolability of diplomats, freedom of movement, and criminal jurisdiction immunity (Shi, 2021). Several comparative studies have studied the differences between diplomatic and consular immunity and found that consular immunity is not absolute, but limited to acts performed in an official capacity (Liu, 2023).

The literature also emphasizes how the practice of the state differs based on political relationships, as well as domestic implementation processes, proving the universalism and flexibility of the doctrine (Simpson & Cryer, 2023). Contemporary studies are increasingly devoted to the scandals caused by so-called abuse of diplomatic immunity and especially to the situation when a crime, labor exploitation, or road accidents have taken place, causing citizens to lose their temper and legalists to feel frustrated (Mushtaq, 2024). Researchers point out how the conflict between diplomatic autonomy and accountability has been a long-standing issue, and reforms are often stymied due to political sensitivities (Gul et al., 2025).

The legal process of waiver is also examined in literature, where the states can waive their immunity, but the decisions are seldom made because of the diplomatic consequences and the reciprocity issue (Farooq et al., 2024). Also, human rights critics note that the existing framework does not provide victims with an effective legal solution in the occurrence of wrongdoing (Zhang, 2023). The proposals made in recent times propose to tighten control, clarify the exemptions under the private acts, and even to embrace more transparent bilateral agreements. All these studies demonstrate the dynamic debate that is diplomatic immunity and

its implications on the practice of international law. Diplomatic immunity is also the focus of scholars who trace its historical progress, legal context, problems in its functioning, and the issue of its abuse in the modern context of international relations and the global governance system.

Historical Context of Laws Governing Diplomatic Immunity

The history of diplomatic immunity is centuries of practice that has changed in order to protect envoys and enhance peaceful relations between states (Talmon, 2024). Some of the earliest civilizations, such as Greece, Rome, and Persia, were aware of the sacrosanctity of diplomatic messengers to avoid war and preserve the negotiation lines (Mushtaq, 2024). These rights were extended by medieval Europe and were entrenched in customary international law through the growing international interstate diplomacy (Simpson & Cryer, 2023). Diplomatic immunity was a well-established tradition by the nineteenth century, as the world grew more connected and foreign ministries of an emerging nation-state became formalized (Farooq et al., 2024).

The twentieth century was a period of change when states wanted to find a more unified and universally recognized legal system, and it led to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 (Shi, 2021). This convention brought together the established practices and established common norms that should be used to regulate privileges, jurisdictional immunity, and inviolability of diplomatic premises (Liu, 2023). According to scholars, the necessity of explicit rules that safeguard diplomatic agents was strengthened by the changes in geopolitics after World War II, decolonization, and the emergence of multilateral institutions (Gul et al., 2025). Consequently, the current legal order is characterized by the continuity of the law as well as the international priorities of current times (Zhang, 2023). The development of laws on current diplomatic immunity.

Theoretical Context of Laws Governing Diplomatic Immunity

The theoretical framework of diplomatic immunity is based on the basic principles of sovereignty, functional necessity, and international cooperation. The concept behind the doctrine is that diplomatic agents should be free of pressure from the state they are receiving and that communication between countries should be open, secure, and free of political tension. In this context, the concept of immunity is not seen as an individual right but as a practical condition that helps diplomats to perform their official tasks in an effective manner. The functional necessity theory is thus the most justified, as it states that immunity is necessary to ensure the uninterrupted execution of diplomatic duties.

There is, however, an interesting theoretical tension brought about by seeking justice. The immunity helps to ensure diplomatic independence, but also creates some issues concerning accountability in the case of wrongdoing. The balance-of-interests theory resolves this tension by stating that diplomats should not be exempted of accountability in instances where diplomats engage in activities that are more than their office mandate under the law. On the same note, the reciprocity theory clarifies that states provide immunity on the basis of the expectation that their own diplomats will get equal protection in foreign countries, and this ensures that there is stability in international affairs. In general, the theoretical background shows that diplomatic immunity and fairness should go hand in hand, and the functional protection and the honor of legal and moral accountability should be carefully balanced.

Laws Regarding Governing Diplomatic Immunity

Diplomatic immunity is regulated by international law, mainly by the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, which provides diplomats immunity against the host country's laws so that they can carry out their duties without interference. This immunity is a comprehensive shield against criminal and civil jurisdiction, inviolability of their person, home, and letters.

1. Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 1961: The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (VCDR), 1961, is the seminal international treaty that establishes the rights, privileges, and immunities of diplomats and diplomatic missions. The primary reason is to make sure that diplomats are allowed to carry out their duties well and in a safe environment that is not interfered with by the host state. It is the universally accepted basis of contemporary diplomatic law.

2. Immunity of jurisdiction: Immunity of jurisdiction shields diplomats against the host state law, which permits them to conduct official business without the fear of arrest, prosecution, or harassment. The ambassadors and high-ranking diplomats are granted complete criminal and civil immunity, whereas the consular officers and other employees are granted functional immunity, which is restricted to official actions. Diplomats do not have to pay lawsuits, administrative procedures, and domestic taxes in respect of their official activity. The sending state can waive immunity to permit prosecution, and a host state may declare a diplomat persona non grata to expel the diplomat when they commit misconduct.

3. Criminal Jurisdiction: Criminal immunity refers to the law that helps to protect the officials, including heads of state and diplomats, against prosecution or arrest due to the actions they carried out as part of their official duty. Civil immunity does not usually apply to personal crimes and typically excludes official acts, except in cases of serious international crime, such as a war crime or genocide.

4. Civil Jurisdiction: Civil immunity is a legal immunity that protects some individuals or organizations (including foreign states, diplomats, and international officials) against being sued by a civil court over actions taken in their official capacity.

Challenges for Laws Governing Diplomatic Immunity

The diplomatic immunity law is fraught with many challenges, which make its application in international relations complicated in the contemporary world. Among the most serious ones, there is a possibility of misuse of immunity in cases when the accused diplomats are suspected of criminal offenses of assault, human trafficking, or financial fraud, and cannot be prosecuted by the receiving state. This gives the impression that immunity is more of a shield to impunity instead of a means of facilitating diplomatic activities.

Though the Vienna Convention permits the sending state to waive immunity, such waivers are uncommon since governments are afraid of political reprisals, retaliation, or harm to bilateral relations. Because of this, the victims tend not to have proper legal redress, which leads to issues of fairness and responsibility of the existing system. The other issue is the growing complexity of diplomatic jobs in the global world. Contemporary diplomacy involves highly political, security, and economic interactions, and it is hard to say what actions should be considered to be official and, therefore, safeguarded. This lack of clarity could lead to different interpretations of the agreements between the States and make implementation challenging, and undermine the legal system.

In addition, the proliferation of diplomatic missions, consular offices and international organizations has led to a growing number of individuals that are entitled to immunity, thus making it more likely there will be disagreements or legal contradictions. Furthermore, more media attention and pressure. The most publicized in alleged diplomatic “misconduct” usually get a lot of criticism and the question of the correctness of the law. Political tension has arisen between the governments due to the need for justice in the country and the need to fulfill international responsibility. Another challenge is that of having a consistent application of immunity rules. Inconsistent implementation of the law and the risk of states' relations based on reciprocity and trust can be caused by the weak laws in states or diplomatic relations that put the law at variance. All such challenges relate to the present issue of the continued utility

of diplomatic immunity and its necessary link with the assurance of justice, transparency and international accountability.

Opportunities for Laws Governing Diplomatic Immunity

Despite the challenges and criticism of diplomatic immunity, it comes with numerous opportunities to enhance international relations, accountability, and make the entire diplomatic process more effective. Modernization and clarification of the legal framework is one of the great opportunities. States may minimize the ambiguities that may lead to misunderstandings or misuse accusations by offering clear and detailed guidelines that differentiate between acts that are carried out in an official capacity and personal behavior. The clarity ensures that no abuse is created of diplomatic immunity; rather, it is applied as it was designed and is used without leading to conflicts between the sending state and the receiving state. It can also be shown to be reliable and respectful towards other countries in international relations; it can change the domestic law to international law in a predictable way.

