

Human Rights Protection in Contemporary Legal Systems: Challenges and Opportunities

Sri Kurniati Handayani Pane¹, Gilang Rizki Aji Putra²

¹ Dharma Indonesia University (UNDHI), Tangerang, Indonesia. E-mail: nuningpane123@gmail.com

² Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta, Indonesia. E-mail: gilangrizkiajiputra0@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The international human rights regime has expanded dramatically since 1945, with an intricate architecture of treaties, institutions, and domestic constitutional provisions designed to protect fundamental rights. Yet, despite unprecedented normative proliferation, the practical effectiveness of human rights protection faces a deepening crisis. Democratic backsliding, securitization, corporate power, digital surveillance, and persistent inequality all erode rights enjoyment, even in states with robust legal frameworks. Scholarly analyses tend to examine these phenomena separately, leaving a gap in our understanding of the systemic interplay between challenges and the opportunities that exist within contemporary legal systems to counteract them. This study addresses that gap by providing an integrated analysis of the structural challenges confronting human rights protection and the emerging opportunities for strengthening enforcement across multiple legal orders. Adopting a qualitative, comparative methodology that draws on doctrinal analysis and a synthesis of interdisciplinary scholarship, the article examines developments within regional human rights systems (Europe, the Americas, Africa) and domestic apex courts in jurisdictions including South Africa, India, Colombia, and Germany. The findings reveal that challenges coalesce around four central dynamics: democratic recession and the erosion of the rule of law, the permanent normalization of security-based exceptions, corporate and digital governance that bypasses traditional rights frameworks, and the persistent marginalization of socioeconomic rights. Simultaneously, the analysis identifies countervailing opportunities through transnational judicial dialogue, strategic legal mobilization, digital constitutionalism, and transformative constitutional interpretations that expand rights protection. The article advances a dynamic, multi-level model of human rights protection as a contested field in which norm diffusion and political resistance continuously interact. Practical implications include the need to fortify judicial independence, strengthen international solidarity mechanisms, embed socioeconomic rights in justiciable frameworks, and regulate digital spaces in line with human rights standards.

Keywords: Constitutionalism; Digital Rights; Human Rights Enforcement; International Human Rights Law; Legal Mobilization; Rule of Law; Transformative Constitutionalism

Citation: Pane, Sri Kurniati Handayani, and Putra, Gilang Rizki Aji. 2024. "Human Rights Protection in Contemporary Legal Systems: Challenges and Opportunities". *JLCS: Journal of Law and Cultural Studies* 1 (1), 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.30872/jlcs.v1i1.3>.

1. INTRODUCTION

The post-World War II human rights project represented one of the most ambitious normative undertakings in modern history. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), followed by the twin Covenants and a multitude of specialized

treaties, established an international legal regime that recognized the inherent dignity and inalienable rights of every individual. Domestic constitutions from Germany to South Africa, from Colombia to India, entrenched justiciable bills of rights, and regional courts in Europe, the Americas, and Africa acquired jurisdiction to hold states accountable for rights violations. Today, virtually every state has ratified at least one core human rights treaty, and constitutional review mechanisms are more widespread than at any previous historical moment (Alston, 2020; Simmons, 2009). The language of human rights has become the preeminent moral discourse of our time, invoked by social movements, judges, and international organizations alike.

Yet, the contemporary moment is marked by a profound paradox. While the normative infrastructure of human rights has never been stronger, the actual enjoyment of rights is under systematic assault in both long-established democracies and fragile transitional contexts. Democratic backsliding in Hungary, Poland, Turkey, India, and the United States has weakened the very institutions—independent courts, free media, vibrant civil society—upon which rights protection depends (Ginsburg & Huq, 2018a; Landau, 2013). The war on terror, securitized migration policies, and public health emergencies have entrenched exceptionalist logics that suspend ordinary rights guarantees with alarming frequency (Gross & Ní Aoláin, 2006; Hafner-Burton, 2013). Multinational corporations and digital platforms now exercise forms of power that transcend state borders, creating accountability gaps that traditional human rights law struggles to close (Deva & Bilchitz, 2017; Kaye, 2020). Meanwhile, economic inequality within and between states renders the formal promise of equal rights hollow for billions, and climate change threatens the material preconditions for almost all human rights (Moyn, 2018; Peel & Osofsky, 2018). These trends have led some critics to proclaim the twilight, or even the endtimes, of the human rights project (Posner, 2014; Hopgood, 2013).

