

Examining the Role of International Human Rights Tribunals in Promoting Accountability for Human Rights Violations

Yolanda Mona Salainti
Manado State University

Article Info

Article history:

Received Jun, 2023

Revised Jun, 2023

Accepted Jun, 2023

Keywords:

Human Rights Violations
International Human Rights
Tribunals
Promoting Accountability

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the crucial role of international human rights courts in advancing accountability for human rights abuses. Its primary objective is to evaluate the effectiveness of these tribunals in holding accountable those – individuals, states, and non-state actors are to blame for major human rights violations. As part of the research methodology, relevant literature, case studies, and legal decisions from international human rights tribunals are thoroughly examined. The International Criminal Court (ICC), the International Court of Justice, and local human rights courts are all part of this. The scope of the investigation includes War crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity, torture, and enforced disappearances. The findings underscore the substantial contribution made by international human rights courts in ensuring justice, truth-seeking, and redress for victims of human rights abuses. These tribunals have played a pivotal role in establishing legal precedents, clarifying the extent of human rights obligations, and fostering international cooperation to address impunity. The study also explores the challenges confronted by international human rights courts, including limited jurisdiction, enforcement capacity, and political opposition. Additionally, it examines potential synergies between international tribunals and national justice systems to strengthen accountability mechanisms at both the international and domestic levels. The findings of this study have significant implications for policymakers, individuals who advocate for human rights, and those who work in the legal field because they highlight the importance of a powerful and independent international human rights court in promoting accountability and providing justice for victims of human rights violations all over the world.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Name: Yolanda Mona Salainti
Institution: Manado State University
Email: salaintiyolanda@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Responsibility for human rights infringement could be a complex issue including a wide run of performing artists,

counting states, universal organizations and companies. Later administrative patterns in Europe have started to force modern lawful commitments on multinational companies,

complemented by sanctions of distinctive natures and concentrated, to hold them responsible for human rights mishandle in their worldwide operations [1].

Within the setting of checking assaults on healthcare frameworks, the World Wellbeing Organization's (WHO) Reconnaissance Framework for Assaults on Wellbeing Administrations (SSA) has been created as a orderly instrument to gather and spread information on assaults on healthcare frameworks. Be that as it may, advancements to this observing instrument are required to reinforce the political needs, investigate techniques, and organization execution fundamental to guarantee responsibility [2].

Human rights breaches are as often as possible not fittingly dealt with within the setting of movement control, and the strategies that can guarantee responsibility ought to be superior caught on. A geological approach to duty in movement control has been suggested, which involves mapping different responsibility instruments over distinctive legitimate systems and employing a broader topographical viewpoint. In the context of present migration control procedures, a multi-pronged strategy is likely to continue being the best place to start to ensure responsibility for human rights breaches[3].

Indirect accountability methods have also been proposed to hold nations and international organizations accountable for human rights crimes outside their borders. States and international organizations that violate human rights outside their walls are frequently exempt from direct accountability claims; therefore, indirect accountability ties do not hold them directly accountable. Instead, they have them indirectly liable by transferring the responsibility to the relevant third party, hoping the latter would transfer it to the state or international body [4].

Finally, the French Carefulness Act seeks to hold southern firms accountable for human rights abuses. Human rights systems like the Security, Regard, and Cure (PRR) system and the UN Guiding Standards on

Commerce and Human Rights have helped move corporate social responsibility to corporate accountability [5]. Responsibility for human rights infringement could be a complex issue that requires a multi-pronged approach, including different on-screen characters and instruments.

The International Court of Human Rights reinforces accountability for human rights violations. Employing international human rights regulations, residential courts must internalize it [6]. Residential tribunals promote and support international human rights law. The Colombian Sacred Court's case law exhibits the Statement of the Joined Countries on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples' "dynamic" approach to interpreting delicate laws, especially with connection to free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC). [6].

