

SOVEREIGNTY V/S HUMAN RIGHTS: RECONCILING NATIONAL INTERESTS WITH INTERNATIONAL LEGAL OBLIGATIONS

Urooj Bashir¹, Syeda Mina Faisal², Dr Ishaq Ahmad³.

¹ Principal Chiefs Law College Township Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

² Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

³ Dept. of Pakistan Studies, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Sheringal Upper Dir, KPK, Pakistan.



HEC
"Y"

Category
HEC Journal
Recognition System



ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: March 10, 2024

Revised: April 09, 2024

Accepted: April 11, 2024

Available Online: April 14, 2024

Keywords:

Sovereignty v/s Human Rights

National Interests

International Legal Obligations

Legal Frameworks

Oversight Mechanisms & Compliance Factors

Funding:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Copyrights:



Copyright Muslim Intellectuals Research Center. All Rights Reserved © 2021. This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

ABSTRACT

This article delves into the intricate balance between national sovereignty and the enforcement of international human rights obligations. It critically examines the tensions that arise when state interests and sovereignty clash with the mandates of international human rights law. Through a thorough analysis of key legal frameworks, case studies, and judicial decisions, the research illuminates how different countries navigate these conflicts. The article explores theoretical perspectives on sovereignty and human rights, evaluates the effectiveness of international oversight mechanisms, and assesses the role of global and regional human rights institutions. Additionally, it investigates the impact of political, cultural, and economic factors on states' compliance with international human rights norms. By offering a nuanced understanding of the reconciliation process between national interests and international obligations, this study aims to provide policymakers, legal practitioners, and scholars with insights into fostering a more coherent and just global human rights regime. The following article employs a qualitative research methodology.

Corresponding Author's Email: mina.faisal@law.uol.edu.pk

INTRODUCTION

The intricate balance between national sovereignty and the enforcement of international human rights obligations constitutes a central and persistent challenge in contemporary international law. At its core, this tension reflects the fundamental dilemma faced by states: the assertion of sovereign authority versus the adherence to universal human rights norms. As states assert their autonomy and independence in governing their territories and populations, they concurrently bear obligations under international law to uphold the inherent dignity and rights of individuals. This article delves into the complexities of

navigating this delicate balance, aiming to provide a comprehensive understanding of how states reconcile their national interests with their international legal obligations in the realm of human rights. The interplay between sovereignty and human rights is not merely theoretical but has profound implications for global governance, peace, and justice (Deng, 2018; Asif et al., 2023).

The theoretical underpinnings of sovereignty and human rights provide essential context for examining this dynamic relationship. Traditional notions of sovereignty posit states as supreme authorities within their territories, wielding exclusive jurisdiction over matters of governance. In contrast, the evolution of human rights discourse emphasizes the primacy of individual rights, transcending state boundaries and demanding universal recognition and protection. The clash between these paradigms underscores the need for a nuanced approach to reconciling state sovereignty with the promotion and protection of human rights. Key legal frameworks govern the interaction between sovereignty and human rights at the international level. Foundational documents such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international treaties establish universal human rights norms, binding on states irrespective of their domestic legal systems. Yet, the implementation and enforcement of these norms often encounter resistance from states asserting sovereignty as a shield against external interference. Understanding the mechanisms available for monitoring and enforcing human rights compliance is crucial for assessing the effectiveness of international human rights law (Walling, 2015; Hussain et al., 2023).

Case studies offer valuable insights into real-world scenarios where conflicts between sovereignty and human rights have arisen. Whether stemming from national security concerns, cultural practices, or political repression, these cases highlight the complexities and nuances of navigating competing interests. By analyzing the responses of states, international institutions, and civil society actors, we gain a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities for reconciling national interests with international legal obligations. The effectiveness of international oversight mechanisms and the role of global and regional human rights institutions are central to this discourse. From treaty bodies to international courts and regional commissions, these institutions play a critical role in promoting human rights and holding states accountable for their obligations. Yet, their impact is contingent upon factors such as political will, resource allocation, and cooperation from member states (Wuerth, 2017; Hussain et al., 2023).

