WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Standard Clauses in International Trade Agreements

I Ketut Ngastawa[1*], Prof. Dr. Johannes Ibrahim Kosasih[2]

[1]Doctoral Program Students in Law at Warmadewa UniversityDoctoral Program in Law at Warmadewa University
[2]Doctoral Program in Law at Warmadewa UniversityDoctoral Program in Law at Warmadewa University

A B S T R A C T

Standard clauses in international trade agreements often create structural inequities, where dominant parties (such as multinational corporations) dictate contract terms, while weaker parties are left with a "take-it-or-leave-it" choice without meaningful negotiation. This study examines the failure of international regulatory frameworks (e.g., UNIDROIT Principles and CISG) to prevent such injustices, despite their claims of ensuring legal certainty and transactional efficiency. Using a radical legal philosophy approach, the research reveals contradictions between contractual justice principles (autonomy of will and equitable rights) and the imbalanced application of boilerplate clauses, exposing systemic biases in their interpretation and enforcement. Key findings identify three core issues: (1) formal equality assumptions in contract law legitimize substantive inequality, (2) weak enforcement mechanisms against exploitative clauses, and (3) fragmented interpretations across jurisdictions. As a solution, the study proposes a substantive justice evaluation model with three pillars: (1) proportionality standards for risk allocation, (2) substantive transparency in clause drafting, and (3) an independent international oversight body. The model is tested through case studies of investment (ISDS) and cross-border e-commerce disputes. The research contributes by reconstructing contract theory to integrate radical philosophical critique with practical solutions. Policy recommendations include amending international instruments (e.g., introducing "red lists" of unfair clauses), enhancing negotiation capacity for developing countries, and reforming dispute resolution systems. The study concludes that contractual justice requires shifting legal focus from mere efficiency to equitable power redistribution.

Keywords: Boilerplate clauses, substantive justice, international contract law, radical legal philosophy, UNIDROIT, CISG, bargaining asymmetry.

1. Introduction

The development of contract law in the context of economic globalization has created a paradox between transactional efficiency and substantive justice. On the one hand, boilerplate clauses in international trade agreements are crucial instruments to ensure legal certainty and uniformity of business practices across jurisdictions. But on the other hand, these clauses often reflect structural inequalities, where the party with the stronger bargaining position is usually a multinational corporation or advanced economic actor dominating the negotiation process, while the other party has only the option of "take it or leave". This reality raises a fundamental philosophical question: are these standardized clauses still in line with the basic principles of contract law, such as autonomy of will, equality of the parties and commutative justice?

Historically, modern contract law has its roots in the philosophical thought of the eighteenth and 19th centuries, in particular Rousseau's theory of the social contract, the doctrine of freedom of contract from the Classical School, as well as Aristotle's concept of justice. However, in contemporary practice, standard clauses often obscure these principles. For example, choice of law and forum selection clauses in international contracts tend to favor parties from jurisdictions with more advanced legal systems, while limitation of liability clauses may disproportionately limit the liability of dominant parties. The traditional doctrinal approach, which focuses only on the formal-legalistic aspect without touching its philosophical roots, fails to address this inequality. Therefore, this study adopts a radical approach in the sense of tracing to the roots of philosophical thought to re-examine the legitimacy of standard clauses within the framework of more critical legal theory.

The complexity of this problem is increasingly evident in empirical cases. Studies have shown that in international contract disputes, courts or arbitration institutions often prioritize the literal enforcement of standard clauses rather than assessing the substance of their justice. A concrete example can be found in the cases of investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS), where investment protection clauses in bilateral agreements (BITs) are often used by foreign investors to challenge the public policies of developing countries. This phenomenon questions whether these standard clauses still function as instruments of justice or are actually tools to perpetuate the imbalance of global economic power. At the theoretical level, this research seeks to bridge the gap between legal philosophy and contract practice by integrating interdisciplinary perspectives, including Rawls's theory of justice, critical legal criticism and legal economic analysis.

