Philosophical and Ethical Foundations of Human Rights amidst the realms of Philosophy, Politics, and Global Responsibilities

[1]**Tauqeer Ahmed Lak,** [2]**Munawar Shah &** [3]**Komal Iqbal**

1. Department of Sociology & Criminology, University of Sargodha
   tauqeer.ahmed@uos.edu.pk
2. BS (ADP) Philosophy Department of Philosophy, University of Punjab, Lahore
   munawar.saood.5252@gmail.com
3. BS (ADP) Philosophy, Department of Philosophy, University of the Punjab Lahore

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Human Rights, Global Interconnectivity, Legal Principles, Ethical Foundations	This philosophical inquiry explores the multifaceted domain of human rights, efficiently navigating the moral principles that provide the basis of their existence in the political sphere. The article extensively examines moral philosophy, political theory, and legal principles, with the goal of clarifying the fundamental concepts that underlie human rights. This paper explores the historical path of human rights and the evolution of the international legal structure. It discusses issues about universality, cultural relativism, and government obligations. The inquiry thoroughly examines the many arguments surrounding the philosophy of human rights, carefully analyzing the deep ethical components that influence political beliefs and actions, thereby offering valuable insights. Analyzing the ethical foundations of human rights in the context of political philosophy, including a wide range of viewpoints including liberal individualism and communitarian ethics. This demonstration examines the intricacies of discussions about rights, focusing on the conflict between positive and negative rights, while also considering the difficulties presented by technological progress and global interconnectivity. It also offers crucial insights for individuals dealing with the ethical obligations of safeguarding human dignity in the current political landscape.
ARTICLE HISTORY	
Date of Submission: 28-06-2023 Date of Acceptance: 20-07-2023 Date of Publication: 30-09-2023	
Funding	
This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors	
Correspondence	Munawar Shah
Email:	munawar.saood.5252@gmail.com
Volume-Issue-Page Number	1(*1*) 51-64
Citation	Lak, M. A., Shah, M., Iqbal, K. (2023). Philosophical and Ethical Foundations of Human Rights amidst the realms of Philosophy, Politics, and Global Responsibilities. *Journal of Humanities, Health and Social Sciences, 1*(1), 51-64

Dr. Tauqeer Ahmed Lak, Munawar Shah, Komal Iqbal

Introduction

Human rights are an ethical framework that aims to identify the fundamental requirements for every person to have a decent life. Ensuring access to healthcare and a ban on torture are examples of human rights that aim to outline the prerequisites for a decent existence. Several declarations and accords made over the past half-century have formalized this aim; these include the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the European Convention on Human Rights (1954), and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966). A lot of people think that the current geopolitical system could use a moral compass, and these three books form the basis of such compass (Osler, 2016). However, the idea of human rights is not an attempt at a comprehensive moral philosophy. On their own, human rights arguments do not give light on the nature of morality. James Nickel argues that ensuring that all people have access to basic necessities is central to the concept of human rights. Everyone has the right to expect certain basic moral guarantees from each other and, most importantly, from the national and international institutions that have the power to directly impact their most important interests. For many, the first moral port of call in this regard is the doctrine of human rights (Gunnarsson et al., 2019). It is generally believed that national and international public agencies are in the best position to ensure these things. Human rights theory seeks to provide the so-called post-ideological contemporary geopolitical order a common groundwork for determining the most basic economic, social, and political conditions that are necessary for all people to have a decent life (Lenoir, 1998).