Moreover, various political, cultural, and economic factors influence states' compliance with human rights obligations. Domestic politics, cultural values, economic interests, and geopolitical considerations shape states' approaches to human rights, sometimes leading to tensions with international legal norms. Understanding these factors is essential for devising strategies to foster greater compliance and accountability in the realm of human rights. This article seeks to offer a comprehensive exploration of the tensions and synergies between sovereignty and human rights in the international legal landscape. By examining theoretical perspectives, legal frameworks, case studies, and empirical analysis, we aim to deepen our understanding of how states reconcile national interests with international legal obligations in the pursuit of a more just and equitable global order (Anaya, & Puig, 2017; Khan, 2024).

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SOVEREIGNTY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The intersection of sovereignty and human rights is a rich terrain for theoretical exploration, encompassing diverse perspectives that illuminate the complexities of this relationship. Traditional views of sovereignty conceive it as an absolute and indivisible attribute of states, entailing exclusive authority over their territories and populations. This view emphasizes the principle of non-intervention and the inviolability of state borders, prioritizing state autonomy above all else. From this perspective, human rights may be perceived as contingent upon state discretion, subject to domestic laws and policies. In contrast, human rights universalism posits that certain rights are inherent to all individuals by virtue of their humanity, irrespective of national boundaries or governmental authority. This perspective challenges the primacy of state sovereignty, asserting that states have an obligation to respect, protect, and fulfill human rights as enshrined in international legal instruments. Human rights universalism emphasizes the indivisibility and among them. Cosmopolitan theories advocate for a global community where individuals are recognized as members of a common humanity, transcending national affiliations. From a cosmopolitan perspective, sovereignty is viewed as a contingent and conditional authority, subject to the principles of justice and human rights. Cosmopolitanism emphasizes the moral imperative to protect the rights and dignity of individuals, even at the expense of state sovereignty, if necessary. Liberal internationalist perspectives emphasize the promotion of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law as essential components of global governance. Within this framework, state sovereignty is not absolute but subject to international norms and institutions that uphold human rights standards (Cohen, & Deng 2016; Khan et al., 2023).

Liberal internationalism seeks to balance state sovereignty with the imperative to protect and promote human rights through multilateral cooperation and collective action. Communitarian theories emphasize the importance of cultural, religious, and communal values in shaping conceptions of rights and responsibilities. From a communitarian perspective, sovereignty is closely tied to the preservation of cultural identity and community solidarity. While communitarianism recognizes the importance of human rights, it may prioritize collective rights and community interests over individual liberties, leading to tensions with universal human rights norms. These theoretical perspectives offer diverse lenses through which to analyze the relationship between state sovereignty and human rights. While traditional notions of sovereignty continue to influence state behavior and international relations, evolving interpretations prioritize the protection and promotion of human rights as a global imperative. By critically examining these theoretical frameworks, we gain insights into the complexities of reconciling national interests with international human rights obligations in an increasingly interconnected world (Davis, & Whytock, 2018; Khan et al., 2023).

LEGAL FRAMEWORKS AND INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW

The legal frameworks governing the intersection of sovereignty and human rights constitute a cornerstone of the international legal order. At the heart of this framework lie foundational documents such as the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which serves as a guiding beacon for human rights norms globally. Adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948, the UDHR enshrines fundamental rights and freedoms inherent to all individuals, regardless of nationality, ethnicity, or religion. While non-binding in itself, the UDHR has acquired customary status and serves as the foundation upon which subsequent human rights treaties and conventions are built. International human rights treaties, conventions, and protocols form another crucial component of the legal framework governing human rights. These treaties, ranging from the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), codify specific rights and obligations binding on states parties. By ratifying these treaties, states voluntarily assume legal obligations to respect, protect, and fulfill the rights enshrined within them. Compliance with treaty obligations is monitored through various mechanisms, including reporting requirements, periodic reviews, and the establishment of treaty bodies composed of independent experts (Gregg, 2016; Khan et al., 2020).