Despite the gravity of these challenges, a myopic focus on decline obscures the countervailing opportunities that contemporary legal systems have generated. Transnational judicial networks increasingly cross-fertilize constitutional rights doctrines, producing innovative interpretations in domains such as climate justice, digital privacy, and socioeconomic rights (Alter, Helfer, & Madsen, 2018). Strategic litigation and legal mobilization by civil society actors have yielded significant victories in contexts as diverse as same-sex marriage, indigenous land rights, and access to essential medicines (Sikkink, 2017). Digital technologies, for all their risks, also enable new forms of rights monitoring, documentation, and advocacy that were unimaginable a generation ago (De Gregorio, 2021). Understanding human rights protection today requires moving beyond a simplistic narrative of either progress or collapse and engaging with the complex, contradictory dynamics that define contemporary legal systems.

This article provides a systematic, integrated analysis of the challenges to human rights protection and the opportunities for its renewal within contemporary legal systems. It pursues three objectives: (1) to identify and categorize the principal structural challenges that impede effective rights protection across diverse legal orders;

(2) to analyse the emerging legal and institutional opportunities that can strengthen enforcement despite adverse political conditions; and (3) to develop a dynamic, multi-level theoretical framework that explains the interplay between norm erosion and norm resilience. The study's novelty lies in its holistic integration of literatures that are typically siloed—democratic backsliding, security studies, business and human rights, digital constitutionalism, and socioeconomic rights adjudication—into a single analytical frame. The article proceeds by reviewing the extant scholarship, detailing the comparative doctrinal methodology, presenting an integrated results and discussion section organized around four thematic challenges and their attendant opportunities, and concluding with implications for theory and practice.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The scholarly literature on human rights protection is vast, but it can be organized around several competing narratives and thematic clusters. A first major strand adopts an optimistic, liberal-internationalist perspective, emphasizing the transformative power of international norms and the progressive expansion of rights protection. Beth Simmons's (2009) *Mobilizing for Human Rights* demonstrated empirically that international human rights treaty ratification improves rights practices in transitional democracies by providing domestic litigants and activists with legal tools to hold governments accountable. Kathryn Sikkink's (2017) *Evidence for Hope* marshalled data to show a global "justice cascade" in which prosecutions for past atrocities have increased, and the legitimacy of human rights norms has deepened over time. The broader transnational legal process school, initiated by Harold Hongju Koh (1997), explains how international law becomes internalized into domestic legal systems through a recursive process of interaction, interpretation, and norm internalization. In this view, the proliferation of international, regional, and domestic human rights institutions creates a mutually reinforcing network that gradually expands rights protection, even in the face of political resistance.

A second strand offers a more sceptical, critical appraisal. Samuel Moyn's (2010, 2018) influential revisionist histories argue that the human rights movement rose to prominence precisely at the moment when more ambitious projects of social transformation—socialism, decolonization, developmentalism—faltering, and that the minimalist focus on physical integrity rights has proven compatible with, and indeed distracting from, gross economic inequality. Stephen Hopgood (2013) has contended that the post-Cold War human rights architecture, dependent on Western power and funding, is now in terminal decline as the global balance of power shifts and authoritarian states mount effective challenges. Eric Posner (2014) has advanced a realist account, arguing that international human rights law is epiphenomenal, exerting little independent causal effect on state behaviour. These critical voices usefully caution against complacency, but their broad-brush dismissal sometimes overlooks the significant, if uneven, advances in rights protection that empirical studies continue to document (Simmons, 2013).

A third significant body of scholarship examines the phenomenon of democratic backsliding and its implications for human rights. Tom Ginsburg and Aziz Huq (2018b)

have theorized the processes by which elected authoritarians incrementally dismantle liberal democratic institutions while retaining the formal trappings of electoral competition. David Landau (2013) coined the concept of “abusive constitutionalism” to capture the use of constitutional amendment and replacement processes to undermine democratic and rights-protective institutions. Kim Lane Scheppele (2018) has described “autocratic legalism” in Hungary, while Wojciech Sadurski (2019) has documented Poland’s constitutional breakdown. These analyses reveal that the most significant contemporary threat to human rights arises not from outright coups d’état but from legal, incremental processes that exploit the very institutions designed to safeguard rights. However, this literature often focuses on institutional degradation without fully linking it to the broader challenges posed by securitization, corporate governance, and digital transformation.

The security and emergency governance literature provides additional insights. Oren Gross and Fionnuala Ní Aoláin (2006) comprehensively analysed how legal systems accommodate states of exception and how such accommodations become entrenched, permanently altering the rights landscape. The post-September 11, 2001, counter-terrorism framework, the COVID-19 pandemic, and climate-related emergencies have all been invoked to justify restrictions on movement, assembly, privacy, and due process that persist beyond the initial crisis (Ginsburg & Versteeg, 2021; Shany, 2020). The risk is that emergency powers normalise a lower baseline of rights protection, creating a permanent “state of exception” that erodes the distinction between normalcy and crisis (Agamben, 2005).