The research not only intends to fill in the academic gaps in the contract law literature, but also provide practical recommendations for policymakers, legal practitioners, and business people. By reconstructing the philosophical foundations of contract law, it is hoped that a more equitable standard clause evaluation model can be developed, without sacrificing legal certainty which is an essential need in international trade. Ultimately, the contribution of

this research lies in the effort to balance economic efficiency and social justice in global contract practice, an issue that is increasingly relevant in an era where economic inequality and the dominance of multinational corporations continue to be major challenges.

Thus, this research is not only relevant for legal academics, but also for stakeholders involved in international trade policy formation, the drafting of cross-border business contracts, and the settlement of commercial disputes. The findings and recommendations produced are expected to be the basis for contract law reform that is more responsive to the demands of global justice.

Based on the background of the problems described above, in this study the author discusses two formulations of the problem, namely how standard clauses in international trade agreements are contrary to the principles of contractual justice (such as autonomy of will and balance of rights) when analyzed through a radical legal philosophy approach? Similarly, why do international regulatory frameworks (such as the UNIDROIT Principles or UNCISG) fail to prevent the injustices of standard clauses, and how can substantive justice-based evaluation models be proposed?

2. Research Methods

The research method used in this study is normative law research. The sources of legal materials used in this study come from: Primary legal material sources are legal materials consisting of legal principles and rules in the form of laws and regulations and court decisions. Secondary legal materials are literature that is relevant to the topic discussed, both legal literature written by influential experts, the opinions of scholars, legal journals and non-legal literature, and articles obtained through the internet. And tertiary legal materials, the source of this legal material is obtained from non-legal sources and can be in the form of data obtained from third parties. In this normative research, the author uses techniques to collect legal materials obtained from libraries, the internet and e-journals. Everything that is presented must be based on all existing and related relative data, so that this writing can be objective, rational and factual.

3. Discussion

3.1 Standard Clauses in International Trade Agreements Are Contrary to the Principles of Contractual Fairness

Standard clauses in international trade agreements are often considered to be efficiency instruments that facilitate cross-border business transactions by providing legal certainty and uniformity of practice. However, when viewed through a radical legal philosophy approach that demands a trace to the root of the underlying thought, these clauses show a clear contradiction to the principles of contractual justice, especially the autonomy of will and the balance of rights. Autonomy of will, as a central principle in contract law, presupposes that the parties have freedom and equality in determining the content of the agreement. However, in practice, standard clauses are often drafted unilaterally by parties with stronger bargaining positions, such as multinational corporations, while other parties, especially business actors from developing countries, are only given the option to accept or reject the entire package of agreements without any meaningful negotiation space. This condition clearly erodes the principle of free will, because the choices available to the weak are actually illusions, not true freedom.

Furthermore, the principle of balance of rights that should be the basis of contractual justice is also disturbed by the existence of a standard clause. Clauses such as choice of law, forum selection, and limitation of liability are often designed to protect the interests of the dominant party, while the other party is burdened with disproportionate risk and uncertainty. For example, forum selection clauses that require dispute resolution in certain jurisdictions can be burdensome for parties from developing countries due to the costs and legal complexities they have to face. A radical legal philosophy approach questions why such clauses are considered valid and binding, when they substantially create injustice. This question leads to the dismantling of the hidden assumptions behind the legitimacy of the standard clause, such as the notion that all parties have equal access to legal information and resources, or that the market will naturally correct existing imbalances.

Through the lens of radical legal philosophy, standard clauses can also be seen as a manifestation of structural power imbalances in the global economic system. Critical legal theory, for example, asserts that contract law is never truly neutral, but always reflects existing power relations. The standard clause, in this context, is not just a tool of efficiency, but also a mechanism for maintaining the status quo that benefits the dominant party. A radical analysis of these clauses reveals that they are often built on a foundation of utilitarian thinking that sacrifices substantive justice in the interest of economic efficiency. In fact, contractual justice should not only be about certainty and predictability, but also about the protection of vulnerable parties from exploitation and injustice.