The practical effectiveness of promoting and safeguarding human rights is substantially enhanced when individual nation states' legal acceptance of the idea is acknowledged. However, it is widely believed that the recognition is not necessary for the ultimate validity of human rights. Human rights, according to this view, take precedence above inflexible national sovereignty. Human rights advocates have long held the belief that every country should adhere to a universal set of principles (Caswell & Cifor, 2016). No nation-state may lawfully use its sovereignty as an excuse to ignore its fundamental human rights obligations indefinitely. Human rights theory is therefore well positioned to provide individuals a robust ethical framework within which to question the legitimacy of the contemporary national and international political and economic power institutions that claim jurisdiction over us and stand in our way. This shows how important the human rights theory is now, both politically and morally. Many of human rights' most devout followers believe that the ideology's ultimate goal is to provide a morally acceptable framework for managing the world as it is right now (Goodale, 2006).

Aims and Objectives

1. To explore the historical path and evolution of human rights within the context of international legal structure

2. Evaluating the ethical principles that form the basis of human rights in the political domain
3. To critically assess the impact of cultural relativism on the understanding and implementation of human rights in a critical manner
4. Exploring the tussle between positive and negative rights and assessing the ethical implication of technological advancement on human rights
5. Challenges posed by technological advancement and global interconnectedness

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 The historical inception and development of both the theory and implementation of human rights

A rationally discernible moral order is the central doctrine of human rights philosophy. The legitimacy of this order is conditional on certain social and historical factors, yet it applies to everyone, everywhere, and at any time. According to this school of thinking, it is possible to objectively confirm that all moral theories and concepts are correct. Modern universalist moral theories include human rights as one of its tenets (Lenoir, 1998). A strong connection exists between the development of moral universalism and the beginnings and progress of human rights philosophy. Although neither exhaustive or adequate, modern human rights philosophy is based on a number of different moral principles. Human rights philosophy has been shaped by these principles. To differentiate between authentic and merely conventional moral ideas and attitudes, one must first acknowledge that morality and justice have their roots in a pre-social domain. In addition to the conviction that every rational being has inherent and equal moral value, the defender of human rights must hold the notion that each person possesses unique natural rights (Ramcharan & Ramcharan, 2008).

The principles of human rights are based on moral universalism and the belief that every person is a member of a single moral society. There are logically discernible moral truths that transcend cultures and histories, according to moral universalism. It is common practice to attribute moral universalism in Europe to Aristotle and the Stoics. Aristotle makes a compelling argument in Nicomachean Ethics for the presence of a natural moral order. It is upon this inherent order that fair regimes should be based. An all-encompassing and, one might argue, global framework for evaluating the soundness of actual human-made legal systems is provided by a natural order argument. Natural justice, according to Aristotle, is different from legal justice as it is valid everywhere and does not rely on public opinion. Natural justice cannot exist apart from certain political and social systems (Bates, 2010). The way to identify the form and content of natural justice is to employ reason that is not distorted by mere partiality or desire. A basic idea that was expressed by two Roman Stoics, Cicero and Seneca, was that morality was derived from God's logical will and that there was a cosmic city where natural moral order could be found, a law that superseded all local legal systems. All of us are obligated to submit to God's will, according to the Stoics, since it is the morally universal standard

(Morsink, 2009). Therefore, according to the Stoics, we are all part of a universal moral society that is mediated by our faith in God. Christianity has consistently supported the idea of a universally moral community throughout Europe's history. Although some have found allusions to rights in Aristotle, the Stoics, and Christian theologians' writings, a notion of rights comparable to our contemporary understanding of human rights really begins to take shape in Europe's so-called doctrine of natural law in the 17th and 18th centuries (Ishay, 2008).

The fundamental premise of the famous 17th-century philosopher John Locke's Two Treatises of Government (1688) is that all people, irrespective of political system, have inherent and unalienable rights. Locke contends that political institutions should yield to natural rights as these rights are based on God-established natural law. Individuals have the right to life, property, and liberty. According to Locke, the establishment of government was motivated by the need to protect these inherent rights. Enlightenment thinkers in the 17th and 18th centuries were connected with the works of philosophers like Kant and Locke (Forsythe, 2009). Political revolutions and upheavals were driven by texts that witness to the concepts of natural rights, moral autonomy, human dignity, and equality. Examples of such texts include the United States Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. In theory, human rights have always been safeguarded yet; a formal statement was only formed in reaction to genocides like the Holocaust. The right to exist is only one of several protected qualities outlined in the 1948 United Nations ratification of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). There were two treaties that complemented the UDHR the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1953) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (1966). Together, these and many additional treaties and declarations form modern human rights philosophy, which upholds universal moral equality and a universal rule of conduct (Iriye et al., 2012).