Parallel scholarship has documented the challenges posed by corporate actors and digital platforms. The United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (Ruggie, 2013) established a global framework for corporate human rights responsibility, yet enforcement remains heavily reliant on voluntary corporate compliance and fragmented domestic litigation. Surya Deva (2021) has argued for a binding international treaty to close the accountability gap for transnational corporations. In the digital sphere, David Kaye (2019) has explored how platform governance structures moderate speech and privacy in ways that bypass traditional state responsibility doctrines. Giovanni De Gregorio (2021) has traced the emergence of “digital constitutionalism” in Europe, where courts and regulators attempt to translate constitutional rights into enforceable obligations in the algorithmic society. These challenges are often studied in isolation from each other and from the broader constitutional dynamics of rights protection.

Finally, a robust literature addresses the status of socioeconomic rights. International human rights law has long treated civil and political rights as immediately justiciable while relegating economic, social, and cultural rights to a programmatic, progressively realisable status. However, domestic courts in South Africa, Colombia, India, and elsewhere have developed innovative adjudicative techniques—reasonableness review, structural interdicts, the minimum core concept—that enforce socioeconomic claims (Langford, 2019; Liebenberg, 2010). Climate change litigation has recently emerged as a frontier, with courts in the Netherlands, Germany, and Colombia

recognising state obligations to reduce emissions as a matter of human rights duty (Peel & Osofsky, 2018). This body of jurisprudence represents a significant expansion of the traditional human rights canon, but its impact remains constrained by resource limitations and political resistance.

What remains conspicuously absent from the literature is an integrated framework that synthesises these diverse challenges and opportunities, analysing them not as independent phenomena but as interacting dimensions of a single, complex field. This article addresses that gap by advancing a model of human rights protection as a dynamic, multi-level contest between forces of erosion and resilience. The methodology for doing so is outlined next.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative, multi-method research design combining doctrinal legal analysis with a comparative synthesis of interdisciplinary scholarship. The approach is interpretive and theory-building, aiming to generate an integrated conceptual framework rather than to test narrowly specified causal hypotheses (Hutchinson & Duncan, 2012). The choice of a qualitative design is appropriate given the research question's concern with understanding how structural challenges and opportunities interact across diverse legal systems—a question that resists the reductionism of purely quantitative approaches and requires attention to legal texts, institutional contexts, and normative meanings.

The research proceeds in two integrated phases. The first phase involves a critical synthesis of the extensive secondary literature spanning international human rights law, comparative constitutional law, democratic backsliding studies, security governance, business and human rights, digital rights, and socioeconomic rights adjudication. This synthesis is not a conventional literature review but an analytical exercise that identifies key mechanisms, enabling conditions, and interactions that cut across the normally siloed literatures. Through this process, a provisional conceptual framework was developed that organises challenges into four intersecting dimensions and opportunities into three levels of institutional response.

The second phase applies this framework through a comparative doctrinal analysis of illustrative legal systems. Jurisdictions were selected using a purposive, maximum-variation logic (Hirschl, 2014) to capture diversity in legal tradition, political regime type, and regional context. The European human rights system, anchored by the European Court of Human Rights and now complemented by the Court of Justice of the European Union's Fundamental Rights Charter, represents a mature, institutionally dense regional mechanism that is currently under strain from illiberal member states (Sadurski, 2019; Scheppele, 2018). The Inter-American system, with its Inter-American Court of Human Rights, has pioneered expansive rights interpretations and innovative remedies, particularly regarding transitional justice and indigenous rights, yet faces chronic compliance challenges (Binder, 2011). The African human rights architecture, encompassing the African Charter and the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights, is younger and less resourced but distinctive in its codification of collective and

socioeconomic rights (Heyns & Killander, 2013). At the domestic level, the analysis draws on apex court jurisprudence and institutional developments from South Africa (a paradigm of transformative constitutionalism), India (a jurisdiction with a long tradition of public interest litigation and the basic structure doctrine), Colombia (a leader in socioeconomic rights adjudication), and Germany (a key actor in digital constitutionalism through the Federal Constitutional Court). These cases are not treated as independent units for systematic comparison but as rich empirical sites that illuminate the operation of the identified challenges and opportunities in context.

The primary data sources are publicly available legal texts: constitutions, statutes, international treaties, and the decisions of domestic and international courts. Secondary sources include peer-reviewed journal articles, monographs, and reports from intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations. The analysis triangulates across these sources to ensure that interpretive claims are well-grounded. No human participants or confidential data were involved, and the study adhered to standard academic integrity norms. The following section presents the integrated findings and discussion.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis reveals that challenges to human rights protection in contemporary legal systems are not random but cluster around four interrelated structural dynamics: democratic recession and rule-of-law erosion, the permanent normalisation of security-based exceptions, corporate and digital governance that displaces state-centred rights frameworks, and the persistent marginalisation of socioeconomic rights. Each dynamic is examined in turn, along with the countervailing opportunities that legal systems have generated.

