



Correspondence

✉ Faiza Anwar
faiza.anwar.ryk@superior.edu.pk

Received

21, 08, 25

Accepted

18, 09, 2025

Copyrights

© 2025 Authors. This is an open, access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).



["Click to Cite"](#)

Disability Rights as Human Rights: Persistent Barriers and Societal Failure

Faiza Anwar¹, Aamir Gul Memon²

- 1 Ph.D. Scholar Department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences, Faculty of Allied Health Sciences, Superior University, Lahore, Pakistan
- 2 Associate Professor, Department of Physical Therapy & Rehabilitation Sciences, Faculty of Allied Health Sciences, Superior University, Lahore Pakistan

EDITORIAL

Disability rights are human rights, this principle is unambiguously affirmed by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which reframes disability as a matter of dignity, equality, participation, and non-discrimination rather than discretionary welfare (1). Yet, despite near-universal endorsement of rights-based language, the daily realities of many persons with disabilities continue to reflect exclusion from schools, workplaces, health services, transport systems, digital spaces, and civic participation. This persistent gap does not stem from an absence of normative guidance; it reflects predictable governance failures, weak accountability, under-resourced implementation, inaccessible environments, and enduring stigma, that societies repeatedly tolerate, therefore reproducing inequity.

First, implementation remains the central fault line, laws and policies may exist, yet enforcement mechanisms are often fragile, fragmented, or performative. Rights require operational architecture: defined standards, financed plans, measurable indicators, transparent reporting, and independent oversight with authority to investigate and compel corrective action. Guidance from the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights emphasizes that independent monitoring frameworks are not optional add-ons, they are central to translating treaty commitments into enforceable practice, particularly when affected communities are systematically excluded from oversight (2). In parallel, disability-inclusive governance is weakened when consultation is episodic or symbolic rather than continuous and decision-relevant; meaningful involvement of organizations of persons with disabilities in planning, implementation, and monitoring is repeatedly reaffirmed in United Nations reporting, yet remains inconsistently institutionalized (3).

Second, conceptual confusion continues to distort policy, medical and charity narratives still dominate public messaging, service design, and administrative decision-making. When disability is framed primarily as individual deficit or pity-based dependency, autonomy is diluted and the threshold for state action becomes benevolence rather than obligation. A rights-based approach requires conceptual clarity: impairment may be part of human diversity, whereas disability is frequently produced and amplified by social arrangements, built environments that exclude, institutions that segregate, and systems that deny reasonable accommodation. This is precisely why inclusive education debates remain so contested; even in well-resourced settings, competing discourses allow rights to be postponed indefinitely under the guise of practical constraints, unless policy is explicitly anchored in participation, equality, and accessibility as non-negotiable standards (4).

Third, inaccessible environments remain a pervasive form of structural discrimination, physical barriers, communication barriers, and digital barriers all constrain participation, while the absence of reasonable accommodation makes exclusion appear routine. Accessibility is not merely technical; it is a distributive choice about whose bodies and minds are treated as normative. The WHO continues to highlight the importance of assistive technology ecosystems, affordability, procurement, service delivery, workforce capacity, and active involvement of users in policy and implementation, because access failures are rarely accidental and often predictable (5). Likewise, disability-inclusive budgeting is indispensable, since commitments without resources are not commitments at all; budgeting frameworks increasingly stress that expenditures can actively entrench exclusion when they finance segregation, institutionalization, or inaccessible infrastructure rather than universal design and community inclusion (6).

Fourth, attitudinal barriers remain both cause and consequence of exclusion, stigma, low expectations, and misconceptions reduce social contact, suppress representation, and normalize discrimination across life domains. These dynamics intensify when persons with disabilities are absent from leadership and policy spaces, since visibility and decision-making power are essential for correcting distorted assumptions and prioritizing lived realities in governance. Societies therefore require sustained, evidence-informed public education, disability-inclusive curricula, and deliberate leadership pathways that move beyond token representation, because rights are most reliably protected when those most affected help design, implement, and evaluate the systems intended to serve them (4, 6).

In short, the ongoing failure to realize disability rights is best understood as a pattern of political and administrative choices rather than inevitable limitation. A credible rights-based agenda is measurable and actionable, independent monitoring with real authority, financed implementation plans, accessibility standards enforced across public and private sectors, reliable provision of reasonable accommodation, and universal design embedded in infrastructure and digital policy. Equally, an intersectional lens is essential, since disability interacts with gender, poverty, geography, and other forms of marginalization to produce layered exclusion that generic policies routinely miss. If societies operationalize these obligations, such as by institutionalizing disabled-led governance, aligning budgets with inclusion, and enforcing accessibility as a baseline rather than an aspiration, then the promise of the CRPD can move from ratification to reality (7).

REFERENCES

1. United Nations. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. New York: United Nations; 2006.
2. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Implementing the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Role of Independent Monitoring Frameworks. Geneva: OHCHR; 2023.
3. United Nations General Assembly. Report on the implementation of the United Nations Disability Inclusion Strategy. New York: United Nations; 2023.
4. Leijen Å, Arcidiacono F, Baucal A. The Dilemma of Inclusive Education: Inclusion for Some or Inclusion for All. *Front Psychol*. 2021;12:633066. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.633066.
5. World Health Organization. Progress Indicators for Access to Assistive Technology. Geneva: WHO; 2025.
6. United Nations Development Programme. Guidelines for Disability-Inclusive Budgeting. New York: UNDP; 2024.