Thus, the radical approach of legal philosophy not only exposes the contradiction between standard clauses and the principle of contractual justice, but also challenges us to rethink the fundamentals of contract law legitimacy itself. If the standard clauses are indeed contrary to the principles of autonomy of will and balance of rights, then a philosophical reconstruction of the way we understand and apply these clauses in the practice of international trade agreements is needed. This could include the development of new evaluation criteria that are more sensitive to the justice aspect, or even regulatory reforms to limit the use of exploitative standard clauses. Ultimately, the goal of this analysis is to restore contract law to its original mission: as an instrument that not only facilitates transactions, but also guarantees fairness for all parties involved.

This analysis does not stop at the normative-doctrinal level, but demands a dismantling of the philosophical roots that underlie the existence and acceptance of such clauses in global contractual practice. Boilerplate clauses are essentially a simplification of contractual mechanisms that emerged in response to the need for efficiency in modern business transactions. In the context of international trade, clauses such as choice of law, forum selection,

limitation of liability, and force majeure have become a kind of 'universal language' that facilitates uniformity of contractual practice across jurisdictions. However, this standardization brings with it the fundamental problem when such clauses systematically favor one party over the other.

The development of the standard clause is inseparable from the history of global capitalism. From the industrial revolution to the current era of digitalization, standard clauses have evolved from mere efficiency tools to legal instruments that often reflect the imbalance of economic power between developed and developing countries, between multinational corporations and small and medium-sized enterprises.

The principle of willpower autonomy as the main pillar of modern contract law actually contains a paradox when faced with the reality of standard clauses. Classical legal theory assumes that the parties come to the negotiating table with an equal position and a balanced negotiating capacity. However, in international contract practice, this assumption proves to be fictitious. Standard clauses are often drafted by large corporate legal teams with abundant resources, while other parties – especially from developing countries – are simply given the option to accept or reject without meaningful negotiation space.

The principle of balance of rights is also distorted. Clauses such as limitation of liability in international distribution contracts, for example, often impose disproportionate risk on local distributors while multinational manufacturers are over-protected. This phenomenon shows how standard clauses can be a tool to unilaterally shift risk through a mechanism that appears to be formally neutral.

Radical legal philosophical approaches require us to question the ontological and epistemological underpinnings of the acceptance of standard clauses in the modern contract legal system. Using Descartes' method of radical skepticism, we can begin by doubting all the assumptions that have been taken for granted about standard clauses.

First, the assumption of economic efficiency, which is the main justification for the standard clause, needs to be retested. Does the efficiency in question really benefit all parties, or is it just a cover to perpetuate structural injustice? Second, the concept of freedom of contract that is the basis for the legitimacy of the standard clause must be deconstructed. In the context of a real power imbalance, is the choice to agree to a standard clause really an expression of freedom, or simply an economic coercion?

Modern contract law theories rooted in classical liberal thought (Locke, Smith, Mill) presuppose the formal equality of the parties. However, in the practice of international contracts, this formal equality is often used to legitimize substantive inequalities. The standard clause is a clear example of how law can function as a tool of hegemony – a concept developed by Marxist thinkers such as Gramsci.

Further, a radical analysis reveals that standard clauses often reflect systemic biases against the North's global business interests. International arbitration clauses, for example, tend to lead to arbitration institutions in developed countries with high costs that are unaffordable for business actors from developing countries. This shows how a clause that appears to be technically neutral actually contains deep geopolitical bias.

The uncontrolled application of default clauses has created structural inequities in the global trading system. Case studies in sectors such as mining, pharmaceuticals, and technology show a consistent pattern: standard clauses tend to perpetuate the dependence of developing economies on global corporations. In some cases, stabilization clauses in investment contracts are even used to limit state sovereignty in regulating the public interest.

From the perspective of Rawls's theory of justice, the standard unequal clause clearly violates the principle of differentiation which requires that inequality can only be justified if it benefits the most disadvantaged. Reality shows that standard clauses often worsen the position of the already weak party.

Radical analysis leads us to the urgent need to reconstruct the philosophical underpinnings of the standard clause arrangement. The utilitarian approach that has dominated so far needs to be complemented by a perspective of distributive justice and critical legal theory. Some principles that can be considered include:

First, the principle of proportionality requires that the allocation of risk through standard clauses must be balanced and take into account the real capacity of each party. Second, the principle of substantive transparency which requires an explanation of the legal consequences of the standard clause in language that can be understood by all parties. Third, the principle of dynamic balance that allows the adjustment of clauses based on fundamental changes in circumstances.