4.1 Democratic Recession and the Hollowing Out of Rights-Protective Institutions

The single greatest contemporary challenge to human rights protection is the global wave of democratic backsliding, which operates not through the dramatic abolition of rights charters but through the incremental incapacitation of the institutions that enforce them. In Hungary, the Fidesz government after 2010 used its parliamentary supermajority to enact a new Fundamental Law and subsequent constitutional amendments that reduced the jurisdiction of the Constitutional Court, altered judicial appointment mechanisms to secure loyalist control, and entrenched illiberal policy preferences in the constitutional text itself (Halmai, 2019; Scheppele, 2018). These measures were formally legal; they complied with the procedural requirements of constitutional amendment. Yet their cumulative effect was to disable the Court's capacity to provide meaningful rights review. The Court, now populated by loyalists, validated further erosions of judicial independence and freedom of expression, creating a feedback loop in which a captured judiciary legitimises ever greater executive power (Bánkuti et al., 2012).

Poland replicated this template from 2015 onward, when the Law and Justice government packed the Constitutional Tribunal and subsequently used the captured

court to rubber-stamp assaults on judicial independence, media pluralism, and assembly rights (Sadurski, 2019). Both cases illustrate a mechanism that has proven deeply resilient to external correction. The European Union's Article 7 procedure and infringement actions, backed by the Court of Justice of the European Union's rulings on judicial independence, have imposed some political and financial costs but have not reversed the institutional decay (Scheppele, 2022). India and the United States, though less dramatic, have witnessed their own variants of democratic erosion, with executive aggrandisement and political pressure on the judiciary producing observable shifts in the willingness of courts to robustly enforce rights in politically sensitive cases (Bhatia, 2020; Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018).

The theoretical implication of these findings is that human rights protection is not a function of the formal existence of rights provisions; it is a function of the institutional ecosystem—independent courts, professional bureaucracies, free media, vibrant civil society—that translates textual guarantees into lived reality. When this ecosystem is degraded, rights provisions become what this article terms constitutional simulacra: symbolic artefacts that are ritually invoked while being operationally inoperative. This reframing moves beyond the classic counter-majoritarian difficulty (Waldron, 2006) and highlights a deeper problem: judicial review is not merely an undemocratic check on majorities but an essential component of a self-sustaining rights-protective equilibrium that, once disrupted, is exceptionally difficult to restore.

Yet, the same period has witnessed countervailing opportunities. Transnational judicial dialogue and regional oversight can partially compensate for domestic institutional decay, albeit imperfectly. The European Court of Human Rights has found Hungary and Poland in violation of fair trial and freedom of expression guarantees repeatedly, creating a body of international legal condemnation that sustains civil society morale and provides ammunition for domestic political opposition (ECtHR, *Baka v. Hungary*, 2016; ECtHR, *Xero Flor w Polsce sp. z o.o. v. Poland*, 2021). The Inter-American Court of Human Rights, operating in a region with a more volatile democratic history, has developed robust doctrines of conventionality control, requiring domestic judges to set aside national laws incompatible with the American Convention (Ferrer Mac-Gregor, 2011). In contexts where domestic judiciaries retain some independence, this doctrine empowers judges to resist executive pressure by appealing to international obligations.

The practical implication is that reinforcing transnational oversight mechanisms—through the EU's rule-of-law conditionality regulation, the Council of Europe's monitoring bodies, and the Inter-American Commission's special mechanisms—constitutes a critical protective layer. Similarly, supporting civil society organisations that function as watchdogs and litigators when domestic institutions fail is essential to maintaining the rights-protective ecosystem even in backsliding environments.

4.2 Securitisation and the Permanent State of Exception

A second structural challenge arises from the progressive normalisation of emergency governance. Classical constitutional theory posited a strict distinction between normalcy, in which constitutional rights operate fully, and exceptional crisis, during which temporary derogations may be justified but must be proportional, time-limited, and subject to judicial oversight (Rossiter, 1948; Gross & Ní Aoláin, 2006). In practice, this distinction has eroded. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, many states have enacted permanent counter-terrorism legislation that grants expansive surveillance, detention, and investigative powers to the executive, bypassing ordinary criminal procedure safeguards. The United Kingdom's successive counter-terrorism acts, France's perpetual state of emergency following the 2015 Paris attacks, and the United States' continuing military detentions and targeted killing operations under the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force represent cases where exceptional measures have become institutionally entrenched (Ackerman, 2010; Fenwick & Phillipson, 2011).

The COVID-19 pandemic dramatically accelerated this trend globally. Hungary's 2020 Enabling Act granted the government the power to rule by decree without a clear sunset clause, a move that the Venice Commission and the UN Human Rights Committee criticised as incompatible with democratic accountability (Scheppele, 2020). India's lockdown and the suspension of fundamental rights in Jammu and Kashmir since 2019 further illustrate the susceptibility of rights to being overridden by security and public health justifications (Bhatia, 2020). The pattern is consistent: emergency powers are invoked, normalised, and then extended to govern an ever-widening range of social problems, from migration to organised crime to environmental threats, creating a permanent architecture of rights derogation masked by ordinary legislation (Shany, 2020).