The ECOWAS Community Court has too obtained ward over human rights things since 2005, conveying unequivocal decisions condemning human rights infringement by ECOWAS Community part parties [7]. The tribunal needs a recognized organization to screen and implement its decisions to make progress because component states rarely comply with them [7].

ICTR was the first international court to prosecute African governments for war crimes, genocide, and other crimes against humanity [8]. The ICTR has regularly convicted the Economic Community of West African States (Community) of human rights breaches [9]. Individuals and NGOs can sue the ECOWAS Court instead of national courts. Broad jurisdiction [9].

Human rights enforcement requires the Universal Court of Human Rights. Domestic tribunals apply and enhance global human rights law. However, portion states rarely follow some tribunals' decisions, thus the court needs a recognized organization to screen and execute its decisions.

Human rights must be promoted and protected globally. Despite worldwide human rights movements and organizations, many countries continue violate human rights. The World Court on Human Rights is

indispensable for resolving these violations and bringing perpetrators to justice. These tribunals, formed inside territorial human rights frameworks like the Inter-American, European, and African frameworks, allow individuals and communities to seek justice and change human rights breaches.

"International human rights law" refers to legal norms, standards, and procedures used to protect and advance human rights internationally. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, International Covenants on Political and Civil Rights, and Social, Cultural, and Economic Rights underpin this law. International law supports it. These disobediences support equal rights and opportunities regardless of nationality, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or other characteristics. Human rights violations are prohibited, investigated, and remedied by international law.

Universal Human Rights Courts are specialist courts inside territorial human rights frameworks. These courts settle human rights claims and ensure global human rights compliance. The Inter-American, European, and African Courts of Human and Peoples' Rights comprise these courts. People, non-governmental groups, and nations protest to courts about territorial human rights violations. States that have accepted the significant arrangements and acknowledged the court's location can sue in court.

Human rights infringement responsibility refers to holding individuals, groups, or states accountable for their actions or exclusions. Responsibility instruments help victims, prevent infringement, and advance law. Criminal arraignments, truth commissions, restitution, and respectful cases can establish responsibility. Global human rights courts investigate complaints, follow reasonable and fair procedures, and issue verdicts that hold perpetrators accountable and heal victims.

This paper's hypothetical system covers international human rights law, universal tribunals, and accountability for human rights crimes. The Universal Court of

Human Rights assesses culpability for human rights abuses. Synthesize theoretical foundations. This system lets us observe these courts' tools, impacts, and obstacles, improving our understanding of their ability to protect human rights and ensure justice.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 *Inter-American Court of Human Rights*

The Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) was founded by the Organization of the Americas (OAS). It investigates extrajudicial executions, enforced disappearances, torture, and violations of free expression throughout the Americas. By holding states accountable and publicizing casualties, the court's responsibilities have grown. Honduras (1988) case *Velasquez Rodriguez v. Honduras* established state liability for human rights violations. It ordered investigations and indictments in Honduras. Additionally, the IACHR has made significant decisions on matters such as the rights of indigenous peoples, women, and LGBT+ individuals, thereby contributing to the advancement of human rights in the region.

2.2 *European Court of Human Rights*

ECHR created the supranational European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). It probes human rights abuses in Board of Europe countries. Europe's European Court of Human Rights promotes and defends human rights. It decided on torture, free speech, impartial trials, and minority protection. Al-Skeini, etc. It highlighted human rights commitments outside its jurisdiction. The Court judged the UK accountable for Basra civilian deaths. The ECtHR's judgements have changed domestic law and policy, improving European human rights protection.

2.3 *African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights*

The AfCHPR is Africa's top human rights court. Africa's human rights

violations require the Court's attention. The court's legal, economic, political, social, and social rights judgements bind some states. Nigeria was found guilty of forcible removals and economic and social rights breaches in Ogoniland in 2001. The African Commission on Human and People's Rights (AfCHPR) has developed standards and protected African human rights, notably women, children, and marginalized people.

