

Politics as a Framework for Human Rights Enforcement: The Domestic and International Perspectives

Dessalegn Adera Eriki

Masters Student in Human Rights at the University of Oslo, The Norwegian Centre for Human Rights

Abstract: Politics is the main framework by which human rights are enforced both at the domestic and international level. At the domestic level, human rights may influence politics and democratization process through norm installing and behaviour change. It influences, at least, theoretically the way governments treat their citizens and those in political sphere. On the other hand, the nature of the political environment affects the enforcement and protection of human rights. When the political atmosphere is tight and closed, the enforcement of human rights would be in the side-lines. When the political environment is conducive, it would be amenable for human rights protection and enforcement.

States may adopt human rights for various reasons. The adoption of human rights, whether out of sincerity or cynically, induces norm and behaviour changes even for those states known for their human rights violations. Adoption of human rights as a show for international political diplomacy may ultimately bring an enduring change in political culture that embraces human rights.

At the international level, politics is almost the only means by which human rights are enforced. This is because there is no supra-national judicial body that adjudicates human rights violations. Moreover, the international response to human rights violations is through consultation, criticism and cooperation, and through use of force in some case. In addition to these, human rights issues are practically tied with economic, diplomatic and geopolitical interests at large. Hence, politics as a framework for human rights enforcement is much more important at the international level.

At both levels, the interactions between politics and human rights are two-directional. Both influence each other in different ways and degrees. The degree of politicization, however, differs significantly.

I. INTRODUCTION

In its earliest version, human right was related only to the natural law philosophy which holds that everyone is entitled to human rights by virtue of his humanity independent of any other considerations. However, as the treatment of individuals was left to the discretion of states under the so-called principle of sovereignty, gross violation of human rights occurred during the Second World War. This led to the establishment of the United Nations and its human rights organs. Since then human rights norms have been internationalized in the sense that a state has no longer discretion in the treatment of its citizens. And the issue of human rights vis-à-vis politics came to the stage.

The title of the essay 'politics as a framework for human rights enforcement: the domestic and international perspective' can be interpreted in two ways. On the one hand, it may be interpreted as the influence of politics on human rights enforcement. On the other hand, it may be taken as the influence of human rights on politics as the former is enforced through the latter. These interpretations show the two-way interactions. Moreover, for the purpose of this essay, enforcement is broadly taken to include human rights adoption, positive enforcement (compliance) and negative enforcement (failure to comply with, or simply violation).

This essay tries to address various issues on the interaction of human rights and politics. Why human rights violations are considered as category of political thought and appraisal? How they influence the way political issues are handled? What is the implication of adopting human rights as a framework for political action? Hence the issues to be discussed pertain to human rights violations as category of political thought and appraisal, the influence of violation of human rights on political issues, and the implication of adopting human rights as a framework for political action. The international political aspect of human rights will also be considered.

This essay, however, would not be a review of all existing literatures on the topic, rather focus on the main literatures in relation thereto.

II. HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS AS CATEGORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT AND APPRAISAL

While philosophical approaches ask what human rights are, why we have them, what they are based on and how they can best be justified, political approach to human rights, on the other hand, start with the problem of putting human rights into practice¹. Political approaches seeks to connect human rights with institutions and practices that can guarantee them². The political approach of human rights is practice-dependent³. The political discourse on human rights pays special attention to power relationships including those associated with social and economic power⁴.

According to James Ingram, there are three images of politics on the basis of which the politics of human rights is manifested. These are based on coercive power, law and institutions, and political action⁵. On the politics of human rights based on coercive power, politics involves the use of power to achieve certain ends, and the politics of human rights is the use of power to advance the moral imperative of protecting these rights⁶. Human rights politics is then the activity of whoever is willing and able to enforce these rights—anyone, that is, except the rights bearers themselves⁷. The second image of politics of human rights is concerned with how human rights should be institutionally guaranteed⁸. On this view, the politics of human rights is a creative, democratic politics of contestation, challenging particular exclusions and inequalities in the name of the open-ended principle of equal freedom, which acquires its particular contours only through this contestation⁹. Accordingly, human rights belong to one party, but power is used on their behalf by another. The politics of human rights is, seemingly of necessity, something the powerful do for the powerless¹⁰. Human rights politics remains a politics of the stronger, not of those whose rights are at issue¹¹.