The findings in this domain challenge the adequacy of the derogation model embedded in international human rights treaties. Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights permits derogations in times of public emergency, provided measures are proportional and non-discriminatory. Yet, the practice reveals that emergencies are increasingly framed as perpetual, diffuse, and politically defined, making the treaty derogation regime almost irrelevant in practice. Courts have at times pushed back. The UK Supreme Court in *R (Begum) v. Special Immigration Appeals Commission* (2021) and the German Federal Constitutional Court in its surveillance jurisprudence have asserted the enduring vitality of fundamental rights even in the face of security claims (de Londras & Davis, 2010). The European Court of Justice's strict data retention rulings (*Digital Rights Ireland*, 2014; *Tele2 Sverige*, 2016) imposed significant limits on blanket surveillance, although states have subsequently enacted revised laws that maintain bulk collection under different labels.

The opportunity lies in reinforcing judicial independence and requiring genuine proportionality analysis that interrogates the factual basis of security claims. International human rights bodies, through their general comments and jurisprudence, can articulate more robust standards for the necessity and proportionality of emergency

measures. Civil society and academic networks that document and publicise the human rights costs of permanent securitisation serve an essential oversight function in contexts where governmental secrecy shrouds these practices.

4.3 Corporate and Digital Governance: Beyond the State-Centred Rights Paradigm

The third structural challenge stems from the mismatch between the state-centred architecture of international human rights law and the reality of globalised corporate and digital power. Multinational corporations today influence the enjoyment of rights—labour rights, environmental health, freedom of expression, privacy—at least as profoundly as many states, yet the primary bearers of duties under human rights treaties remain states. The Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (2011) consolidated the “protect, respect, and remedy” framework, affirming that corporations have a responsibility to respect human rights, but this responsibility is not legally binding under international law, and enforcement depends on often weak domestic legislation and extraterritorial judicial reach (Ruggie, 2013; Deva, 2021). Litigation against parent companies for human rights abuses committed by subsidiaries abroad—such as the Vedanta case in the United Kingdom (2019)—has achieved some successes but remains costly and jurisdictionally complex (Meeran, 2020).

Digital platforms introduce an additional layer of complexity. Companies like Meta, Alphabet, and X (formerly Twitter) make decisions about content moderation, data collection, and algorithmic amplification that profoundly affect users’ freedom of expression, privacy, and non-discrimination. These decisions are governed by private terms of service, opaque algorithmic systems, and commercial imperatives rather than constitutional rights frameworks (Kaye, 2019; Balkin, 2018). States simultaneously leverage these platforms for surveillance purposes, creating a public-private hybrid that evades conventional rights remedies. Shoshana Zuboff (2019) has analysed how “surveillance capitalism” extracts personal data as raw material, creating an economic logic that is structurally inimical to autonomy and privacy.

Legal systems have nonetheless begun to respond with innovative regulatory instruments, offering significant opportunities. The European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR, 2018) establishes a rights-based framework for data protection with significant extraterritorial reach, and the Court of Justice of the European Union has interpreted it to protect fundamental rights robustly. The emerging EU Digital Services Act and AI Act extend this logic into content governance and algorithmic accountability (De Gregorio, 2021). In Germany, the Federal Constitutional Court’s landmark Right to be Forgotten decisions (2019) affirmed that domestic constitutional rights apply to private platform governance. In the Global South, India’s Supreme Court recognised a fundamental right to privacy in *Puttaswamy I* (2017), and Kenya’s High Court has issued injunctions against unlawful surveillance (Nanima, 2021). Transnational networks of data protection authorities and the work of the UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression provide additional layers of normative elaboration.

The theoretical contribution here is to highlight that rights protection in the algorithmic age cannot rely on vertical state-individual models alone. A new “horizontal” constitutionalism is required that imposes direct obligations on powerful private actors, whether through legislation, administrative regulation, or the extension of constitutional doctrines to private governance (Balkin, 2018). This represents a profound but necessary evolution in human rights law. Practically, the opportunity lies in accelerating the shift toward binding international instruments on business and human rights, strengthening the regulatory capacity of domestic data protection and competition authorities, and ensuring that international human rights bodies develop clear guidance on state obligations to regulate private actors extraterritorially.