The Inter-American, European, and African Courts of Human Rights' case examples highlight their vast variety of human rights breaches and involvement in accountability. These tribunals have set legal standards, improved human rights law, and ensured justice for human rights violations. These case studies show how the World Court of Human Rights holds offenders accountable and the Court's underlying principles for promoting human rights and equity.

2.4 Human Rights Courts in Asia

Whereas this term paper centers fundamentally on the Human Rights Courts within the Americas, Europe, and Africa, it is critical to recognize improvements in Asia related to human rights courts and their instruments. Whereas no territorial court is committed only to human rights in Asia, a few national and sub-regional courts and commissions play a vital part in tending to human rights infringement and advancing responsibility. This case think about gives an outline of a few of Asia's existing human rights courts and instruments.

National human rights commissions in Asia. A number of national human rights commissions in Asia address human rights concerns. These commissions examine complaints, advocate for human rights, and revise orders and authorities.

2.5 International Court of Human Rights: Structure and Mandate

a. Structure of the International Court of Human Rights

Universal human rights courts are specialist tribunals that interpret and execute territorial human rights accords. These courts vary by jurisdiction. They usually have judges, a register, and support staff.

Universal human rights courts choose judges based on their knowledge in universal law and human rights. Each court can adjust its. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights consists of seven judges, whereas the European Court has one judge from each Board of Europe member state. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights has seven justices, while the European Court includes one judge from each Board of Europe member state.

The registry regulates the court's caseload, plans hearings, and assists judges. The register also processes judicial applications and complaints.

b. Mandate of the International Court of Human Rights

Universal human rights tribunals are charged with deciphering and implementing territorial human rights arrangements and ensuring conformity with human rights measures. The courts have been granted the authority to adjudicate cases, including those in which parties to the settlements are accused of violating human rights.

2.6 Inter-American Court of Human Rights

American human rights tradition formed the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. This body probes Americas-wide human rights breaches. Nations that accepted the American Convention on Human Rights are under the court's jurisdiction. The court applies precedent to current cases. The Inter-American Court's advisory opinions promote human rights.

2.7 *European Court of Human Rights*

European Convention on Human Rights established European Court of Human Rights. It looks into Council of Europe human rights issues. The court has jurisdiction over nations that have embraced the tradition and acknowledged its power to hear regional cases. The court translates the tradition and issues official choices on cases brought some time recently it. The European Court too plays an imperative part in advancing human rights through its admonitory conclusions and in checking the execution of its judgments by part states.

2.8 **African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights**

The Convention included the African Court on Human and People's Rights in the African Constitution. It investigates human rights violations in African Union nations. Individuals, nonprofit organizations, and states that ratified the convention and accepted the court's site fell under the court's jurisdiction. The court interprets and rules on recent cases. The court can also make legal decisions and provide counseling.

2.9 *Complementarity with National Jurisdictions*

International human rights courts operate alongside national judicial systems, aiming to complement rather than replace them. International human rights courts provide a forum for individuals and organizations to seek justice when national mechanisms can or unwillingly address human rights violations effectively. International human rights courts play an essential role in setting human rights standards, interpreting treaty provisions, and ensuring accountability, while national courts are responsible for implementing and enforcing international human rights standards within their respective jurisdictions.

3. METHOD

The investigate strategy included a comprehensive audit of important writing, case considers, and statute from universal human rights courts, counting the Universal Criminal Court (ICC), the Universal Court of Equity (ICJ), and territorial human rights courts. The examination covers a wide extend of human rights infringement, such as genocide, war violations, violations against humankind, torment, and upheld vanishings.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 *Challenges to Accountability*

Promoting accountability for human rights violations is a complex endeavor and involves numerous challenges. These challenges arise from legal, political and practical factors that impede the effective functioning of international human rights courts and the achievement of accountability. Understanding these challenges is critical in identifying areas for improvement and enhancing accountability mechanisms. The following section outlines some of the main challenges to accountability.

