

Norm Internalization of Western Powers (United States, United Kingdom, and France) Regarding Respect for Human Rights in the International Community

Yekta. Behnam Roudsari¹ , Afshin. Zargar^{2*} , Zeinab. Esmati³ 

¹ Department of Public International Law, Ka.C., Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran

² Department of International Relations, Ka.C., Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran

³ Law Department, Ka.C., Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: a.zargar@kiau.ac.ir

Received: 2023-08-25	Revised: 2023-10-13	Accepted: 2023-11-01	Published: 2023-12-28
EDITOR: Tahereh Ebrahimifar ^{id} Head of Sociology Department, Faculty of Arts, Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt. Email: Tah.Ebrahimifar@iauctb.ac.ir			
REVIEWER 1: Mohammadbagher. Jafari ^{id} Department of Sociology of Culture, Istanbul, Türkiye. Email: mbjafari@kmanresce.ca			
REVIEWER 2: Jeremiah Thuku Thuku ^{id} Department of Literary and Communication Studies, Laikipia University, Nyahururu, Kenya. Email: jerethukuthuku@gmail.com			

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The role of power in shaping human rights norms is discussed, but it would strengthen your argument to include more concrete examples of how Western powers' actions have deviated from their proclaimed respect for human rights. Consider providing specific cases from recent international conflicts.

When referencing the Human Rights Committee's general comment on Article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, consider explaining how this specific framework can be applied to the three countries discussed (USA, UK, France).

The discussion on specialized committees is insightful, but the connection to the countries you focus on (USA, UK, France) is weak. Are these committees effective in holding them accountable? Including this analysis would enhance the relevance of this section.

While discussing the UK's counterterrorism laws, a specific focus on the UK's involvement in international human rights violations, such as in the Middle East or its domestic surveillance practices, would better tie this section to the overarching theme of norm internalization.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

When discussing the inconsistency between the power of states and their human rights obligations, it would benefit the paper to acknowledge how global power dynamics (e.g., economic interests) complicate the adherence to international human rights standards.

You reference the "adoption of binding standards," but the text could benefit from a deeper exploration of which specific legal instruments you are referring to. Including the names of treaties or conventions would clarify the mechanisms you mention.

The statement "states must be committed to their human rights obligations" is quite general. This argument would be stronger if you elaborated on how different international organizations (e.g., UN, ICC) actively hold states accountable for violations.

While the role of civil society in ensuring respect for human rights is acknowledged, more empirical examples would be helpful here to illustrate how civil society has successfully pushed for greater accountability. Adding case studies could make your argument more persuasive.

The section could be expanded by adding a critique or analysis of the effectiveness of these rapporteurs. How have their reports impacted Western powers' adherence to human rights norms, and what tangible changes, if any, have occurred as a result?

In this section, the historical analysis of U.S. foreign policy is relevant, but it could be more focused on the normative theory framework. You mention "strategic interests" but fail to explore how this concept relates to the moral duty of states to uphold human rights.

The mention of U.S. military interventions in the Middle East is an important point, but the paper would benefit from a deeper discussion on how these actions contradict international human rights law, especially in relation to norms of sovereignty and non-intervention.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.