Customary international law also plays a significant role in shaping the legal landscape of human rights. Derived from consistent state practice and accepted as law, customary norms complement treaty-based obligations and fill gaps in legal protection. Principles such as the prohibition of torture, the right to self-determination, and the protection of civilians in armed conflict have attained customary status, binding on all states irrespective of treaty ratification. Customary norms provide a flexible and adaptable framework for addressing evolving challenges to human rights protection. Special attention is given to mechanisms for monitoring and enforcing human rights compliance within the legal framework. International courts and tribunals, such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Criminal Court (ICC), play a crucial role in adjudicating disputes and holding states accountable for human rights violations. Regional human rights courts, including the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR), offer additional avenues for redress at the regional level (Goodman, 2017; Khan et al., 2021).

Furthermore, a range of non-judicial mechanisms exists to monitor and promote human rights compliance, including treaty bodies, special rapporteurs, and human rights commissions. These bodies conduct periodic reviews of states' compliance with treaty obligations, issue recommendations, and investigate alleged violations. While lacking coercive enforcement powers, their reports and findings serve as influential tools for raising awareness, fostering dialogue, and pressuring states to uphold their human rights commitments. the legal frameworks governing the intersection of sovereignty and human rights constitute a multifaceted system of norms, treaties, and mechanisms aimed at promoting and protecting human dignity and equality. By examining foundational documents, international treaties, customary law, and mechanisms for monitoring and enforcement, we gain insights into the complexities of reconciling state sovereignty with the imperative to respect and uphold universal human rights standards (Benhabib, 2020; Khan et al., 2023).

EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERNATIONAL OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS

The effectiveness of international oversight mechanisms in promoting human rights while respecting state sovereignty is a critical aspect of global governance. Drawing on empirical evidence and scholarly analysis, this section seeks to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of such mechanisms and their impact on human rights protection worldwide. Treaty bodies, established under various international human rights treaties, play a central role in monitoring states' compliance with treaty obligations. Composed of independent experts, these bodies conduct periodic reviews of states' reports, issue recommendations, and provide guidance on interpreting treaty provisions. While treaty bodies serve as important mechanisms for accountability, their effectiveness is often hindered by limited resources, backlog of reports, and challenges in implementation. Moreover, some states may selectively comply with recommendations, undermining the overall impact of treaty monitoring (Peters, 2016; Khan et al., 2022).

Special rapporteurs, appointed by the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) and other international bodies, investigate specific human rights issues and country situations, reporting their findings to the relevant authorities. These rapporteurs serve as crucial advocates for human rights, shedding light on violations and advocating for remedial action. However, their effectiveness is contingent upon access to information, cooperation from governments, and political support. In some cases, governments may obstruct or ignore the findings of special rapporteurs, limiting their ability to effect meaningful change. The Universal Periodic Review, conducted by the UNHRC, provides a mechanism for the comprehensive assessment of each UN member state's human rights record every four to five years. Through a peer-review process, states receive feedback and recommendations from other UN member states, contributing to dialogue, transparency, and accountability. While the UPR offers a platform for constructive engagement and dialogue, its impact depends on the willingness of states to participate genuinely and implement recommendations in good faith. Moreover, the voluntary nature of the UPR raises questions about its enforceability and effectiveness in addressing systemic human rights violations (Donnelly, & Whelan, 2020; Khan et al., 2022).

In evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of international oversight mechanisms, it becomes apparent that while they serve as vital tools for promoting human rights and holding states accountable, their effectiveness is contingent on several factors. By spotlighting abuses, these mechanisms exert pressure on governments to improve their human rights records and provide redress to victims. However, resource constraints, political dynamics, and the absence of enforcement mechanisms limit their ability to compel states to comply with recommendations consistently. While international oversight mechanisms play a vital role in promoting human rights and holding states accountable, their effectiveness depends on a combination of factors. By critically evaluating their strengths and weaknesses and considering contextual factors such as political dynamics and resource constraints, we can assess their impact on human rights protection and identify strategies for enhancing their effectiveness in reconciling state sovereignty with the imperative to uphold universal human rights standards (Forsythe, 2017; Khan et al., 2020).