2.2 Implementation of human rights duties

The same human rights are believed to be owed to everyone. Everyone has a responsibility to safeguard and defend the human rights of others, according to this declaration. But in reality, national governments and international organizations are often responsible for protecting human rights. These institutions should shoulder a disproportionate amount of the moral responsibility for protecting human rights, argue philosophers like Thomas Pogge (1995), since they are best suited to do so. This view maintains that nation-state governments and international organizations like the UN and the World Bank should spearhead efforts to ensure the worldwide protection of human rights, even though NGOs and individual citizens can play a key role in this effort. The presence of universally accepted responsibilities, for instance, may be argued to provide sufficient protection for human rights (Baderin & Ssenyonjo, 2016). A privatization of human rights of this type, however, would fail to take into account two essential considerations. An individual's moral compass is most strongly influenced by the standards set by their immediate circle of friends, relatives, and neighbors. Ability to fulfill obligations is

significantly affected by one's financial situation. people in impoverished nations are therefore far less able to repay the kindness of people in wealthy nations due to global economic disparity. When it comes to causes like these, Pogge says that national and international institutions are primarily responsible. For human rights to be fully protected and promoted, nation-states must collaborate with international organizations that strive to achieve the global circumstances required for this purpose. The provision of sufficient institutions and services to the inhabitants of a nation-state is another responsibility of that nation-state (Tasioulas, 2012).

All nations and international organizations have a basic obligation to protect human rights. To fulfill this commitment, we must ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live a decent life. Just because we are striving to establish a morally perfect society does not imply we can't attain human rights, which include providing everyone with the resources to live decent lives. The fact that many people think human rights are too utopian is more indicative of how far our society has fallen behind on even the most fundamental of objectives than of any inherent shortcomings in human rights themselves (Mutua, 2017). It might seem that the objectives of human rights are not too lofty. According to human rights, all individuals should be able to live in politically democratic communities where they have access to basic necessities. The power of individual human rights is intended to be almost absolute, notwithstanding the modest purposes they may have. Put another way, the goals of society are not meant to take precedence above the demands of rights. A idea put out by Ronald Dworkin, this quality is called rights as trumps (Raszewski, 2015). He thinks that the best method to think about rights is as good as any underlying justification for political decisions that state a societal goal. Public policy and the distribution of public benefits, according to Dworkin, should always prioritize claims of rights. The right of a minority to live without prejudice, for instance, must be respected more highly than any benefits that the majority would get from doing so. Likewise, a person's right to an adequate diet should take priority over the desire of other individuals to have lavish meals, regardless of the total happiness these people would have. Dworkin articulates the inherent equality that underpins the contemporary conception of human rights via the idea of rights as trumps. To ensure that fundamental human rights are provided in an equitable and just manner, it is possible to treat rights as paramount. Although cutting-edge technology may not be required to accomplish everything that human rights aim to accomplish, this in no way diminishes the preeminence of human rights as a social and political consideration (Bantekas & Oette, 2013).