The implementation of this radical philosophical approach certainly faces great challenges. Resistance from global business interests, differences in national legal systems, and the complexity of international transactions are some of the real obstacles. However, some strategic steps can be considered:

First, the development of soft law instruments such as the UNIDROIT guidelines on fair standard clauses. Second, reform of the dispute settlement system that is more sensitive to the imbalance of power. Third, increasing the negotiation capacity of developing countries through technical assistance programs and institutional development.

3.2 International Regulatory Framework Fails to Prevent Injustice from Standard Clauses, and Substantive Fairness-Based Evaluation Models

International regulatory frameworks such as the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts (PICC) and the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG) have indeed provided globally recognized standards for harmonization of contract law. However, in practice, these instruments have proven to be ineffective enough in preventing the injustices arising from the application of standard clauses in international trade agreements. The main weakness lies in its overly general and flexible nature, so it does not expressly regulate the supervision mechanism for potentially unequal clauses. The UNIDROIT Principles, for example, although they contain principles of justice such as good faith and

fair dealing, do not have legally binding force and their implementation is highly dependent on the interpretation of the arbitral institution or the local court. While the CISG, which applies is binding on countries that ratify it, deliberately avoids specific arrangements about standard clauses because it is considered to be the domain of national law.

The failure of this regulatory framework can be traced from several fundamental aspects. First, the approach used is still too focused on the formal-procedural aspect rather than the substance of justice. For example, the provisions on contract formation in the CISG emphasize more on the offer and acceptance mechanisms, without touching on the fundamental issue of the imbalance of negotiating power. Second, these instruments are not equipped with adequate enforcement mechanisms to handle cases of abuse of standard clauses by dominant parties. Third, there is fragmentation in interpretation and application, where arbitration institutions in different jurisdictions often have different interpretations of the same clause, creating legal uncertainty.

It is in this context that a model of substantive justice-based evaluation becomes relevant to be proposed. This model should be built on a few key pillars. The first pillar is the development of proportionality standards in assessing standard clauses, which not only look at the formal agreement of the parties, but also consider the real impact of these clauses on the balance of rights and obligations. The second pillar is the application of the principle of substantive transparency which requires the drafting of the standard clause to explain its legal implications clearly and in easy-to-understand language, rather than simply fulfilling the formalities of providing information. The third pillar is the establishment of an independent supervisory body at the international level that is authorized to evaluate standard clauses that are widely used in global trade practices.

This evaluation model needs to be equipped with concrete indicators to measure the level of fairness of a standard clause. The first indicator is the aspect of risk distribution, whether the clause allocates risks in a balanced manner or burdens one of the parties. The second indicator is access to justice, whether the clause makes it difficult for one of the parties to access the dispute resolution mechanism. The third indicator is the systemic impact, whether the application of the clause has the potential to create structural injustices in the long run. This approach is different from the traditional evaluation model which only looks at the procedural aspects of contract formation.

The implementation of this substantive justice-based evaluation model requires support from various stakeholders. At the international level, amendments to instruments such as the UNIDROIT Principles are needed to include more detailed guidance on the evaluation of standard clauses. At the national level, countries need to adopt laws that specifically regulate the supervision of standard clauses in international contracts. Meanwhile, at the level of business practice, it is necessary to develop a more balanced alternative clause model to replace standard clauses that have tended to be uneven. With this comprehensive approach, it is hoped that the international regulatory framework will not only be an instrument of legal harmonization, but also be able to ensure the realization of substantive justice in the practice of international trade contracts.