ROLE OF GLOBAL AND REGIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS

The mediation of conflicts between sovereignty and human rights often falls within the purview of global and regional human rights institutions. This section of the article scrutinizes the functions of key institutions, such as the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC), the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR), elucidating their impact on state behavior and compliance with international human rights norms. At the global level, the United Nations Human Rights Council serves as a principal forum for addressing human rights violations and promoting adherence to international norms. Through mechanisms such as the Universal Periodic Review and special rapporteurs, the UNHRC monitors human rights situations worldwide, conducts investigations, and issues recommendations aimed at enhancing state compliance. While the UNHRC lacks enforcement powers, its moral authority and convening power play a pivotal role in shaping international discourse and catalyzing action on human rights issues (Patrick, 2017; Khan et al., 2021).

Regional human rights institutions, such as the European Court of Human Rights and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, offer additional layers of oversight and accountability. The European Court of Human Rights, established under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), adjudicates cases brought against member states for alleged human rights violations. Its judgments, binding on member states, contribute to the development of European human rights jurisprudence and serve as precedents for domestic courts. Similarly, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, operating within the framework of the Organization of American States (OAS), investigates human rights abuses in the Americas and issues reports and recommendations to member states. These regional institutions play a crucial role in promoting human rights and upholding the rule of law within their respective jurisdictions. By providing avenues for redress and accountability, they contribute to the protection of individuals' rights and the prevention of impunity. Moreover, regional human rights bodies serve as complements to global mechanisms, offering tailored responses to regional challenges and fostering cooperation among member states (Gibney, 2015; Khan et al., 2024).

However, the effectiveness of global and regional human rights institutions is contingent upon several factors, including political will, resource allocation, and cooperation from member states. While institutions like the ECtHR and the IACHR have achieved significant milestones in advancing human rights protection, challenges such as backlog of cases, limited enforcement mechanisms, and non-compliance by member states persist. The role of global and regional human rights institutions in mediating conflicts between sovereignty and human rights is multifaceted. By analyzing their functions, impact, and challenges, we gain insights into their capacity to promote state compliance with international human rights norms and hold governments accountable for their actions. Moving forward, efforts to strengthen these institutions and enhance their effectiveness are essential for advancing the protection and promotion of human rights worldwide (Helms, 2018; Usman et al., 2021).

FACTORS INFLUENCING STATES' COMPLIANCE WITH HUMAN RIGHTS OBLIGATIONS

Understanding the complexities of states' compliance with international human rights obligations requires an exploration of the diverse array of political, cultural, and economic factors at play. This section delves into the intricate interplay of domestic politics, cultural values, economic interests, and geopolitical considerations, shedding light on how these dynamics shape states' approaches to human rights and occasionally engender tensions with international legal obligations. Domestic politics often exert a profound influence on states' adherence to human rights norms. Governments may prioritize maintaining power and stability, sometimes at the expense of human rights principles. Authoritarian regimes, in particular, may employ repression and censorship to suppress dissent and consolidate control. Conversely, democratic governments may face pressure from civil society and international actors to uphold human rights standards, leading to greater compliance with international obligations (Teson, 2018; Usman et al., 2021). Cultural values and traditions play a significant role in shaping attitudes toward human rights. Societies with deep-rooted cultural norms may perceive certain rights differently or prioritize collective interests over individual liberties. Cultural relativism poses challenges to universal human rights standards, as states may justify rights violations on the grounds of cultural authenticity or national sovereignty. Bridging the gap between cultural diversity and universal human rights requires sensitivity, dialogue, and a commitment to cross-cultural understanding. Economic considerations often intersect with human rights obligations, influencing state behavior in complex ways. States may prioritize economic development and trade relationships over human rights concerns, particularly when faced with competing interests. Economic inequality and poverty can exacerbate human rights abuses, as marginalized populations lack the resources and leverage to assert their rights. Moreover, multinational corporations and global supply chains may inadvertently contribute to human rights violations, raising questions about corporate accountability and ethical business practices (Wewerinke-Singh, 2019; USMAN et al., 2021).