2.3 Philosophical perspectives on human rights

2.3.1 Skeptical Views on Human Rights: Bentham's Legal Positivism and Kant's Conceptual Framework

The works of Jeremy Bentham provide a case against human rights from the perspective of a skeptic. The traditional example of a right, in Bentham's view, is a legally established institution. According to Bentham's positivist theory of law, we may objectively ascertain the

existence of a legal right by looking at the relevant social circumstances. Human rights are but a glimmer in the vast ocean of paradigmatic (legal) rights since they are universal moral rights. It is hard to objectively prove the existence of social facts since they are not empirical in character. They are only rights that have been created, according to Bentham (Reidy, 2011). As "nonsense on stilts," Bentham derided the concept of "natural rights" or human rights as morally unalienable. This kind of right is shown, for instance, in the French Declaration of Human and Citizen Rights (1789). Bentham had a solid basis to doubt the legitimacy of human rights as positive legal rights under international law given his background as a legal positivist. The concept of international law was still in its early stages as it had not yet been created. Positivists appear to be arguing that the question is whether or not social truths can be empirically and objectively studied. Bentham thought that a strong moral argument may be sufficient to support a moral claim. Still, a legitimate moral claim is not the same as a universal moral right (Reidy, 2011).

That a human right can only exist in an ethically acceptable context is an argument that Kant raised ethical concerns about. Natural rights were laid down by him on the basis of the belief that every individual has an inherent right to be free from the judgments of others. There was no public process for determining, defining, or exercising these inherent rights, thus even if they made theoretical sense, they were not completely realized. A dysfunctional right relationship resulted from people having to figure out on their own what their rights and responsibilities were and how to respond to infractions since there was no such framework (Frohnen & Grasso, 2008). In Kant's view, the complete realization of natural rights can only occur when a political body creates a positive legal system by means of an initial contract between free equals. Civil society and the rule of law were, in Kant's view, logically and pragmatically required to safeguard fundamental rights. Civic society and the rule of law were not only solutions to problems, but rather essential to the metaphysics of morality, according to Kant, who disagreed with Locke on this point. A worldwide civil society controlled by the rule of law was necessary, in Kant's opinion, for human rights to be fully realized as full-fledged rights in the international order. According to this school of thought, human rights can only be fully realized when they are universally recognized and accepted by the moral community across the world (Cruft et al., 2015).

2.3.2 Challenging Human Rights Skepticism: Investigating Universality, Moral Norms, and Long-standing Disagreements

Since there are not usually any universally accepted moral norms, some human rights naysayers argue, there cannot be moral rights that apply to everyone. This line of thinking does not add up. Before anything else, we need to clarify what we mean by "universally shared." It is far from certain that there are no universally acknowledged moral principles. The widespread acceptance of basic human rights, as shown by both national laws and international treaty commitments, suggests that there are, if not universally accepted moral principles, then

certainly some highly popular ones. Additionally, regardless of whether there are universally acknowledged moral principles or not, this fact would still indicate that not all moral communities acknowledge and support human rights, assuming that such rights do in fact exist.. For reasons having nothing to do with the moral duties of its leaders, its people, or the moral underpinning of its institutionally and historically realized way of life, states often provide the appearance of protecting basic human rights (Harrington & Stuttaford, 2010).

While widespread moral disagreement and diversity of opinion does not disprove the validity of human rights as a universal moral principle, it does need an explanation of these facts. In addition to denying the reality of human rights, relativists argue that no universal moral rights or other cross-cultural standards exist for rationally resolving moral disagreements. Moral conflict may represent a number of things, including the variety of objective values, the complexity of human moral experience, the reality that we all reason from our own unique experiences, and so on. All of these things might add up to a liberal dedication to moral variety and a narrow view of human rights as universal moral rights. Nonetheless, this in no way disproves the existence of human rights or the universality of moral rights (Nickel, 1993).

2.4 Exposing Realist Skepticism: Reconsidering Human Rights in the Global Context

Some people who are skeptical about human rights contend that there can't be moral rights that apply to everyone since people have different moral standards. This argument lacks logic. Disregarding the need to define "universally shared," it is still not immediately apparent that not everyone has the same moral judgments. As shown by the widespread recognition of basic human rights in national and international treaty obligations, there may be generally agreed-upon moral standards. Second, even if universally accepted moral principles do not exist, this would only mean that human rights, if they do exist, are not now recognized and upheld by all moral communities. But it's also possible that this will just prove what we suspected all along: that systematic violations of human rights do in fact exist. It should come as no surprise that both domestic and international legal frameworks often safeguard fundamental human rights. It would seem that nations often maintain fundamental human rights for reasons unrelated to the moral convictions of their residents or authorities or the inherent goodness of their society's long-standing norms and practices (Sarat & Kearns, 1997).