4. Conclusions and Suggestions

4.1 Conclusion

1) A radical philosophical-analysis of standard clauses in international trade agreements reveals that they often conflict with the principles of contractual fairness, such as autonomy of will and the balance of rights. Although claimed to be a tool of efficiency, the standard clause actually reinforces structural injustice, where the party with a stronger bargaining position, usually the multinational corporation dominates the content of the agreement, while the weaker party is only given the option to accept or reject. Conventional legal approaches that rely on formal equality fail to address this inequality, requiring a fundamental reconstruction of the legitimacy of standard clauses based on the principle of substantive justice.
2) International regulatory frameworks such as the UNIDROIT Principles and the CISG fail to prevent the injustice of standard clauses because they focus too much on formal aspects and pay less attention to substantive justice. The flexibility of interpretation and weak enforcement mechanisms make the lame clause still prevalent in use, especially by dominant parties in international transactions. Existing legal approaches have not been able to address the challenges of the imbalance of negotiating power and the systemic impact of exploitative standard clauses.

4.2 Suggestions

1) To address this problem, it is necessary to carry out reforms at three levels. First, at the theoretical level, by developing a framework for evaluating standard clauses based on justice, not just efficiency. Second, at the regulatory level, through strengthening international legal instruments such as the UNIDROIT Principles to limit unequal clauses and encourage transparency. Third, at a practical level, by increasing the negotiating capacity of weak parties through training and legal assistance. In addition, arbitration bodies and courts should be more critical in assessing the substantial fairness of standard clauses, rather than just formal compliance. These measures are expected to rebalance contractual relations in international trade.
2) It is necessary to develop a substantive justice-based standard clause evaluation model with three main steps: (1) strengthening international instruments through more detailed guidance on inequality clauses, (2) establishing an independent oversight mechanism to assess the proportionality of clauses, and (3) encouraging substantive transparency in contract drafting. States also need to adopt national regulations that limit unfair clauses, while businesses are encouraged to adopt a more balanced alternative clause model.

References

Alfadil, M. O., Kassem, M. A., Ali, K. N., & Alaghbari, W, 2022, "Construction Industry from the Perspective of Force Majeure and Environmental Risk Compared to the Covid-19 Outbreak: a Systematic Literature Review, Sustainability", 14(3), p. 1135.

Barnhizer, David & Daniel Barnhizer, 2021. The Artificial Intelligence Contagion: Can Democracy Withstand the Imminent Transformation of Work, Wealth, and the Social Order? Clarity Press.

Buana, Mirsa Satria, 2023, Comparison of Constitutional Law: Philosophy, Theory, and Practice, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta.

Gilo, D & Porat, A, 2022, "The Dual Role of Boilerplate Clauses: Efficiency vs. Exploitation." Journal of Legal Studies, 51 (1), pp. 1-38.

Hadid, S., Chasanah, C., & Khuriyah, K, 2025, Revitalizing the PAI Curriculum: from a Doctrinal Approach to a Humanistic Approach. Journal of Research in the Educational Sciences, 4 (1), p. 448-460.

Khairanis, R & Aldi, M, 2024, The Relevance of the Philosophy of Science in the Era of the Industrial Revolution 5.0: A Phenomenological Analysis, Carong: Journal of Education, Social and Humanities, 1 (2), pp. 87-97.

Luzak, J, 2021, "The Illusion of Consent in Digital Contracts: A European Perspective." European Law Journal, 27 (3), pp. 345-365.

Micklitz, Hans. W, 2020, The Politics of Justice in European Private Law: Social Justice, Access Justice, Societal Justice, Cambridge University Press.

Pasaribu, Muldri Pudamo James, 2024, The Urgency of Realizing Fair and Safe Trade Through Legal Metrology Legal Instruments, Nas Media Pustaka, Makassar.

Penasthika, Priskila Prastika, 2024, Unveiling Legal Choices: In International Commercial Contracts in Indonesia, Prenada Media, Jakarta.

Pistor, Katharina, 2023, The Code of Capital: How the Law Creates Wealth and Inequality. Princeton University Press.

Sandel, Michael, 2020, The Tyranny of Merit: What's Become of the Common Good? Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Trianto, A., Rosida, N & Wijaya, E, 2023, "Critical Legal Studies: Understanding the Relationship Between Business, Government and Legal Interests", Mendapo: Journal of Administrative Law, 4 (2), pp. 134-151.

Taali, Muhammad, et al., 2024, Policy Evaluation Theory and Model: An Education Curriculum Policy Study, PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia, Jambi