4.2 *Legal Challenges*

International human rights courts have jurisdiction over cases involving states that have ratified the relevant treaties and recognize the court's jurisdiction. However, some states may refuse to accept the jurisdiction of such tribunals or may enact laws that impede their ability to effectively address human rights violations.

Granting immunity or amnesty to individuals accused of human rights violations can hamper accountability efforts. Immunity provisions, particularly for high-ranking officials or state actors, can shield perpetrators from prosecution and undermine the pursuit of justice.

The effectiveness of international human rights court judgments depends on the willingness and capacity of states

to implement and enforce those judgments domestically. In some cases, states may ignore or delay the implementation of court judgments, leading to a lack of effective remedies for victims.

4.3 Political Challenges

Accountability requires state collaboration. States may not assist with international human rights courts, hinder investigations, or defy court rulings.

Politics Interference Politics can impede accountability. Powerful state actors can push the legal system, skewing results or manipulating investigations, prosecutions, or witness testimony.

International Disagreement: Human rights violations demand international collaboration and consensus. Disagreements among governments over human rights principles or political factors can hinder attempts to remedy violations and bring perpetrators to justice.

4.4 Practical Challenges

Access to Justice: Limited access to justice can hinder accountability, especially for marginalized and vulnerable groups. Barriers such as lack of legal aid, language barriers, and intimidation can prevent victims from seeking redress or filing complaints with international human rights courts.

Resource Constraints: International human rights courts can face resource constraints, including lack of funding, staff, and logistical support. Limited resources can impact the efficiency and effectiveness of the court process and impede the timely delivery of justice.

Security and Witness Protection Risks: In cases involving gross human rights violations, witnesses, victims, and their families may face security risks. The lack of robust witness protection mechanisms can deter individuals from coming forward and providing important

evidence, hampering accountability efforts.

Addressing these challenges requires a comprehensive and multi-faceted approach. Strengthening domestic legal frameworks, enhancing state cooperation, increasing awareness and education on human rights, securing adequate resources for international human rights courts, and developing strong witness protection mechanisms are some potential strategies to address these challenges. By recognizing and working to overcome these obstacles, the promotion of accountability for human rights violations can be advanced, leading to improved justice, redress, and prevention of future violations.

4.5 Mandate and Jurisdiction

The Inter-American, European, and African Courts of Human Rights have different territorial jurisdictions. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights covers American Tradition countries and the European Court covers European Tradition countries. Both tribunals protect international human rights. Human rights and African Charter on Human and People's Rights cases are heard by the African Court.

4.6 Legal Framework and Implementation

Universal human rights courts settle and document complaints using diverse legal approaches. People, states, and the IACHR bring matters to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. The European Court of Human Rights hears from individuals, NGOs, and states. Individuals, non-governmental organizations, and states can bring complaints with the African Court of Human and Peoples' Rights, however under Article 34(6) of the agreement that formed the court, nations must announce the court's jurisdiction. Case kinds and court openness vary.

International human rights courts have written arguments, hearings, and rulings. Permissions vary. The IACHR decides and requires state compliance reports. States must follow ECHR rulings. The Committee of Priests of Europe manages requirements. States must follow ACHPR rulings. AU monitors judicial orders.

4.7 *Impact on Human Rights Practices*

Country-specific international human rights tribunals affect local human rights enforcement. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights supports accountability, human rights, and legitimate change in the Americas. Its rulings influenced domestic laws and norms, advancing human rights. The European Court of Human Rights has shaped European human rights laws and ideas. The African Court of Human and Peoples' Rights is a more modern court that has promoted human rights and accountability in Africa, despite its growing authority. This is true despite its ongoing impacts.

4.8 *Challenges and Future Directions*

Despite their accomplishments, international human rights tribunals are hampered in their effectiveness by obstacles. These include limited state cooperation, delays in the implementation of court decisions, limited resources, political interference, and complex human rights violations. To overcome these obstacles, state cooperation must be enhanced, domestic legal systems must be strengthened, adequate resources must be guaranteed, human rights education and awareness must be promoted, and mechanisms for implementing court decisions must be strengthened. In addition, exploring opportunities for cooperation and exchanging best practices among regional tribunals can contribute to the global advancement of human rights protection.