It is necessary to account for the fact that there is extensive and ongoing moral disagreement and diversity, even if these facts do not prove that there are no universal moral rights, also called human rights. Because of the lack of international, cross-cultural norms for the reasonable resolution of moral disputes, relativists argue that human rights do not exist in the sense of universal moral rights. There are several potential causes of moral conflict, including the diversity of objective values, the intricacy of our own moral experiences, and the fact that we all reason from our own distinct perspectives. A liberal dedication to moral diversity and a limited view of human rights as universal moral rights could be both supported

by these factors. Taking this into consideration does lead one to be skeptical of human rights, but it does not disprove their existence as globally acknowledged, morally required rights (Sarat & Kearns, 1997).

2.5 The foundational ethical principles underpinning human rights in the political domain

Without exception, everyone must be granted the right to human rights. People have these rights just by virtue of being human, according to the framework's central principle. A government must protect economic, social, and cultural rights in addition to civil and political rights since human rights are inseparable and interrelated. Under the principles of indivisibility, people's capacity to exercise some rights, including the right to life, is inevitably impacted when a government abuses rights like health. Participation in the decision-making process pertaining to the defense of one's rights is guaranteed to all individuals. Having an opinion on rights-related government choices is one way to do this, but it is not the only one. Governments must deal with these concerns and encourage civil society's involvement in order to protect human rights. In order to enforce rights, the government must establish accountability systems (Agada, 2023). Adopting legislation or policy statements just to acknowledge rights is insufficient; concrete steps must be taken to ensure that the government is held responsible for violating these provisions. Governments that practice transparency are required to be forthcoming with all information and the process by which rights-related decisions are made. The public has to be aware of and comprehend how public institutions, including hospitals and schools, which are essential for upholding human rights, are governed and operated, as well as how important choices impacting those rights are made. Without exception, everyone's rights to human dignity must be upheld. Protecting against laws and procedures that might have a discriminatory impact is also included in this, in addition to intentional discrimination (Raszewski, 2015).

2.6 Challenges posed by technological advancement and global interconnectedness

The rapid advancement of technology and the increasing interconnectivity of the global community provide several obstacles to the protection of human rights. The widespread deployment of surveillance technology by governmental and corporate organizations raises substantial privacy issues, since it infringes upon people' personal rights via mass monitoring, data aggregation, and face recognition technologies. During the digital age, the emergence of cyber security risks, such as unauthorized access to data and malicious attacks by hackers, exposes personal information to possible hazards. These hazards have the potential to violate privacy and lead to instances of identity theft. The digital gap exacerbates existing inequalities by hindering participation in the digital age due to inadequate technical access, therefore highlighting issues about fair opportunity and access. The emergence of artificial intelligence and autonomous technology presents ethical quandaries, such as algorithmic prejudice and responsibility concerns, that act as a benchmark for fairness and the ideals of equal treatment.

The phenomenon of globalization, coupled with technological progress in the domains of trade and industry, gives rise to apprehensions over worker rights (Nussbaum, 1997).

