



Human Rights in Historical and Contemporary Perspective: State Power, Global Politics, and Emerging Challenges

Zoay Iman¹, Ahmad Aleem², Zoha Rao³, Nida Kafeel⁴

¹Department of Law, Rashid Latif Khan University, Lahore, Pakistan, Email: zoayimanzoayiman@gmail.com

²Department of Law, Rashid Latif Khan University, Lahore, Pakistan, Email: ahmadarain5069@gmail.com

³Department of English, Government College Women University, Faisalabad, Pakistan,

Email: raozuha1@gmail.com

⁴Advocate High Court, Former Judge District Judiciary Punjab, Email: nidatasleemkhan@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received:	April	07, 2026
Revised:	May	04, 2026
Accepted:	May	10, 2026
Available Online:	May	16, 2026

Keywords:

Human Rights Governance, Historical Consciousness, International Relations, State Sovereignty, Multilateral Accountability, Political Realities

Corresponding Author:

Nida Kafeel

Email:

nidatasleemkhan@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59075/tamsaal.v4i5.138>

ABSTRACT

The twenty-first century international order is characterized by a fundamental paradox: while human rights have become a central pillar of global governance, their implementation remains constrained by state sovereignty, geopolitical competition, and power politics. This qualitative research examines how historical consciousness informs contemporary international relations and human rights governance. Drawing on theoretical perspectives from realism, liberalism, and constructivism, the study explores the relationship between state power and international accountability. Through critical analysis of the Rwandan Genocide, international responses to China's human rights record, and the institutional limitations of the International Criminal Court (ICC), the paper demonstrates that human rights norms are not static legal principles but dynamic frameworks shaped by political interests and historical experiences. The findings reveal that historical understanding exposes recurring institutional failures, highlights selective applications of international law, and provides valuable lessons for contemporary human rights advocacy. The study argues that effective protection of human dignity requires stronger multilateral institutions, consistent enforcement of international law, and historically informed policymaking. Ultimately, an equitable global order depends upon reconciling universal human rights ideals with the realities of state sovereignty and geopolitical competition.



Introduction

Human rights have emerged as one of the defining principles of the modern international system since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948. International organizations, states, and civil society groups have increasingly recognized human rights as universal values that transcend national boundaries. Despite this normative advancement, serious

human rights violations continue across the globe, exposing the limitations of international institutions and the enduring influence of state sovereignty.

The relationship between power and human rights remains a central concern in international relations. Powerful states often shape the global human rights agenda according to strategic interests, while weaker states face greater accountability pressures. This discrepancy raises questions regarding the effectiveness, legitimacy, and fairness of international human rights mechanisms.

This paper investigates how historical consciousness contributes to understanding contemporary human rights challenges. Through an analysis of historical developments, institutional frameworks, and representative case studies, this research investigates the impact of state power on the governance of international human rights and evaluates the future trajectory of global accountability mechanisms

Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are:

1. To examine the relationship between state sovereignty and human rights enforcement.
2. To analyze how historical experiences shape contemporary human rights governance.
3. To evaluate the effectiveness of international institutions in addressing human rights violations.
4. To explore the impact of geopolitical interests on human rights accountability.
5. To propose recommendations for strengthening global human rights protection.

Research Methodology

This research adopts a qualitative and descriptive methodology based on secondary data analysis. Data were collected from academic books, peer-reviewed journal articles, reports published by international organizations, and policy documents.

The study utilizes historical analysis, comparative case study approach, theoretical review of international relations literature as well as content analysis of international human rights institutions.

Three case studies were selected:

The Rwandan Genocide (1994)

International responses to China's human rights record

Institutional limitations of the International Criminal Court (ICC)

These cases illustrate different dimensions of the interaction between power politics and human rights governance.

Theoretical Framework

Realist scholars argue that states prioritize national interests, security, and survival above moral considerations. According to realism, international institutions lack independent authority and remain dependent upon state cooperation.

Hans Morgenthau (1948) contended that political actions are primarily motivated by power considerations rather than ethical commitments. From this perspective, human rights enforcement occurs only when it aligns with strategic interests.

Liberal theorists emphasize the importance of international cooperation, multilateral institutions, and the rule of law in promoting peace and addressing global challenges. From a liberal perspective, organizations such as the United Nations, the International Criminal Court, and various human rights regimes help regulate state behavior, encourage cooperation, and strengthen the protection of human rights. Liberals argue that adherence to international norms and legal frameworks can reduce conflict, enhance accountability, and foster a more stable and just international order.

Liberalism suggests that democratic governance and international norms can mitigate conflict and encourage respect for human rights.