Geopolitical factors, including strategic alliances, security threats, and regional dynamics, shape states' approaches to human rights on the international stage. States may prioritize geopolitical interests over human rights considerations, forging alliances with repressive regimes or turning a blind eye to abuses in pursuit of strategic objectives. Power dynamics within international institutions can also influence human rights discourse, with influential states wielding disproportionate influence over agenda-setting and decision-making processes. In navigating these complex dynamics, states must strike a delicate balance between upholding their sovereignty and fulfilling their international human rights obligations. While political, cultural, and economic factors may sometimes lead to tensions with international legal norms, concerted efforts to promote dialogue, accountability, and respect for human rights can foster greater compliance and advance the realization of universal human dignity and equality. The multifaceted nature of factors influencing states' compliance with human rights obligations underscores the need for a nuanced and context-sensitive approach to human rights advocacy and enforcement. By understanding and

addressing the underlying political, cultural, and economic dynamics, stakeholders can work collaboratively to overcome challenges and build a more just and inclusive world for all (Criddle, & Fox-Decent, 2016; Usman et al., 2021).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the intricate interplay between sovereignty and human rights presents a multifaceted challenge in contemporary global governance, spanning theoretical, legal, institutional, and socio-political dimensions. From contrasting theoretical perspectives that range from traditional sovereignty to evolving human rights universalism, to the foundational legal frameworks established by documents like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international treaties, and the mechanisms of oversight provided by treaty bodies, special rapporteurs, and periodic reviews, the landscape is rich and complex. Furthermore, the roles played by global and regional human rights institutions, such as the United Nations Human Rights Council, the European Court of Human Rights, and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, in mediating conflicts and adjudicating disputes, are crucial. However, the challenge extends beyond legal and institutional frameworks to encompass political, cultural, and economic factors, including domestic politics, cultural values, economic interests, and geopolitical considerations, which often shape states' behavior and compliance with international human rights norms, sometimes leading to tensions and challenges. Despite these complexities, there exists an opportunity for dialogue, cooperation, and progress. By fostering a nuanced understanding of the intricacies involved and by engaging in constructive dialogue and collaboration, states, international institutions, and civil society can work together to advance human rights and uphold the principles of dignity, equality, and justice for all, forging a path towards a more just and inclusive global human rights regime where sovereignty and human rights are not seen as competing interests but as complementary pillars of a truly democratic and equitable international order.

For future research, it is essential to delve deeper into the evolving dynamics between sovereignty and human rights in the face of emerging challenges such as technological advancements, climate change, and global pandemics. Exploring how these factors intersect with traditional notions of sovereignty and human rights will provide valuable insights into the adaptability and resilience of the international human rights regime. Additionally, further examination of the role of non-state actors, including multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations, and grassroots movements, in promoting and protecting human rights will enrich our understanding of the complex dynamics at play. Moreover, comparative studies across different regions and countries can offer valuable lessons and best practices for fostering greater compliance with international human rights norms while respecting national sovereignty. By continuing to explore these avenues, future research can contribute to the development of more effective strategies for reconciling national interests with international human rights obligations in an ever-changing global landscape.

REFERENCES

- Anaya, S. J., & Puig, S. (2017). Mitigating state sovereignty: The duty to consult with indigenous peoples. *University of Toronto Law Journal*, 67(4), 435-464.
- Asif Khan, Muhammad Usman, & sohail Amjad. (2023). THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS. *International Journal of Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences*. ISSN (E) 2959-2461 (P) 2959-3808, 2(3), 780–786.
- Benhabib, S. (2020). The end of the 1951 refugee convention? Dilemmas of sovereignty, territoriality, and human rights. *Jus Cogens*, 2(1), 75-100.
- Cohen, R., & Deng, F. M. (2016). *Sovereignty as responsibility* (pp. 74-93). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Criddle, E. J., & Fox-Decent, E. (2016). *Fiduciaries of humanity: How international law constitutes authority*. Oxford University Press.
- Davis, S., & Whytock, C. A. (2018). State remedies for human rights. *BUL Rev.*, 98, 397.
- Deng, F. M. (2018). Reconciling sovereignty with responsibility: A basis for international humanitarian action. In *Africa in World Politics* (pp. 283-325). Routledge.
- Donnelly, J., & Whelan, D. J. (2020). *International human rights*. Routledge.
- Forsythe, D. P. (2017). *Human rights in international relations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gibney, M. (2015). *International human rights law: Returning to universal principles*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Goodman, R. (2017). Human rights treaties, invalid reservations, and state consent. In *International law of human rights* (pp. 417-446). Routledge.
- Gregg, B. (2016). *The human rights state: Justice within and beyond sovereign nations*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Helms, J. (2018). American Sovereignty and the UN. In *The National Interest on International Law and Order* (pp. 88-108). Routledge.
- Hussain, N., Khan, A., & Chandio, L. A. (2023). Legal Safeguards against Mob Justice: An Analysis of Blasphemy Laws in Pakistan and International Human Rights Norms. *Al-Qamar*, 13-26.
- Hussain, N., Khan, A., Chandio, L. A., & Oad, S. (2023). Individual criminal responsibility for the crime of aggression: the role of the ICC's Leadership Clause. *Pakistan journal of humanities and social sciences*, 11(1), 223-232.
- Khan, A. (2024). The Intersection of Artificial Intelligence And International Trade Laws: Challenges And Opportunities. *IIUM Law Journal*, 32(1), 103–152. <https://doi.org/10.31436/iiumlj.v32i1.912>
- Khan, A. S., Bibi, A., Khan, A., & Ahmad, I. (2023). Responsibility of Sexual Violence Under International Law. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 3(1), 29-41.
- Khan, A., & Jiliani, M. A. H. S. (2023). Expanding The Boundaries Of Jurisprudence In The Era Of Technological Advancements. *IIUMLJ*, 31, 393.