For Ignatief human rights are nothing other than politics. Human rights require politics as they are a matter of taking sides, mobilising constituencies powerful enough to force abusers to stop¹². The point of human rights is to ensure that power be exercised over rights holders in ways that respect their autonomy as agents¹³.

As indicated above, the duties in relation to human rights principally fall on the state as a political institution. Human rights essentially regulate the behaviour of the officials of a state or other coercive institutional frameworks¹⁴. Human rights do not tells us how we should act towards one another, they instead define standards of conduct applicable to political arrangements¹⁵. They deal with how people should be treated by their governments and institutions¹⁶. This is

¹ Ingram, James. What Is a “Right to Have Rights”? Three Images of the Politics of Human Rights. p.402

² Ibid.

³ Valentini, Laura. In What Sense are Human Rights Political? A Preliminary Exploration. p.182

⁴ Evans, Tony. The Politics of Human Rights :A Global Perspective. p.10

⁵ Ingram, James. Supranote 1, p.403

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Id. P.412

⁹ Id. p.413

¹⁰ Id. p.405

¹¹ Id. p.407

¹² Ignatief, Michael. Human Rights as Politics and Idolatry. p.9

¹³ Ingram, James. Supranote 1, p.406

¹⁴ Tasioulas, John. Are Human Rights Essentially Triggers for Intervention? P.938

¹⁵ Valentini, Laura. Supranote 3, p.183

¹⁶ Nickel, James. Making Sense of Human Rights. p.13

because the state makes itself a principal addressee when it negotiates a human rights treaties. That constrains the political acts of states. Their recognition, protection and violations are related to the state as a political institution. Due to this, their violation would be considered as a category of political thought. In this vein, some interpret human rights as benchmarks of political legitimacy, the moral duty to obey the law of any given political community being conditional on its compliance with them¹⁷.

The other reason why human rights are considered as a category of political thought arises from the nature and content of human rights law itself. In both national and international societies, it is politics that determines the content of the human rights norms¹⁸. Human rights norms are made in the legislative process, and the legislative process always involves policy choices and calculations of power¹⁹. With in states, chief executive officers and their legal staff make political decisions all the time about whether and how to apply law in particular situations²⁰. Particularly, at the international level, there is no central law making body, no international tribunal accepted as a legitimate interpreter of legal obligations, save for the European Court of Human Rights, and no global law enforcement corps to enforce the rules²¹. Hence, the enforcement of human rights norms at the international level largely depends on the non-judicial aspects, political aspects to say so, that gives human rights largely a political feature. This implies the reality of action on human rights is through soft law-via public policy, reflecting the interplay of governments, IGO, NGOs and individuals²².

Political approach to human rights is, therefore, a question of finding the surest method of guaranteeing rights and preventing their continuing violation²³. According to James Ingram, the political view has now the upper hand, and that human rights' defenders are now less troubled by rights' extra-political provenance or justification and focus more on the practical task of realizing them²⁴.

In addition to these, the political feature of human rights can also be seen from the perspective of the rationale for their formulation. The recognition of human rights began with experience, direct or indirect of indignities and injustices. The evidence for the idea that experienced dangers and injustices play a large role in the formulations of human rights is found in the fact that bills of rights often begin with a list of recently experienced injustices that make imperative the proposed rights²⁵. In this regard, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was born out of the experience of the war that had just ended and particularly the connection between the holocaust and the declaration²⁶. In promulgating the universal declaration as a common standard of achievement, what UN did was setting international political morality that addresses familiar abuses of contemporary political institutions²⁷. It is due to this account that human rights are political projects undertaken in larger scale after scourge of the Second World War²⁸. This political project, embodied in the contemporary idea of human rights movement, aspires to formulate and enforce international norms that will prevent governments from doing horrible things to their people and there by promote international peace and security²⁹. Political view of human rights in its wider version takes human rights standards for internal legitimacy and when violated it posits responsibility on the part of the international community³⁰.