These problems occur as a result of exploitative behaviors and inadequate regulation, which breach international human rights norms. Maintaining a careful balance between implementing national security measures, such as thorough surveillance and terrorist initiatives, while also protecting civil rights presents a difficult task. Furthermore, the environmental consequences of electronic gadgets, including resource depletion and the production of electronic waste, give rise to issues about the right to a sustainable environment. The deliberate dissemination of deceptive material, particularly on social media platforms, presents a danger to democratic procedures and erodes the credibility of open and equitable elections. To address these complex challenges, it is crucial for governments, international organizations, civil society, and the corporate sector to work together in developing ethical frameworks, legislation, and policies that protect human rights in an ever-evolving technological landscape and interconnected global society (Rathore & Cistelecan, 2012)

3.0 Philosophical analysis of ethical foundation of human rights

In many cases, people see human rights as both moral and legal rights, even if they originally originate from moral principles. This is because several human rights have been enshrined in both international and local law. Furthermore, human rights may be of a positive or negative character depending on the obligations placed on others to uphold them, and they can be classified as claim rights or liberty rights. The fundamental objective of protecting human rights is to ensure that every individual has the opportunity to live a life that is at least somewhat satisfying. There are five main types of human rights. In the end, when it comes to allocating public funds, human rights are seen by everyone as being more important than other political and social considerations (Sarat and Kearns 1997). Philosophers tend to reach consensus on issues concerning human rights' subject matter, effectiveness, and formal features. But there is a major split on how to even begin to investigate the conceptual underpinnings of human rights justifications. It is true that philosophers have provided several, and at times conflicting, answers to this question. Philosophers have looked to a wide range of principles—including democracy, reason and decision-making capacity, fundamental human values, autonomy, human dignity, and equality—in an effort to offer a rational foundation for human rights (Sarat and Kearns 1997).

Politics, philosophy, and international duties all interact intricately to provide the moral foundation for human rights. Thoroughly investigating and critically analyzing the moral aspects of our shared humanity is necessary for examining the philosophical underpinnings of our collective human nature. The philosophical foundations that impact the development, affirmation, and application of human rights will be thoroughly examined in this investigation. Political institutions, moral ideals, and the obligations placed on the global society are all intricately examined in this comprehensive study. Philosophical inquiry, political factors, and the acknowledgment of universally applicable moral duties all contribute to the development of human rights. A comprehensive analysis is required to completely comprehend the inception and evolution of human rights. The theoretical underpinnings, as well as the real-world dynamics within political settings and the collective obligations of the international community, should all be part of this investigation. Understanding human rights—the bedrock of ethical government and international cooperation—requires an exhaustive investigation (Agada 2023).

59

4.0 Methodology

This qualitative research deploys a systematic approach to investigate the diverse world of human rights. The paper does so by conducting a comprehensive assessment of secondary materials, which includes books, academic articles, reviews, and analyses in the fields of moral philosophy, political theory, and legal principles. Demonstrating the moral foundations that underpin human rights within the political domain is the primary objective of the technique, which takes into account historical trajectories, international legal systems, and important philosophical disputes. This article engages in a comprehensive investigation of ethical foundations with the purpose of resolving concerns such as universality, cultural relativism, and government responsibility. This is accomplished by embracing a variety of views, such as communitarian ethics and liberal individualism. Moreover, the study provides a critical analysis of the conflict between positive and negative rights, as well as a navigation of the obstacles that are provided by technology improvements and worldwide interconnection. The purpose of this research is to provide useful insights into the ethical duties surrounding the protection of human dignity within the context of the complexity of the present political environment.

5.0 Discussion and conclusion

There is a long and illustrious history behind the idea of human rights. The belief that justice exists and is relevant to all people, regardless of where they are from or what their background is, is the bedrock philosophical principle upon which human rights rest. Recent geopolitical developments have put the modern conception of human rights in the spotlight. People from many walks of life and in all sorts of circumstances understand and make use of the terminology around human rights. When thinking about how governments on a global and national scale should treat their citizens, human rights have emerged as a central concept. Everyone has the right to a life that satisfies their most fundamental needs, according to the principle of human rights. The fact that we are still far from realizing a morally compelling order predicated on human rights is evidence of the contemporary world's failure to accomplish this goal. Human rights have long been questioned in terms of their theoretical foundation. There is still a strong moral case in support of human rights, even if there are many unanswered questions in the continuing debate between human rights advocates and critics. One may argue that the ability to utilize one's imagination is the main reason people exist. Here we have a world where human rights do not exist.