Constructivist scholars highlight the significance of ideas, norms, identities, and historical narratives in shaping international relations. Unlike realist perspectives, which emphasize material power and state interests, constructivism argues that state behavior is influenced by socially constructed beliefs and shared understandings. From this perspective, human rights are viewed as evolving social norms rather than fixed principles. Their interpretation, acceptance, and implementation develop over time through interactions among states, international organizations, and civil society actors. Consequently, the promotion and protection of human rights depend not only on legal and political mechanisms but also on the diffusion of norms, collective identities, and historical experiences that shape global perceptions of justice, legitimacy, and accountability.

Historical consciousness plays a significant role within the constructivist framework because collective memory influences policy decisions and international responses to crises.

Historical Consciousness and Human Rights Governance

Historical consciousness refers to the awareness and interpretation of historical events and their significance for present and future actions. Human rights institutions themselves emerged from historical experiences, particularly the atrocities committed during World War II.

The Holocaust motivated the creation of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and subsequent international legal frameworks. Historical memory remains central to contemporary human rights advocacy because it provides evidence of the consequences of institutional failures and political indifference.

Learning from history enables policymakers to identify recurring patterns such as:

- Genocide prevention failures
- Selective international intervention
- Abuse of sovereign authority
- Weak accountability mechanisms

Historical awareness therefore serves as both a moral guide and a practical tool for improving governance structures.

Case Studies

The Rwandan Genocide and International Failure

The Rwandan Genocide of 1994 remains one of the most significant failures of international human rights protection. Over approximately 800,000 people, primarily Tutsis and moderate Hutus, were killed within a period of around 100 days.

Despite receiving warnings regarding the unfolding violence, the international community failed to intervene effectively. The United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) lacked sufficient resources, authority, and political backing from major powers.

The genocide demonstrated several structural weaknesses:

- Reluctance of powerful states to commit resources.
- Overemphasis on state sovereignty.
- Bureaucratic delays within the United Nations.
- Lack of preventive action despite available intelligence.

The Rwandan case continues to influence debates concerning the “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P), which seeks to balance sovereignty with humanitarian intervention.

China and Human Rights Diplomacy

China occupies a significant position in contemporary global politics as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council and a major economic power.

International concerns regarding issues in Xinjiang, Hong Kong, and restrictions on civil liberties have generated extensive debate within global human rights forums. However, international responses often remain constrained by China’s economic influence and diplomatic leverage.

This case illustrates how:

- Economic interdependence affects human rights advocacy.
- Powerful states can resist external scrutiny.
- Human rights enforcement may be influenced by geopolitical considerations.
- International institutions often face limitations when addressing major powers.
- The Chinese case demonstrates that global human rights governance remains heavily shaped by power politics despite commitments to universal values.

The International Criminal Court (ICC)

The International Criminal Court (ICC) was established through the Rome Statute in 1998 to prosecute individuals accused of genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and the crime of aggression. As the first permanent international criminal tribunal, the ICC represents a significant milestone in the development of international justice and accountability.

Despite its achievements, the Court faces several challenges, including jurisdictional constraints, political resistance, and perceptions of selectivity. The ICC relies heavily on state cooperation to execute arrest warrants, secure evidence, and enforce its decisions. Furthermore, major powers such as the United States, China, and Russia have not ratified the Rome Statute, limiting the Court's universal reach and authority. Critics also contend that ICC investigations have disproportionately focused on politically weaker states, while influential actors often remain beyond its jurisdiction or escape accountability.

While the ICC has strengthened the normative framework of international criminal justice and contributed to the global fight against impunity, its effectiveness continues to be constrained by limited enforcement powers, inconsistent state cooperation, and geopolitical considerations. Consequently, the ICC illustrates the persistent tension between the universal aspirations of international law and the political realities of the international system.

To enhance its effectiveness, the Court may benefit from stronger state cooperation, broader ratification of the Rome Statute, greater protection from political influence, and increased institutional resources for investigations and prosecutions. Enhanced collaboration with regional organizations and domestic judicial systems may further strengthen accountability mechanisms and improve the efficient prosecution of international crimes.

Through the analysis of the Rwandan Genocide, China's human rights diplomacy, and the International Criminal Court, this study demonstrates that although international human rights norms have become increasingly institutionalized, their implementation continues to be shaped by complex political, legal, and strategic considerations. The effectiveness of international human rights protection therefore depends not only on the existence of legal frameworks but also on the willingness of states and international institutions to enforce them consistently and impartially.

Discussion

The three case studies reveal recurring patterns in global human rights governance.

First, state sovereignty continues to operate as a formidable barrier to international intervention, with governments often invoking it as a shield against external accountability despite persistent reports of grave human rights abuses.

Second, political and strategic interests frequently dictate the international response to human rights violations. Considerations related to alliances, economic cooperation, and security agendas often take precedence over ethical and normative obligations.