Further more, the view of human rights as category of political thought and appraisal can be inferred from the conduct of transnational NGOs' human rights activism that likes to portray itself as antipolitics, in the defense of universal moral claims designed to delegitimize political justifications for the abuse of human rights³¹. Their Human rights activism

¹⁷ Tasioulas, John. Supranote 14

¹⁸ Forsythe, David. Human Rights in International Relations. p.20

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Id. p.21

²¹ Beitz, Charless. The Idea of Human Rights. p.41

²² Forsythe, David. Supranote 18, p.15

²³ Ingram, James. Supranote 1, p.402

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Nickel, James. Supranote 16, p.71

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Id. p.10

²⁸ Id. p.60

²⁹ Id. p.2

³⁰ Valentini, Laura. Supranote 3, p.184

³¹ Ignatief, Michael. Supranote 12, p.9

means taking sides, mobilising constituencies powerful enough to force abusers to stop. As a consequence, effective human rights activism is bound to be partial and political³².

On the other hand, human rights are also international standards of evaluation and criticism unrestricted by political boundaries. They provide standards for criticism by outsiders such as international organisations, peoples and groups in other countries, and foreign governments³³. A country ratifying a UN human rights treaty agrees to respect and implement the rights the treaty covers. It also agrees to accept and respond to international criticisms and scrutiny of its records. Accordingly, the state is the relevant political institution that needs to be evaluated on the issue of human rights violation.

To put it in a nutshell, human rights implementation is an issue of politics. The right to have a right needs a state that effectively protects human rights and human rights violation comes when a state violates, be indifferent to their violation, or be too weak to defend them³⁴. In the words of Ranci, human rights become political when they are denied and the denial is contested³⁵.

III. THE INFLUENCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS ON DOMESTIC POLITICS

States as primary addressees of human rights are required to respect and protect human rights. However, at times states themselves may violate or fail to protect human rights. The issue then is what the influence of human rights violation on domestic politics would be.

The mere violation by itself may not have impact on domestic politics. The impact depends on the coordination of several internal and external factors. The influence of human rights violation on domestic politics starts when the transnational actors put the norm violating states on the international agenda there by creating awareness of the so-called international community, and the relevant human rights organs³⁶. The activity of Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International is of paramount importance in this regard. These transnational actors would make activities of domestic opposition groups and human rights actors legitimate³⁷. These would then create a pressure on the norm violating government from below as well³⁸.

If the pressure is successful and sustainable, it would produce effect on domestic politics. The norm violating government would be forced to adopt tactical concessions³⁹. For instance, if the government has not adopted human rights instruments, it may go on adopting the instruments in addition to addressing the violations⁴⁰. The norm violating state may also release prisoners, approach international human rights organs and talk 'a talk of human rights'⁴¹. Considering the cases of some countries would be of help in this regard. After powerful international mobilization by transnational actors that led to the legitimization of domestic opposition, Kenya was forced to make some fragile political and institutional reform processes⁴². Similar tactical move was also made by Ugandan government⁴³. Similarly, in Tunisia and Morocco, the repression that gave rise to emergence of transnational human rights networks forced both governments to make institutional changes with regard to human rights⁴⁴. However still, the influence of human rights violations on domestic

³² Ibid.