The other salient opportunity will be strengthening of accountability and oversight mechanisms. While immunity is required for the actions of diplomats not be hampered, states can have their own open procedures to deal with allegations of wrongdoing. Even if there is a serious offense, voluntary immunity is encouraged and the principle of diplomatic protection allowed for the victim to be able to obtain justice without the principle taking over. An coordinated reporting and communication among the states can also help increase transparency, uniformity of the rules application and help balance and equitably resolve conflicts. Furthermore, the idea of diplomatic immunity could be an opportunity to imbibe the human rights and ethical consideration in the international practice. The new legislation would protect the interests of locals and prevent abuse and violations of the diplomatic privileges.

This kind of integration enhances the trust of people in diplomatic activity and the validity of immunity as a legal institution. Legal aspects, ethical and cultural considerations, conflict resolution will be taught to form the basis for responsible diplomatic practices and conflict avoidance. The law of diplomatic immunity can be expanded in this manner to ensure that a balance of necessity, justice and responsibility is achieved. All these seek to ensure that the immunity is effective, respected and that the immunity is ethical; and that international relations are clear and stable in the complex and interconnected world.

Discussion

The diplomatic immunity law is an important area of overlapping between the international rules of law, the sovereignty of states and accountability. This discussion brings out the role of immunity in ensuring successful diplomacy, coupled with the fact that it also poses some challenges as far as abuse and inaccessibility to justice are concerned. Diplomatic immunity also provides protection for diplomats to perform their official duties without letdown from harassment or coercion from the country they are stationed in, something vital to the sound management of international relations.

They are, however, subject to the same safeguards as others, and sometimes even more so, and diplomats manage to engage in misconduct because of the safeguards, which results in a clash of practicality and justice. The modern arguments stress the need to reconcile these interests. The key ingredients of ensuring the legitimacy and accountability are maintained are making official actions transparent, waiving in extreme cases and introducing human rights protection.

Besides, there is also an opportunity to lower risks of violation by diplomatic training and internal control system, which will balance immunity and moral and legal responsibility. Finally, it will be shown that diplomatic immunity is essential to diplomacy and that it needs to be rethought and reframed. The principles of transparency, state cooperation and greater

internal and external accountability and public trust, would balance the functional necessity of immunity; leading to a more balanced and high-quality international legal system.

Conclusion

Diplomatic immunity is one of the fundamentals of international law and its purpose is to guarantee that diplomacy is managed through a streamlined process and that diplomats are protected. It is derived from the practice of the past and is reflected in legal rules, especially the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961), and provides diplomats with an elementary set of rights to facilitate their work without the risk of compulsion or undue interference. The doctrine is however plagued with issues such as abuse, irresponsibility and inadequacy to human rights values. The discussion of fairness that is now dominant emphasizes the need for balance while fulfilling the functional need, in which immunity is not used for the defense of personal evil. Enhancing transparency, clarifying the laws and establishing checks on the situation is possible with the help of internal investigation, waivers and diplomatic training. Addressing these concerns, states are able to increase the legitimacy and effectiveness of diplomatic immunity, facilitate responsible conduct, trust between states, and a more just and stable international law framework that does not just take into account the sovereign interests of states, but also pays attention to international justice.

Recommendations

According to the observation made on the diplomatic immunity, there are several recommendations that can be given to make it more effective, yet accountable and just. To begin with, states need to be very clear on the coverage of diplomatic immunity between official action and personal conduct. Definitions will help to minimize ambiguities and avoid misunderstandings, and make sure that immunity is used accordingly. Second, sending states ought to come up with clear domestic mechanisms that look into claims of abuse by their diplomats. In the severest of cases, voluntary waivers of immunity should be encouraged to bring justice to the victims, while maintaining the notion of diplomatic protection. Third, human rights issues should be included in the practice of diplomacy. Other rules can be put in place to prevent violations and abuses of diplomatic privileges and to safeguard local populations.

Fourth, there should be an increased emphasis on diplomats' education and training programs. Violations of the rules may be prevented before the event and diplomatic skills may be fostered through training on the legal rules, ethical conduct and cultural sensitivity. Lastly, the cooperation and peer review mechanisms between countries should be expanded. Seeking to enhance transparency, foster trust, and develop uniform methods for addressing challenges, consistent communication and contact between sending and receiving states can help achieve these goals. They will help to establish the proper balance between the practical need for diplomatic immunity and responsibility, justice and morality and enhance international diplomacy and international relations.