4.4 Inequality and the Neglect of Socioeconomic Rights

The fourth challenge is the most enduring: the relative neglect of economic, social, and cultural rights within the practical operation of contemporary legal systems. The international human rights regime was bifurcated from the outset, with civil and political rights treated as immediately justiciable and economic and social rights relegated to progressive realisation dependent on resource availability. Despite the formal indivisibility of all human rights proclaimed at the 1993 Vienna World Conference, in practice, most constitutional courts and international supervisory mechanisms have focused overwhelmingly on civil and political rights, leaving profound economic inequality, inadequate housing, malnutrition, and avoidable morbidity largely unaddressed by rights adjudication (Moyn, 2018; Alston, 2020).

Yet, a significant body of innovative jurisprudence has emerged that demonstrates the potential for socioeconomic rights adjudication to contribute to structural justice. The South African Constitutional Court’s *Grootboom* (2000) and *Treatment Action Campaign* (2002) decisions, while criticised for their restrained “reasonableness review” approach, nevertheless compelled the government to adopt comprehensive housing and HIV treatment policies that saved lives and shifted bureaucratic culture (Liebenberg, 2010). The Colombian Constitutional Court’s structural judgment T-025/2004 on internally displaced persons and its subsequent supervision of compliance represent one of the most ambitious experiments in judicial oversight of socioeconomic rights implementation, linking rights to budgetary allocations and administrative reform (Rodríguez-Garavito, 2011). In India, the Supreme Court expanded the right to life under Article 21 to encompass the rights to food, education, and health, and through the mechanism of continuing mandamus has overseen the implementation of massive social programmes like the mid-day meal scheme (Khosla, 2012).

At the international level, the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which entered into force in 2013, established an individual complaints mechanism, opening new pathways for accountability. Climate change litigation has become a particularly dynamic front. The Dutch Supreme Court in *Urgenda* (2019) ordered the government to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 25% from 1990 levels, grounding the duty in the European Convention on Human Rights’ rights to life and private life. The German Federal Constitutional Court’s 2021 climate

order found the state's climate legislation insufficient to protect the fundamental rights of future generations, compelling more ambitious targets. These decisions suggest that courts can play a meaningful role in addressing structural inequality and ecological degradation when they interpret rights holistically and are willing to engage with complex policy questions.

The theoretical contribution of this analysis is to demonstrate that the marginalisation of socioeconomic rights is not an inherent feature of rights discourse but a contingent historical product that can be, and is being, corrected through adjudicative innovation and transnational norm diffusion. The practical opportunity is immense: embedding robust socioeconomic rights justiciability into domestic constitutions, coupled with capacity-building for judges and administrators, can contribute to a more equitable distribution of resources and life chances. This does not mean courts should replace legislatures in setting social policy; rather, they can serve as catalysts for democratic deliberation and administrative accountability, bridging the gap between formal equality and substantive justice.

4.5 Synthesis: A Dynamic, Multi-Level Model of Rights Protection

The four challenges—democratic recession, emergency normalisation, corporate and digital governance, and socioeconomic marginalisation—are not independent phenomena. They interact in complex ways. Backsliding governments exploit emergencies to consolidate power and restrict rights; they foster clientelistic relationships with corporate actors that weaken regulatory oversight; and they often mobilise against socioeconomic redistribution, framing it as an assault on national sovereignty. Conversely, opportunities also intersect: transnational judicial dialogue strengthens domestic courts facing political pressure; digital technologies facilitate the documentation of rights violations and enable new forms of legal mobilisation; socioeconomic rights litigation can reinforce democratic accountability by demanding government transparency and participation.

The integrated analysis yields a dynamic model in which human rights protection is understood not as a static attribute of legal systems but as a field of continuous contestation between forces of erosion and resilience. Erosion operates through mechanisms of institutional capture, discursive reframing, and resource extraction, while resilience operates through norm diffusion, transnational solidarity, and institutional innovation. The model implies that no single intervention—whether a treaty, a court ruling, or a constitutional reform—can guarantee rights protection; rather, protection must be continuously sustained through the interplay of independent institutions, mobilised civil societies, and responsive legal cultures.

5. CONCLUSION

This article set out to examine the principal challenges to human rights protection in contemporary legal systems and the opportunities that exist to strengthen enforcement despite adverse conditions. The integrated analysis yields four principal findings. First, democratic backsliding and rule-of-law erosion represent the most

immediate and pervasive threat, disabling the institutional ecosystem on which rights enforcement depends while preserving the formal shell of constitutionalism. Second, the permanent normalisation of emergency powers has eroded the distinction between normalcy and exception, creating a durable architecture of rights derogation. Third, corporate and digital governance increasingly determine the enjoyment of fundamental rights, yet the state-centred architecture of human rights law struggles to hold private power accountable. Fourth, the enduring marginalisation of socioeconomic rights perpetuates a narrow conception of human rights that tolerates gross inequality.

Against these challenges, the analysis identified significant countervailing opportunities: the role of transnational judicial networks and regional human rights bodies in maintaining normative pressure on backsliding states; the potential of digital constitutionalism to extend rights protections to the algorithmic sphere; the innovative socioeconomic rights jurisprudence emerging from constitutional courts in the Global South; and the resilience of legal mobilisation by civil society actors who use law as a resource for political contestation even in hostile environments.