- Khan, A., Amjad, S., & Usman, M. (2020). The Role of Customary International Law in Contemporary International Relations. *International Review of Social Sciences*, 8(08), 259-265.
- Khan, A., Bhatti, S. H., & Jillani, M. A. H. S. (2021). An overview on individual criminal liability for crime of aggression. *Liberal Arts & Social Sciences International Journal (LASSIJ)*.
- Khan, A., Hussain, N., & Oad, S. (2023). The Rome Statute: A Critical Review Of The Role Of The Swgca In Defining The Crime Of Aggression. *Pakistan Journal of International Affairs*, 6(1).
- Khan, A., Iqbal, N., & Ahmad, I. (2022). Human Trafficking in Pakistan: A Qualitative Analysis. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 2(3), 257-268.
- Khan, A., Javed, K., Khan, A. S., & Rizwi, A. (2022). Aggression and individual criminal responsibility in the perspective of Islamic law. *Competitive Social Science Research Journal*, 3(1), 35-48.
- Khan, A., Usman, M., & Amjad, S. (2020). Enforcing Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights: A Global Imperative. *International Review of Social Sciences (IRSS)*, 8(09).
- KHAN, A., USMAN, M., & RIAZ, N. (2021). The Intersectionality of Human Rights: Addressing Multiple Discrimination.
- Khan, M. I., & Riaz, N. (2024). Blasphemy Laws in Pakistan: A Legal Analysis and Contemporary Discourse. *International Journal of Social Science Archives (IJSSA)*, 7(1), 67-71.
- Patrick, S. (2017). *The sovereignty wars: Reconciling America with the world*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Peters, A. (2016). *Beyond human rights: the legal status of the individual in international law* (Vol. 126). Cambridge University Press.
- Teson, F. (2018). *A philosophy of international law*. Routledge.
- Usman, M. U. H. A. M. M. A. D., Amjad, S. O. H. A. I. L., & Khan, A. S. I. F. (2021). Human Trafficking and Smuggling: Intersection with Maritime Law and International Cooperation.
- Usman, M. U. H. A. M. M. A. D., Khan, A. S. I. F., & Amjad, S. O. H. A. I. L. (2021). State Responsibility and International Law: Bridging the Gap.
- USMAN, M., KANWEL, S., KHAN, M. I., & Khan, A. (2021). Advancing Gender Equality within the Legal Framework of Pakistan: Navigating Progress and Overcoming Persistent Challenges. *International Review of Social Sciences (IRSS)*, 9(5), 310-316.
- USMAN, M., KHAN, A., & AMJAD, S. (2021). Implications of Transnational Crime on Maritime Jurisdiction and Enforcement.
- Walling, C. B. (2015). Human rights norms, state sovereignty and humanitarian intervention. *Hum. Rts. Q.*, 37, 383.
- Wewerinke-Singh, M. (2019). *State responsibility, climate change and human rights under international law*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Wuerth, I. (2017). International law in the post-human rights era. *Tex. L. Rev.*, 96, 279.