Third, lessons drawn from past humanitarian catastrophes underscore the risks associated with institutional paralysis. The Rwandan Genocide of 1994, during which approximately 800,000

people were killed within a period of one hundred days while international actors largely failed to respond decisively, serves as a stark reminder of the human costs of delayed intervention and inadequate collective action.

Historical consciousness therefore provides an essential framework for understanding why human rights mechanisms succeed or fail. Rather than viewing international law as a neutral system, history reveals its operation within broader structures of power and politics.

The Future of Human Rights in the 21st Century

The future of human rights governance will be influenced by several emerging challenges:

The decline of unipolar global dominance and the rise of emerging powers may reshape the international human rights landscape.

Rapid technological advancements may enhance states' surveillance capabilities, thereby posing potential risks to privacy and civil liberties.

Environmental degradation and climate-related challenges may increasingly undermine fundamental human rights, including health, food security, and protection against forced displacement.

The expanding use of artificial intelligence technologies may generate complex concerns related to discrimination, accountability, transparency, and ethical governance.

Effectively responding to these emerging challenges may necessitate stronger collaboration among states, international organizations, and civil society stakeholders.

Recommendations

To enhance the effectiveness of global human rights governance, international institutions must be reformed to strengthen accountability mechanisms and ensure timely responses to human rights violations. Greater efforts should be made to eliminate the selective application of international law, as unequal enforcement undermines the credibility and legitimacy of the international system. Strengthening support for multilateral human rights frameworks through improved cooperation among states and international organizations can help create a more consistent and coordinated approach to protecting human dignity. Furthermore, the development of robust early-warning systems is essential for identifying potential atrocities before they escalate into large-scale humanitarian crises.

In addition, governments and educational institutions should promote human rights education grounded in historical awareness, enabling societies to learn from past injustices and prevent their recurrence. Transparency in international decision-making processes must also be increased to foster public trust and institutional legitimacy. Effective protection of human rights requires stronger collaboration between governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society groups, and international organizations, ensuring that diverse perspectives contribute to policy development and implementation. Finally, as technological advancement and environmental degradation present new challenges, international legal frameworks should expand protections related to digital rights, privacy, artificial intelligence, climate justice, and

environmental sustainability. Collectively, these measures can contribute to a more equitable, accountable, and responsive global human rights system in the twenty-first century.

Conclusion

Human rights occupy a central place within the contemporary international order, yet their implementation remains constrained by state sovereignty and geopolitical interests. Through analysis of Rwanda, China's human rights diplomacy, and the International Criminal Court, this study demonstrates that power politics continues to shape the enforcement of international norms.

Historical consciousness provides a valuable framework for understanding these dynamics. By examining past failures and successes, policymakers and institutions can develop more effective strategies for protecting human dignity. The future of human rights depends not only upon stronger legal frameworks but also upon consistent political commitment, institutional reform, and a willingness to apply international law impartially. Building a more equitable global order requires balancing sovereignty with accountability and integrating historical lessons into contemporary policymaking.

References

1. Donnelly, J. (2013). *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice* (3rd ed.). Cornell University Press.
2. <https://www.cornellpress.cornell.edu>
3. Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization*, 52(4). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2601361>
4. Human Rights Watch. World Reports. <https://www.hrw.org/world-report>
5. Human Rights Commission of Pakistan (HRCP). Annual State of Human Rights Reports. <https://hrcp-web.org/hrcpweb/publications>
6. Haqqani, H. (2005). *Pakistan: Between Mosque and Military*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. <https://carnegieendowment.org>
7. International Criminal Court. Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. <https://www.icc-cpi.int/resource-library/documents/rs-eng.pdf>
8. International Commission of Jurists Pakistan Reports. <https://www.icj.org>
9. Jalal, A. (1995). *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia*. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org>
10. Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press. <https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691122483/after-hegemony>
11. Khan, A. (Various Human Rights and Governance Studies, Pakistan Institute of Development Economics) <https://pide.org.pk>
12. Lodhi, M. (Ed.). (2011). *Pakistan: Beyond the Crisis State*. Columbia University Press. <https://cup.columbia.edu>
13. Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics Among Nations*. McGraw-Hill. <https://archive.org/details/politicsamongnat00morg>
14. Power, S. (2002). *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*. Basic Books. <https://www.basicbooks.com>

15. Siddiq, A. (2007). *Military Inc.: Inside Pakistan's Military Economy*. Pluto Press.
<https://www.plutobooks.com>
16. United Nations. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948).
<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>
17. Yusuf, H. (2018). *Pakistan's Public Diplomacy*. United States Institute of Peace.
<https://www.usip.org>