³³ Nickel, James. Supranote 18, p.10

³⁴ Ingram, James. Supranote 1, p..404

³⁵ Id. p.408

³⁶ Risse, Thomas and Kathryn Sikkink. The Socialization of Human Rights Norms in to Domestic Practices: Introduction.. p.5

³⁷ Id.P.6

³⁸ Id. p.7

³⁹ Id. p.12

⁴⁰ Id. p.12

⁴¹ Id. p.12

⁴² Schmitz, Hans. Transnational Activism and Political Change in Kenya and Uganda. P.40

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Granzer, Sieglinde. Changing Discourse: Transnational Advocacy Networks in Tunisia and Morocco.pp.109-119

politics may swing back and forth depending on whether the concession was sincere or cynical⁴⁵. When pressure decreases, governments may switch back to repressions as was the case in Kenya in early 1990s⁴⁶.

On the other hand, human rights violations may not be known to the transnational advocacy networks⁴⁷. In such cases, the international pressure may not be exerted on the norm violating governments. In this situation, it is only the domestic actors and oppositions, if any, that would have to confront the governments on its violations of human rights. Even in these situations, the domestic actors and oppositions may succeed to force the human rights violating government to comply with human rights norms and thereby effecting reforms⁴⁸.

The degree of influence on the domestic politics, on the other hand, depends whether the concession was tactical or not. Though, under normal course of things, one may expect that sincere concession rather than instrumental adaptation would better influence domestic politics, it may not be always the case. Tactical concessions may also sometimes produce rule consistent behavior in the sense that the government may come to respect human rights norms out of sincere belief⁴⁹.

As already indicated, human rights regulate the behavior of political institutions, so concessions made as a result of human rights violations would in one way or another influence the domestic politics. Concession made for the protection of human rights would require the state to make available the institutional, policy and legal framework for its enjoyment⁵⁰. This move requires political decision and deliberation. So the political issues to be handled domestically as a result of pressure, both domestic and international, may range from such short term concessions to such long term measures of legal, policy and institutional frameworks.

IV. THE IMPLICATION OF ADOPTING HUMAN RIGHTS AS A FRAMEWORK FOR POLITICAL ACTION

As already indicated in the introduction, politics serves as a framework for human rights enforcement. It is through the policy, legal and institutional framework that the state, as a political organ, enforces human rights. In this way, politics influences the way human rights are enforced. Here, however, when we talk about the implication of adopting human rights as a framework for political action, it is to talk about the way human rights would impact the political process under consideration.

When human rights are adopted as a framework for political action, the political process is expected to go in line with the human rights requirements. This is to say that the political actions and processes would be adjusted to conform to demands of the human rights adopted. However, the implication of human rights adoption on political action varies across the spectrum of states. It depends on whether the state is false positive, sincere, repressive or liberal⁵¹. For sincere ratifiers, adoption of human rights can change the priorities of governing leaders, the reasoning of courts, and demands of groups of potential right beneficiaries⁵². Even for false positives(resistant ratifiers), treaties will have some important influences through the effects they may have on political mobilisation which is a function of both the value that potential rights claimants place on the rights in question and the likelihood that mobilisation will succeed in realizing them⁵³.

The implications of adopting human rights for political actions, generally speaking, can be seen from the perspective of the state itself and from the perspectives of the citizens. For the government adoption of treaty influences its agenda setting

⁴⁵ Risse, Thomas and Kathryn Sikkink. Supranote 38, p.15

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Id. p.23

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Id. pp.32-33

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ A. Beth, Simmon: Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics. p.120

⁵² Id.p.125

⁵³ Id. p.113

and policy priorities there by potentially triggering political reform⁵⁴. This political actions of the government for compliance may be further induced by leverage of court litigation made by citizens⁵⁵.

The precommitment it took would make the government receptive of the demands to the rights⁵⁶. These demand may increase the size of the coalition which in turn may expand the range of strategies the coalition would employ to secure the realisation of the human rights⁵⁷. When this happens it impacts the domestic political process as the government would be legitimately required to answer to the requirements of the treaty. This means that, in one way or another, there would be some changes in the political process. For example, if the treaty is about political rights, the ratifying government would be obliged to open the forum for the enjoyment of these rights. This by itself requires a political decision.

Ratification precommitment has also a subtle effect on the politics of rule implementation⁵⁸. Precommitment makes it harder for a government that has secured domestic ratification to plausibly deny the importance of rights protection in the local context⁵⁹. The ratification of human rights treaties has the potential to raise government's consistency costs at home⁶⁰. Once they ratify treaties, governments would be left with few windows of justification to resist compliance with human rights treaties. This is because right demanders and their advocates may work assiduously to expose the inconsistencies between precommitment and post-ratification behaviour in countries around the world⁶¹. As the compliance of the government will be under strict observation, the government would be committed to its political reform process and action to protect human rights.

From citizens perspectives, adoption of human rights increases the value individuals place on their rights and their success for pursuing the right⁶². They would be motivated to mobilise to demand the realisation of their rights⁶³. This may press the government to adopt political reforms and changes. However, citizens demand for rights is influenced by other factors, too. According to mobilisation theory, people can hardly be expected to make rights demand when there is practically no chance of success, as in the case of harsh government repression⁶⁴. Moreover, the motivation to demand is also low when the perceived value of the right demand is marginal⁶⁵.

The implication of adopting human rights for political action can be clearly seen from the ongoing conflict of the Syrian Arab Republic. The Syrian government has adopted several international treaties including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the convention Against Torture⁶⁶. Under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, freedom of expression and peaceful political demonstration and opposition is guaranteed⁶⁷. However, the government responded with excessive use of force against demonstrators and killing of protestors, indiscriminate bombing, torturing, ill-treatment of detainees and enforced disappearances⁶⁸. These actions of the government have trapped itself for it failed to respect the human rights it has ratified. Due to the failure of the government to respect the human rights of citizens, the political action taken by opposition groups have gained some sort of legitimacy⁶⁹. The opposition commenced its political action from a demand for human rights protection⁷⁰. Using that demand as framework, it began demanding for political reform and change.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Id. p.129

⁵⁶ Id.p.144

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Id. p.145

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid. p.135

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Id.p.137

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic. UN/A/HRC/18/53, 2011,p.5

⁶⁷ See art.19,21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ They are being supported by the western major powers such as USA, UK and France and the Arab League States

⁷⁰ Report of the United Nations High Commissioner. Supranote 66, p.5

In sum, adoption of human rights as framework for political action makes the state under a duty to make its political action in line with the requirement for protection of human rights though the practice may be otherwise. For citizens, it may make their move for political action legitimate when a state fails to protect human rights.

V. THE INTERNATIONAL POLITICS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

As human rights have been internationalised, it is also important to see the international aspects of human rights politics. Most international and transnational efforts to promote and defend human rights are more accurately understood as political rather than legal⁷¹. Neither the charter based nor the treaty based components of the UN human rights system have evolved effective mechanisms for the judicial application of sanctions⁷². On the other hand, a wide array of political forms of action, lacking any capacity for the appeal and review of decisions to act, have been developed both within and outside the UN systems⁷³. Some of these aims at promoting human rights primarily through persuasive, others involve the support, coordination, and mobilization of domestic political agents, and others involve the formation of transnational coalitions of nongovernmental agents for purposes of communication and public advocacy⁷⁴.

Although states remain jealous of their sovereignty and anxious to prevent outsiders from interfering in their affairs, the principle that international interventions are justifiable in cases of large scale violations of human rights is now well established⁷⁵. The human rights covenants that states have signed since 1945 have implied that state sovereignty is conditional on adequate human rights observance, yet this conditionality has never been made explicit in international law⁷⁶. Reference to the idea of state sovereignty no longer provides an automatic and impenetrable shield against international action on issues once regarded as essentially domestic⁷⁷. The intervention can range from economic sanction to humanitarian intervention using armed forces⁷⁸. This is the role of human rights as reasons for transnational political action. Accordingly, human rights specify limits to a regime's internal autonomy, and that their fulfilment is sufficient to exclude justified and forceful intervention by other people⁷⁹.