As a thread in the intricate web of globalization, the evolution of human rights laws reflects both achievements and persistent challenges. As the link between globalization and human rights gains prominence in this age of increasing global connectivity, it is essential to embrace a holistic and sophisticated approach to address the complex realities of the present. From its philosophical roots in antiquity to the modern era's formal international accords, the evolution of human rights law reflects humanity's universal need for respect, equity, and

dignity. Yet, globalization presents both positive and negative opportunities and threats to human rights, necessitating thoughtful discussion. Incomparable technological advancement, cross-cultural understanding, and economic growth have all come from the trend of globalization. Yet, growing environmental degradation, socioeconomic inequality, and challenges to cultural and individual rights are all manifestations of how this issue affects human rights. Multinational corporations have a positive effect on the economy, but they have also sparked concerns about accountability and human rights abuses in global supply chains. To advance human rights in today's interconnected world, the role of civil society and international organizations is crucial. These organizations serve as watchdogs by promoting personal accountability, standing up for the rights of the oppressed, and opening up dialogue on how to end human rights abuses.

Efforts to advance human rights have, throughout history, been greatly aided by passionate and determined grassroots movements. In order to tackle the complexities of our linked world, a rights-based approach is necessary in light of today's urgent concerns, such as migration crises, environmental degradation, and technological advancements. In order to overcome these challenges and protect the inherent universality of human rights, collaborative efforts including governments, NGOs, civil society, and businesses are crucial. The evolution of human rights laws in this age of globalization ultimately calls for a concerted effort to protect the inherent value and rights of every individual. The benefits of connectivity must be considered in light of our ethical duties, we must fight for inclusion, and we must fortify institutions that ensure accountability and equity. In order to build a society where human rights are not only ideals but lived realities for everyone, it is essential to embrace the values of empathy, cooperation, and flexibility. It is critical that we work toward a more equitable, courteous, and human rights-preserving society as we navigate the intricate and linked world of globalization.

6.0 Implication of study

While analyzing the morality of human rights and navigating the intricate relationships between philosophy, politics, and global commitments, persons, societies, and the global community are affected. A complete understanding allows educated persons to critically engage in political processes and promote human rights in their areas. The universality of human rights encourages international collaboration and problem solving. This outlook allows politicians to design and change moral rules and regulations, supporting fair and impartial legal systems. Moral basis also facilitates conflict resolution via communication and healing. It promotes moral foreign policy and a fair international system by forcing states to prioritize human rights. The exploration improves advocacy and activism by improving communication and change mobilization. Businesses, particularly multinationals, may use this information to promote justice, sustainability, and responsible global citizenship, but human rights ethics in education promotes socially responsible people. In addition to legal responsibility, ethical

grounds support international human rights remedies. Finally, considering the link between philosophy and human rights encourages cultural awareness and frameworks that respect diverse perspectives. This study guides moral decision-making, empowering governments, corporations, and individuals to create a more just and compassionate world.

7.0 Limitations of the study

The philosophical analysis addresses the morality of human rights and the complicated interplay of philosophy, politics, and global responsibility, but its limitations must be understood. Essentially, the research may favor Western intellectual traditions, ignoring cultural differences in human rights perspectives. The research chronological setting may not account for global political shifts and ethical concerns following its period. Political predisposition might alter how philosophical ideas are viewed, compromising the study's neutrality. Owing to its narrow scope, the study may underrepresent various philosophical traditions. This inquiry may also overlook regional differences in human rights interpretation and application and the challenges of infusing morality into legal regimes. The context's interdisciplinary nature may restrict its insights from economics, psychology, sociology, and sociology. Due to data constraints, the research may not account for rapid global political shifts or ethical arguments' subjectivity, which may restrict its depth of analysis. Understanding these restrictions is crucial to maintaining openness and understanding the complex and ever-changing nature of human rights.