The theoretical contribution of the study lies in its articulation of a dynamic, multi-level model of human rights protection as a contested field in which norm erosion and norm resilience continuously interact. This model moves beyond both liberal optimism and critical fatalism by specifying the mechanisms that drive each dynamic and the conditions under which opportunities can be maximised. The concept of constitutional simulacra captures the specific contemporary danger of regimes that maintain rights discourse while disabling rights enforcement, and the analysis demonstrates that responding to this danger requires integrated strategies that span institutional, discursive, and material dimensions.

The practical implications are threefold. For domestic constitutional designers and legislators, the findings underscore the paramount importance of protecting the institutional prerequisites of rights enforcement—particularly judicial independence, media freedom, and civil society space—through constitutional entrenchment, procedural safeguards, and, where relevant, international anchoring. For international and regional human rights bodies, the analysis highlights the need to develop more robust early warning mechanisms, strengthen the justiciability of socioeconomic rights, extend accountability frameworks to private and digital actors, and coordinate across fragmented institutional landscapes. For civil society organisations and social movements, the findings affirm that legal mobilisation remains a vital strategy but must be embedded within broader political mobilisation, cultural change, and transnational solidarity networks.

The study has limitations that invite further research. The comparative case selection, while illustrative, is not exhaustive, and the framework's applicability to contexts beyond those examined—such as China, the Gulf states, or small island developing states facing existential climate threats—requires dedicated investigation. The analysis focused primarily on legal doctrine and institutional dynamics; future research should integrate empirical social science methods to measure the causal impact of the identified mechanisms on rights outcomes. Additionally, the normative

question of how to adjudicate trade-offs between competing rights and collective interests in an era of polycrisis remains under-theorised and demands sustained philosophical and legal engagement.

In an era of polycrisis—democratic, ecological, epidemiological—human rights protection confronts its most severe test since the Universal Declaration was adopted. The future of the project depends not on the mere accumulation of norms and institutions but on the strategic intelligence with which legal systems, civil societies, and transnational networks exploit the opportunities that persist even in the most challenging environments. The analysis presented here offers a framework for understanding that task and a cautious, but grounded, basis for hope.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, B. (2010). The emergency constitution. *Yale Law Journal*, 119 (5), 1029–1091.
- Agamben, G. (2005). *State of exception* (K. Attell, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Alston, P. (2020). The populist challenge to human rights. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 12 (1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huaa012>
- Alter, K. J., Helfer, L. R., & Madsen, M. R. (Eds.). (2018). *International court authority*. Oxford University Press.
- Balkin, J. M. (2018). Free speech in the algorithmic society: Big data, private governance, and new school speech regulation. *UC Davis Law Review*, 51 (3), 1149–1210.
- Bánkuti, M., Halmai, G., & Scheppele, K. L. (2012). Hungary's illiberal turn: Disabling the constitution. *Journal of Democracy*, 23 (3), 138–146. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2012.0054>
- Bhatia, G. (2020). *The executive and the constitution*. Oxford University Press.
- Binder, C. (2011). The prohibition of amnesties by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. *German Law Journal*, 12 (5), 1203–1230. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2071832200017222>
- De Gregorio, G. (2021). Digital constitutionalism in Europe: Reframing rights and powers in the algorithmic society. *Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies*, *23*, 78–102. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cel.2021.5>
- de Londras, F., & Davis, F. F. (2010). Controlling the executive in times of terrorism: Competing perspectives on effective oversight mechanisms. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, *30*(1), 19–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqq002>
- Deva, S. (2021). *Business and human rights: Alternative approaches to accountability*. Cambridge University Press.
- Deva, S., & Bilchitz, D. (Eds.). (2017). *Human rights obligations of business: Beyond the corporate responsibility to respect?* Cambridge University Press.

