



## THE ROLE AND IMPORTANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

*Sobirjonova Saida Sarvar qizi*

*Uzbekistan State World Languages University,*

*Faculty of International Journalism,*

*2nd-year student of International Relations,*

*Phone: +998 94 944 8983,*

*[sobirjonovasaida73@gmail.com](mailto:sobirjonovasaida73@gmail.com)*

**Abstract.** *This article examines the role and significance of human rights within the system of international relations from a scientific perspective. In the context of globalization, it highlights that political, economic, and cultural interactions between states are closely linked to the respect for and protection of human rights. The study applies analytical and comparative methods to explore the mechanisms of international organizations, particularly the United Nations, in ensuring human rights, as well as the principles of universality and non-discrimination, and the classification of human rights into different generations. The results demonstrate that international human rights frameworks play a crucial role in shaping state behavior and promoting accountability. The discussion further addresses the tensions between state sovereignty and the protection of human rights, emphasizing their complex and sometimes contradictory nature. The article concludes that the protection of human rights at the international level is essential for maintaining global peace, stability, and effective cooperation among states.*

**Keywords:** *international legal system, human rights protection, globalization, state sovereignty, universality principle, non-discrimination principle, international cooperation mechanisms, global stability.*

**Introduction.** In the context of contemporary globalization, the protection and promotion of human rights has become one of the most significant and pressing issues in the system of international relations. Human rights are an inalienable and



universal set of rights inherent to every individual by virtue of being human. Their protection is no longer considered solely an internal matter of states but a shared responsibility of the international community. Since the second half of the twentieth century, human rights have developed into an independent branch of international law, evolving through universal and regional mechanisms.

The international human rights law system is based on both general and specific principles, among which respect for human rights, universality, and non-discrimination are fundamental. These principles are enshrined in international legal instruments that impose obligations on states to respect, protect, and fulfill human rights. In particular, the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) serve as the foundational legal framework of the modern human rights system.

The development of human rights is commonly explained through the concept of generations of rights. First-generation rights include civil and political rights aimed at ensuring individual freedom and limiting state power. Second-generation rights cover economic, social, and cultural rights, the realization of which requires certain socio-economic conditions. Third-generation rights refer to collective rights such as peace, development, and a healthy environment, reflecting the global dimension of human rights protection.

Scholarly works by A. Kh. Saidov and M. Bobojonov emphasize the international-legal nature of human rights and the obligations of states in ensuring their implementation [1]. Furthermore, key international treaties, such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), provide the legal foundation for universal human rights standards [2].

**Methodology.** This study uses a qualitative research approach based on doctrinal legal analysis. It examines international human rights law through interpretation of legal documents, academic literature, and institutional reports.



The research is based on both primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include key international instruments such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), ICCPR, CRC, and CERD. Secondary sources include scholarly books and articles by authors such as A. Kh. Saidov and M. Bobojonov.

The analysis is conducted using descriptive and analytical methods to explain the development of human rights norms, their classification into generations, and the role of international monitoring mechanisms. A comparative approach is also used to assess universal and regional human rights systems.

No empirical or statistical data is used in this study; it is focused on conceptual and legal analysis of existing international frameworks.

### **Analysis and results.**

International human rights law constitutes one of the foundational normative pillars of the contemporary international legal order. It operates not merely as a set of moral principles, but as a structured legal regime composed of binding norms, interpretative frameworks, and enforcement mechanisms. This system is built upon the interaction between two main categories: general principles of international law (such as good faith, sovereignty, and non-intervention) and specific principles of international human rights law (including universality, equality, accountability, and indivisibility of rights). Among these, the principle of respect for human rights—explicitly embedded in the Charter of the United Nations—serves as the cornerstone of the entire system [3]. It redefines human rights protection from a domestic jurisdictional matter into a legitimate concern of the international community, thereby expanding the scope of international legal responsibility.

Closely linked to this foundational principle are the doctrines of universality and non-discrimination, which ensure that human rights apply equally to all individuals regardless of nationality, gender, ethnicity, religion, or social status. These principles establish equality before the law as a universal legal standard and reject culturally or politically selective interpretations of rights [4]. In practice, however, the implementation of universality often encounters challenges due to



cultural relativism, political interests of states, and differing levels of socio-economic development.

The results further indicate that the historical evolution of human rights can be analytically structured into three interdependent generations of rights. The first generation—civil and political rights—includes fundamental protections such as the right to life, freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, due process guarantees, and political participation. These rights primarily impose negative obligations on states, requiring them to refrain from arbitrary interference while ensuring effective legal remedies against violations.

The second generation encompasses economic, social, and cultural rights, including access to education, healthcare, employment, housing, and an adequate standard of living. Unlike civil and political rights, these rights are resource-dependent and require positive state action, including policy formulation, institutional development, and sustained financial investment. Their realization is therefore closely tied to a state's economic capacity, making global inequality a significant factor influencing their implementation.

The third generation consists of solidarity or collective rights, which reflect the growing interdependence of states in addressing transnational challenges. These include the rights to development, peace, environmental protection, and humanitarian assistance. Some scholars further identify the right of peoples to self-determination as a foundational collective entitlement, serving as a bridge between individual and group rights. This generational framework demonstrates that human rights law is not static but dynamically expands in response to global political, environmental, and technological changes.