Contributions

Dr. Tauqeer Ahmed Lak: Problem Identification and Model Development

Komal Iqbal: Literature search, Methodology

Munawar Shah: Drafting and data analysis, proofreading and editing

Conflict of Interests/Disclosures

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest w.r.t this article's research, authorship, and/or publication.

References

Agada, S. A. (2023). Philosophical Perspectives and Definitional Problems of Human Rights: Critical and Intellectual Appraisal. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY*, 4(4), 260-277.

Baderin, M. A., & Ssenyonjo, M. (2016). Development of International Human Rights Law before and after the UDHR. In *International Human Rights Law* (pp. 19-44). Routledge.

Bantekas, I., & Oette, L. (2013). *International human rights law and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Bates, E. (2010). *The evolution of the European Convention on Human Rights: from its inception to the creation of a permanent Court of Human Rights*. Oxford University Press.

Caswell, M., & Cifor, M. (2016). From human rights to feminist ethics: radical empathy in the archives. *Archivaria*, *81*(1), 23-43.

Cruft, R., Liao, S. M., & Renzo, M. (2015). *Philosophical foundations of human rights*. Philosophical Foundations of L.

Forsythe, D. P. (2009). *Encyclopedia of human rights* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.

Frohnen, B. P., & Grasso, K. L. (2008). *Rethinking rights: historical, political, and philosophical perspectives* (Vol. 1). University of Missouri Press.

Goodale, M. (2006). Ethical theory as social practice. *American Anthropologist*, *108*(1), 25-37.

Gunnarsson, L., Mürbe, U., & Weiss, N. (2019). *The human right to a dignified existence in an international context: legal and philosophical perspectives* (Vol. 46). Nomos Verlag.

Harrington, J., & Stuttaford, M. (2010). *Global health and human rights: legal and philosophical perspectives*. Routledge.

Iriye, A., Goedde, P., & Hitchcock, W. I. (2012). *The human rights revolution: an international history* (Vol. 3). Oxford University Press.

Ishay, M. (2008). *The history of human rights: From ancient times to the globalization era*. Univ of California Press.

Lenoir, N. (1998). Universal declaration on the human genome and human rights: the first legal and ethical framework at the global level. *Colum. Hum. Rts. L. Rev.*, *30*, 537.

Morsink, J. (2009). *Inherent human rights: Philosophical roots of the universal declaration*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mutua, M. W. (2017). The ideology of human rights. In *International Law of Human Rights* (pp. 103-172). Routledge.

Nickel, J. W. (1993). The human right to a safe environment: Philosophical perspectives on its scope and justification. *Yale J. Int'l L.*, *18*, 281.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). Capabilities and human rights. *Fordham L. Rev.*, *66*, 273.

Osler, A. (2016). *Human rights and schooling: An ethical framework for teaching for social justice*. Teachers College Press.

Ramcharan, B., & Ramcharan, B. G. (2008). *Contemporary human rights ideas: Rethinking theory and practice*. Routledge.

Raszewski, A. (2015). Human Rights in China and the Philosophical Perspective. *Acta Asiatica Varsoviensia*(28).

Rathore, A. S., & Cistelecan, A. (2012). *Wronging Rights?: Philosophical Challenges for Human Rights* (Vol. 1). Routledge.

Reidy, D. (2011). Philosophy and Human Rights: Contemporary Perspectives. In *Philosophical Dimensions of Human Rights: Some Contemporary Views* (pp. 23-44). Springer.

Sarat, A., & Kearns, T. R. (1997). *Legal Rights: Historical and Philosophical Perspectives*. University of Michigan Press.

Tasioulas, J. (2012). *On the nature of human rights*. na.