- Fenwick, H., & Phillipson, G. (2011). Covert derogations and judicial deference: Redefining liberty and due process rights in counterterrorism law. *McGill Law Journal*, *56*(4), 863–928. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1005841ar>
- Ferrer Mac-Gregor, E. (2011). Conventionality control: The new doctrine of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. *American Journal of International Law Unbound*, *105*, 107–112. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S239877230000140X>
- Ginsburg, T., & Huq, A. Z. (2018a). Democracy's 'near misses.' *Journal of Democracy*, *29*(4), 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2018.0060>
- Ginsburg, T., & Huq, A. Z. (2018b). *How to save a constitutional democracy*. University of Chicago Press.
- Ginsburg, T., & Versteeg, M. (2021). The bound executive: Emergency powers during the pandemic. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, *19*(5), 1474–1509. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moab083>
- Gross, O., & Ní Aoláin, F. (2006). *Law in times of crisis: Emergency powers in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hafner-Burton, E. M. (2008). Sticks and stones: Naming and shaming the human rights enforcement problem. *International Organization*, *62*(4), 689–716. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818308080243>
- Hafner-Burton, E. M. (2013). *Making human rights a reality*. Princeton University Press.
- Halmai, G. (2019). Populism, authoritarianism and constitutionalism. *German Law Journal*, *20*(3), 296–313. <https://doi.org/10.1017/glj.2019.23>
- Helfer, L. R., & Voeten, E. (2014). International courts as agents of legal change: Evidence from LGBT rights in Europe. *International Organization*, *68*(1), 77–110. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818313000392>
- Heyns, C., & Killander, M. (2013). Africa. In D. Moeckli, S. Shah, & S. Sivakumaran (Eds.), *International human rights law* (2nd ed., pp. 462–479). Oxford University Press.
- Hirschl, R. (2014). *Comparative matters: The renaissance of comparative constitutional law*. Oxford University Press.
- Hopgood, S. (2013). *The endtimes of human rights*. Cornell University Press.
- Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: Doctrinal legal research. *Deakin Law Review*, *17*(1), 83–119. <https://doi.org/10.21153/dlr2012vol17no1art70>
- Kaye, D. (2019). *Speech police: The global struggle to govern the internet*. Columbia Global Reports.

- Kaye, D. (2020). The UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression and the regulation of digital content: A framework for digital rights. *Journal of International Law and International Relations*, *15*(1), 1–23.
- Khosla, M. (2012). *The Indian Constitution*. Oxford University Press.
- Koh, H. H. (1997). Why do nations obey international law? *Yale Law Journal*, *106*(8), 2599–2659. <https://doi.org/10.2307/797228>
- Landau, D. (2013). Abusive constitutionalism. *UC Davis Law Review*, *47*(1), 189–260.
- Langford, M. (Ed.). (2019). *Social rights jurisprudence: Emerging trends in international and comparative law* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How democracies die*. Crown.
- Liebenberg, S. (2010). *Socio-economic rights: Adjudication under a transformative constitution*. Juta.
- Meeran, R. (2020). Multinational corporations and human rights litigation: A practical guide. *Human Rights Law Review*, *20*(3), 549–578. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngaa024>
- Moyn, S. (2010). *The last utopia: Human rights in history*. Harvard University Press.
- Moyn, S. (2018). *Not enough: Human rights in an unequal world*. Harvard University Press.
- Nanima, R. D. (2021). The right to privacy in the digital age in Africa: A case for legislative intervention. *African Human Rights Law Journal*, *21*(1), 27–52. <https://doi.org/10.17159/1996-2096/2021/v21n1a2>
- Peel, J., & Osofsky, H. M. (2018). A rights turn in climate change litigation? *Transnational Environmental Law*, *7*(1), 37–67. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2047102517000292>
- Posner, E. A. (2014). *The twilight of human rights law*. Oxford University Press.
- Rodríguez-Garavito, C. (2011). Beyond the courtroom: The impact of judicial activism on socioeconomic rights in Latin America. *Texas Law Review*, *89*(7), 1669–1698.
- Rossiter, C. (1948). *Constitutional dictatorship: Crisis government in the modern democracies*. Princeton University Press.
- Ruggie, J. G. (2013). *Just business: Multinational corporations and human rights*. W. W. Norton.
- Sadurski, W. (2019). *Poland's constitutional breakdown*. Oxford University Press.
- Scheppele, K. L. (2018). Autocratic legalism. *University of Chicago Law Review*, *85*(2), 545–583.

- Scheppele, K. L. (2020). The pandemic and the constitution: Hungary's Enabling Act in comparative perspective. *Verfassungsblog*. <https://doi.org/10.17176/20200423-173327-0>
- Scheppele, K. L. (2022). The party's over: What comes after autocratic legalism? *Verfassungsblog*. <https://doi.org/10.17176/20220112-153023-0>
- Shany, Y. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic and international human rights law. *Journal of International Humanitarian Legal Studies*, 11 (2), 197–213. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18781527-01102001>
- Sikkink, K. (2017). *Evidence for hope: Making human rights work in the 21st century*. Princeton University Press.
- Sikkink, K., & Kim, H. J. (2013). The justice cascade: The origins and effectiveness of prosecutions of human rights violations. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 9, 269–285. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-102612-133956>
- Simmons, B. A. (2009). *Mobilizing for human rights: International law in domestic politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Simmons, B. A. (2013). Civil rights in international law: Compliance with aspects of the 'International Bill of Rights.' *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 16 (2), 437–481. <https://doi.org/10.2979/gls.2009.16.2.437>
- Waldron, J. (2006). The core of the case against judicial review. *Yale Law Journal*, 115 (6), 1346–1406. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20455656>
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.