Where political will is adequate, the UN security council might declare large scale human rights violations to constitute a threat to, or breach of, international peace and security, permitting authoritative action under Chapter VII of Charter⁸⁰. The council using the cold war precedents from Rhodesian and south Africa had done so after cold war in places like Iraq, Somalia, the former Yugoslavia and Haiti⁸¹. There is also a new development of International Responsibility to Protect (R2P) Which implies that if a sovereign state failed to exercise its primary responsibility to prevent gross violation of human rights, being unable or unwilling to do so, outside states have the responsibility to act⁸².

However, similar to the domestic politics of human rights, the international politics of human rights is also full of flaws. Even though states may claim the enforcement of international human rights is their top priorities, they have, in most cases, weak incentives to enforce international human rights treaties involving their trade partners, allies or other strategically, politically and economically important states⁸³. Empirical studies of US foreign policy during the cold war and then after support the point that US administrations have tended to provide aid on the basis of foreign policy exigencies rather than human rights performance⁸⁴.

VI. CONCLUSION

⁷¹ Beitz, Charles. Supranote 21, p.41

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Nickel, James. Supranote 16, p.14

⁷⁶ Ignatieff, Michael. Supranote 12, p.37

⁷⁷ P.Forsythe, David. Supranote 18, p.30

⁷⁸ Beitz, Charles. Supranote 21, p.59

⁷⁹ Nicklel, James. Supranote 16, p.110

⁸⁰ P.Forsythe, David. Supranote 18, p.74

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

While the philosophical approach of human rights deals with their nature and justification, the political approach to human rights starts with putting human rights in to practice. The political approach of human rights seeks to connect human rights with institutions and practices that can guarantee them. The political institution that can guarantee them is the state. And politics of human rights is the use of state machinery to advance the protection of these rights. In this respect, the state machineries are required to exercise their powers over rights holders in the way that respect their autonomy as agents. This is a question of finding the surest method of guaranteeing rights and preventing their continuing violation. Human rights as such deal with how individuals shall be treated by their governments and institutions. Their recognition, protection and violation are related with the state as a political institution. That is why human rights violation is considered as a category of political thought and appraisal. A norm claimed against politics and violated by politics.

It is not only that human rights violations are a category of political thought because they are claimed against, and violated by, the state as a political institution, but also because the content of human rights is determined by politics and its legislative process involves policy choices and calculations of power. And their enforcement, particularly, at the international level, is mainly via advocacy through the interplay of different stakeholders.

Moreover, The political nature of human rights, and hence their violation as a category of political thought, can also be seen from the perspective of the rationale for their recognition. Human rights began to be recognised in the way we understand them after the second world war so as to inhibit the arbitrary acts of political institutions, the state and its machineries against individuals. That is why we have the activities of transnational human rights actors principally as anti-politics and an act of delegitimization when they deal with violating states.

Human rights violations are also considered as a category of political appraisal. This is because human rights norms are standards by which a state would be subject to criticism and evaluation by international human rights organs and foreign states for its human rights record. As there is no supra-national judicial body that can impose legal sanction, the evaluations and the criticism, and actions if any, are mostly non-judicial, in the sense that they are political.

When state violates human rights, the violation would have its own influence on domestic politics. The level of influence, however, depends on the degree of the violation and on the coordination of internal and external human right actors, among others. If the human right violating state is put under international pressure, and the pressure is successful, it may be forced to make some political concessions such as adoption of human rights treaties, and suspension of violations, as the case may be. The measures taken by Kenyan and Ugandan governments in the 1980s are cases in point. Though states who make tactical political concessions as a result of pressures may switch back to violations, sometimes, however, tactical political concessions may endure to produce rule consistent behaviour.

When human rights are adopted as a framework for political action, the latter is expected, in theory, to go in line with the human rights values adopted. When states ratify human rights treaties, they are expected to be in compliance therewith. However, in practice, a state may ratify human rights treaties out of consideration for strategic purposes. This situation creates a difference between sincere ratifiers and cynical ones vis-à-vis compliance to human rights treaties. In both states the adopted treaty would be a trigger political reform, increase demand for rights, and induce compliance though the degree of success may differ. And the state would be left with much less opportunity to divert politically from the rule of respect for human rights. The state would rather be trapped by its words for all actions it takes in contrary to human rights values. The current situation of Syrian regime clearly shows this.