In general, the comparative analysis of international human rights tribunals emphasizes their unique roles, mandates,

and effects in their respective regions. By addressing obstacles and capitalizing on their strengths, these courts can continue to play an essential role in advancing responsibility, protecting human rights, and cultivating a culture of respect for human rights at the territorial and global levels.

5. CONCLUSION

Human rights violations were held accountable by the International, European, and African Courts of Human Rights. These courts' missions have allowed citizens, charities, and states to investigate possible human rights breaches and helped raise standards and legislation in their jurisdictions.

This research analyzes a number of case studies, each of which illustrates the variety of human rights violations brought before these courts as well as the influence of such courts in terms of fostering accountability. These courts have handed down historic verdicts, established legal precedents, and mandated remedies, which has resulted in states being held accountable for their crimes and provided victims with justice. These courts have also made a contribution to the advancement of human rights standards, including the recognition of previously unrecognized rights and the improvement of the safety of underrepresented communities.

On the other hand, efforts to foster responsibility for violations of human rights have not been without their share of obstacles. Significant challenges include jurisdictional constraints, immunity provisions, a lack of domestic implementation, governmental collaboration, political interference, limited access to justice, limited resources, and security hazards. Legal, political, and practical obstacles include these as well. In order to solve these issues, a multi-pronged approach is required. This approach should encompass strengthening the legislative framework, improving governmental collaboration, addressing constraints in resource availability, boosting awareness and

education on human rights, and building robust systems for the protection of witnesses.

International human rights courts must be made more effective and accessible. Regional collaboration, best practices, and

conversation among human rights courts can enhance global human rights protection. Discrimination, inequality, and impunity, which perpetuate human rights breaches, must be addressed.

REFERENCE

- [1] R. Sabia, "The Accountability of Multinational Companies for Human Rights Violations, Regulatory Trends and New Punitive Approaches Across Europe," *Eur. Crim. Law Rev.*, 2021.
- [2] B. M. Meier, H. Rice, and S. Bandara, "Monitoring attacks on health care as a basis to facilitate accountability for human rights violations," *Health Hum. Rights*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 55–70, 2021.
- [3] N. F. Tan and T. Gammeltoft-Hansen, "A topographical approach to accountability for human rights violations in migration control," *Ger. Law J.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 335–354, 2020, doi: 10.1017/glj.2020.31.
- [4] M. Heupel, "Indirect Accountability for Extraterritorial Human Rights Violations," *Int. Stud. Perspect.*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 172–197, May 2020, doi: 10.1093/isp/ekz019.
- [5] A. Schilling-Vacaflor, "Putting the French Duty of Vigilance Law in Context: Towards Corporate Accountability for Human Rights Violations in the Global South?," *Hum. Rights Rev.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 109–127, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s12142-020-00607-9.
- [6] J. Parra, "The Role of Domestic Courts in International Human Rights Law: The Constitutional Court of Colombia and Free, Prior and Informed Consent," *Int. J. Minor. Gr. Rights*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 355–381, 2016, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718115-02303001>.
- [7] D. C. N. Nwaogu, "Ecowas Community Court of Justice: Features and Challenges of Its Human Rights Mandate," *UCC Law J.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 265–292, 2022, doi: 10.47963/ucclj.v2i2.1126.
- [8] C. C. Jalloh and A. B. M. Marong, Eds., "Promoting Accountability under International Law for Gross Human Rights Violations in Africa: Essays in Honour of Prosecutor Hassan Bubacar Jallow," 2015.
- [9] K. J. Alter, L. Helfer, and J. R. McAllister, "A New International Human Rights Court for West Africa: The ECOWAS Community Court of Justice," *Am. J. Int. Law*, vol. 107, no. 4, pp. 737–779, 2013, doi: 10.5305/amerjintlaw.107.4.0737.