Research Limitations

The present study of diplomatic immunity has some limitations which must be borne in mind in interpreting the results. For one, the information that is available is usually more granular because most diplomatic misbehavior are not public, and so cannot be analyzed in their entirety. Second, the study is almost exclusively secondary and may not fully reflect the dynamic of the use of diplomatic immunity in various countries. Thirdly, extrapolation of results faces problems because of the political situation in the sending and receiving states and the different legal systems they have.

Fourth, the conclusions that can derive from the international environment may change over time as a result of the dynamism in the world; for example, new geopolitical tensions and new diplomatic norms and practices within the world may affect the conclusions that can be

drawn in the future. Lastly, no mention of interviews with diplomats, lawyers or policy makers that might be useful for information and insight. The restrictions underscore the importance of cautious interpretation, and indicate possible directions for furthermore studies.

Research Implications

International study of diplomatic immunity has a number of noteworthy implications for the law and international relations. First, it signals the need to have a balance between the protection of diplomats and accountability: “Immunity should not be a substitute for justice.” Secondly, this shows that there is a need to have the legal frameworks, principles, and a lack of ambiguity to narrow the breadth of the immunity and to prevent potential misuse of it by the immunity in states. Thirdly, the study indicates that internal control and monitoring mechanism must be put in place to address misconduct before it occurs, in diplomatic services.

Fourth, the paper shows that the incorporation of the ethical and human rights within the diplomatic style will raise both trust and legitimacy of the public. Lastly, the study offers a basis for future research in the search for a sensible reform, comparative law and the potential development of the role of diplomatic immunity within the current change of the international system. The overall implications can supply to policy-making, law-making and diplomacy.

Future Research Directions

Future research on diplomatic immunity can focus on certain points to aid in the understanding of the subject and advancement of international law. One direction that a comparative analysis of state practice could take would be analyzing how various countries apply and respond to allegations of misconduct with the goal of gaining a better understanding of best practices and potential for reform; one could analyze this in either direction, but it would be helpful to do so in both. The other area is how the application and perception of diplomatic immunity is affected by the changing international relations, such as geopolitical tensions, multilateral diplomacy, and international crises. Also, future research may focus on the incorporation of human rights, and perhaps diplomatic privileges and accountability mechanisms could be balanced to prevent the loss of the role of diplomats. Empirical methods could also be employed in research, for example, by interviewing diplomats, lawyers and policy makers for their first-hand accounts of issues and solutions. Finally, technologies and diplomacy online have offered the opportunity to explore the potential of using immunity in virtual and cyberspace. The research fields might lead to the development of diplomatic law and help in the responsible, transparent and effective participation in the international community.

References

- Farooq, Q., Ullah, M., & Mahar, W. F. (2024). The power of ideas: Diplomatic think tanks and Pakistan’s foreign policy. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 5(2), 536–545. [https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2024\(5-II\)50](https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2024(5-II)50)
- Gul, H., Naseem, I., Khan, M.B., & Zaman, K. (2025). Assessing the impact of U.S. economic aid and military support on the strategic dynamics of Pakistan’s foreign policy: A study of diplomatic relations and public sentiment. *Future Business Journal*, 11, 96. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-025-00528-4>
- Liu, J. (2023). The Japan-Korea joint development agreement: With particular references to revising the deadlock resolution mechanism. *Chinese Journal of International Law*, 22(1), 149–158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chinesejil/jmad012>
- Mushtaq, S. (2024). Nation and its modes of oppressions in South Asia. *International Affairs*, 100(1), 451–453. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiaid321>
- Shi, X. (2021). Diplomatic immunity *ratione materiae* and crimes in international law

Nordic Journal of International Law, 90(2), 228-252.

<https://doi.org/10.1163/15718107-bja10025>

Simpson, G., & Cryer, R. (2023). *British yearbook of international law*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bybil/brad012>

Talmon, S. (2024). Recognition and diplomatic relations. *British Yearbook of International Law*, 94(1), 210–235. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bybil/brad012>

Zhang, Y. (2023). Equitable representation on international benches and the appointment of tribunal members in investor–State dispute settlement: A historical perspective, *Journal of International Dispute Settlement*, 14(4), 428–450. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jnlids/idad021>