Individuals, on the other hand, would be motivated to claim their human rights as the adoption would increase the value they give to rights and the legitimacy of claim. They may, when their right is violated, go on to demand political change and reform by the violating government. The Syrian revolution shows this situation as it has turned from a demand to non-violation of human rights to political reform, regime change for that matter.

As human rights are international norms, their protection is said to be a concern of international community. However, their protection (enforcement) at the international level is largely political. There is no judicial means of addressing violations at the international level. The enforcement depends on reporting, criticism, condemnation and consultation, and, only in few extreme cases, through intervention which can go to the extent of taking military action. However, still there is no well-defined rule for intervention to protect human rights violations. And state practices show much discrepancy on account of economic, diplomatic and geopolitical interests. This further makes the enforcement of human rights norms at the international level much more political.

REFERENCES

Books and Articles:

- [1] Baynes, Kenneth. Towards a Political Conception of Human Rights. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, Vol.35, No.4, 2009.
- [2] Beitz, Charles. *The Idea of Human Rights*. New York (Oxford University Press) 2009.
- [3] Benhabib, Seyla. Claiming Rights across Borders: International Human Rights and Democratic Sovereignty. *American Political Science Review* Vol. 103, No. 4, 2009.
- [4] Cohen, Joshua. Minimalism About Human Rights: The Most We Can Hope For? *Journal of Political Science Philosophy*, Vol.12, No.2, 2004.
- [5] Christie, Kenneth and Denny Roy. *Politics of Human Rights in East Asia*. USA (Pluto Press) 2001.
- [6] Evans, Tony. *The Politics of Human Rights: A Global Perspective*. USA (Pluto Press) 2001.
- [7] Forsythe, David. *Human Rights in International Relations*. 3rd edition. USA (Cambridge University Press) 2012.
- [8] Gourevitch, Alex. Are Human Rights Liberal? *Journal of Human Rights*, Vol.8, No.4, 2009.
- [9] Granzer, Sieglinde. The Changing Discourse: Transnational Advocacy Networks in Tunisia and Morocco. In: *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge Series in International Relations: 66. Edited by Risse, Thomas, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink. UK (Cambridge University Press) 2001.
- [10] Ignatieff, Michael. *Human Rights as Politics and Idolatry*. Princeton (Princeton University Press) 2001.
- [11] Ingram, James. 'What is a Right to Have Rights'? Three Images of the Politics of Human Rights. *American Political Science Review*. Vol.102, No. 4, 2008.
- [12] Kennedy, David. The International Human Rights Movement: Part of the Problem. *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, Vol.15, No.101, 2002.
- [13] Nickel, James. *Making Sense of Human Rights*. 2nd edition. USA (Blackwell Publishing Ltd.) 2007
- [14] Risse, Thomas and Kathryn Sikkink. The Socialization of Human Rights Norms in to Domestic Practices: Introduction. In: *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge Series in International Relations: 66. Edited by Risse, Thomas, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink. UK (Cambridge University Press) 2001.
- [15] Schmitz, Hans. Transnational Activism and Political Change in Kenya and Uganda. In: *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge Series in International Relations: 66. Edited by Risse, Thomas, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink. UK (Cambridge University Press) 2001.
- [16] Simmons, Beth. *Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics*. New York (Cambridge University Press) 2009.
- [17] Tasioulas, John. Are Human Rights Essentially Triggers for Intervention? *Philosophy Compass*. Vol.4, No.6, 2009
- [18] Valentini, Laura. In What Sense are Human Rights Political? A preliminary Exploration. *Political Studies*, Vol.60, 2012.

Others:

- [19] The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966.
- [20] The Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the Situation of Human Rights in the Syrian Arab Republic. A/HRC/18/53, 15/09/2011.