The findings confirm that international legal instruments have played a decisive role in the codification, institutionalization, and universalization of human rights norms. The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights established the first comprehensive normative blueprint of universal rights, significantly influencing constitutional developments and subsequent treaty law [5]. The 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic,



Social and Cultural Rights transformed these norms into legally binding obligations, thereby strengthening their enforceability within international law [6]. Together, these three instruments form the International Bill of Human Rights, which serves as the core reference point for global human rights standards[7]. In addition, specialized international conventions—such as the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948), the Convention Against Torture (1984), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989)—have contributed to the development of targeted protection regimes addressing specific categories of vulnerability and harm [8].

The analysis also reveals that the protection of human rights is implemented through a multi-tiered institutional architecture consisting of global, regional, and national mechanisms. At the global level, United Nations treaty bodies—including the Human Rights Committee, the Committee Against Torture, and the Committee on the Rights of the Child—monitor state compliance through periodic reporting procedures, concluding observations, and optional individual complaint mechanisms. Although these bodies lack direct coercive enforcement powers, they exert significant normative influence through authoritative interpretations, reputational pressure, and diplomatic accountability mechanisms such as “naming and shaming.”

In addition, UN Special Rapporteurs and Independent Working Groups enhance the system’s responsiveness by conducting country visits, issuing thematic reports, and investigating allegations of systematic violations. These mechanisms contribute to agenda-setting within the international community and often serve as early warning instruments for emerging human rights crises.

At the regional level, human rights protection is significantly more judicialized and enforceable. The European human rights system, based on the European Convention on Human Rights, is distinguished by the binding jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights, whose judgments are legally obligatory for member states. Similarly, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights and the African



Court on Human and Peoples' Rights provide judicial and quasi-judicial oversight, enhancing regional accountability and strengthening enforcement capacity compared to universal mechanisms[9].

These regional systems not only complement the global framework but also provide contextualized interpretations of human rights norms, reflecting regional legal traditions and socio-political realities. This multi-level interaction between global and regional mechanisms creates a complex but increasingly coherent enforcement architecture.

The results further demonstrate that state sovereignty remains a central, yet evolving, principle in the implementation of international human rights law. While sovereignty grants states primary responsibility for protecting individuals within their jurisdiction, it is simultaneously constrained by international legal obligations voluntarily assumed through treaties and customary law. This duality produces an inherent tension between domestic autonomy and international oversight.

In practice, this tension manifests when states perceive international monitoring or criticism as interference in internal affairs. Nevertheless, the gradual acceptance of concepts such as “responsibility to protect” and increased judicial cooperation indicates a slow but consistent shift toward conditional sovereignty, where legitimacy is increasingly linked to compliance with human rights standards.

Overall, the findings confirm that international human rights law has evolved into a highly structured, multi-dimensional system combining normative principles, binding legal instruments, and layered institutional mechanisms. Despite persistent challenges—such as weak enforcement capacity, political selectivity, resource inequality, and sovereignty-based resistance—the system continues to expand and strengthen. Its ongoing development is reflected in the proliferation of treaty bodies, increasing regional integration, and the progressive interpretation of rights through international jurisprudence.

Ultimately, international human rights law functions as both a legal framework and a global governance mechanism, promoting accountability,



harmonizing standards across jurisdictions, and reinforcing the protection of human dignity in an increasingly interconnected world.

**Conclusion.** The development of international human rights law reflects a gradual process shaped by historical, political, and legal transformations. While major international instruments established universal standards for human rights protection, their practical implementation remains uneven across different states.

Although all countries have formally committed to key human rights conventions, significant gaps persist between legal obligations and actual enforcement. Weak institutional capacity, limited political will, and socio-economic disparities continue to affect the effective realization of human rights.

Despite the existence of global and regional monitoring mechanisms, challenges remain in ensuring consistent compliance with international standards. State sovereignty and differing national contexts often limit the effectiveness of enforcement systems.

Sustainable progress in international human rights protection therefore requires not only legal commitments, but also stronger institutions, improved accountability mechanisms, and long-term cooperation between states and international organizations.

## REFERENCES

1. Saidov, A. X. (2012). International Law: Lecture Course. Tashkent: Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan.
2. Bobojonov, M. (2015). Human Rights and International Relations. Tashkent: Fan.
3. Council of Europe. (n.d.). European Court of Human Rights. Url:<https://www.echr.coe.int/>
4. OHCHR. (n.d.). Human Rights Principles. United Nations Human Rights Office. Url:<https://www.ohchr.org/en/human-rights>
5. OHCHR. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. United Nations. Url: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>



6. OHCHR. (1966). International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Url:<https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights>
7. OHCHR. (1966). International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Url:<https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-economic-social-and-cultural-rights>
8. OHCHR. (n.d.). Human Rights Treaty Bodies. United Nations Human Rights Office. Url:<https://www.ohchr.org/en/treaty-bodies>
9. United Nations. (1945). Charter of the United Nations. Url:<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter>