Page 1944 - 1961 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.119736*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 3

2025

Evolution of Rule of Law

ASMITA SINGH[1] AND DR VIVEK GOYAL[2]

ABSTRACT

The Rule of Law, a cornerstone of modern liberal democracies and a benchmark for just governance globally, is not a static monolith but a concept that has undergone profound evolution over millennia. This article traces its complex trajectory, beginning with ancient precursors in Mesopotamia, Greece, and Rome that established foundational ideas of codified law, fairness, and limits on power. It examines the critical contributions of the medieval period, particularly the Magna Carta and the development of common law in England, which entrenched principles of due process and accountability. The Enlightenment provided the crucial philosophical scaffolding, with thinkers like Locke, Montesquieu, and Rousseau articulating theories of natural rights, separation of powers, and social contracts that fueled revolutionary transformations in America and France, institutionalizing the Rule of Law within constitutional frameworks. The 19th century saw its formalization, notably through A.V. Dicey's influential formulation, alongside the rise of constitutionalism and administrative law. The cataclysms of the 20th century, particularly the World Wars and the rise of totalitarianism, spurred the internationalization of the Rule of Law, linking it intrinsically with human rights through instruments like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and regional conventions. Finally, the article analyzes contemporary challenges and adaptations in the face of globalization, technological advancements, terrorism, and the resurgence of illiberalism, highlighting the ongoing tension between formal and substantive conceptions and the persistent struggle to realize its ideals universally. The article argues that the Rule of Law's evolution reflects a continuous, often contested, journey towards limiting arbitrary power and ensuring governance under laws that are just, predictable, and equally applied.

Keywords: *Rule of Law, Legal History, Constitutionalism, Political Philosophy, Human Rights, Governance, Magna Carta, Enlightenment, Dicey.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The phrase "Rule of Law" resonates powerfully in contemporary political and legal discourse. It is invoked as a prerequisite for stable governance, economic prosperity, democratic

[1] Author is a LL.M. student at School of Law, Graphic Era Hill University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India.
[2] Author is the HOD and Associate Professor at School of Law, Graphic Era Hill University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

legitimacy, and the protection of fundamental human rights.[3] Yet, despite its ubiquity, its meaning is often assumed rather than articulated, and its historical depth is frequently overlooked. The concept as understood today – encompassing principles like the supremacy of law, equality before the law, accountability to the law, fairness in its application, separation of powers, legal certainty, and the avoidance of arbitrariness[4] – is the product of a long, intricate, and often turbulent evolutionary process spanning diverse civilizations and intellectual traditions.

This article seeks to illuminate this evolution. It aims to trace the development of the core ideas underpinning the Rule of Law from its earliest identifiable precursors in antiquity to its complex manifestations and challenges in the 21st century. It is not a teleological narrative suggesting an inevitable march towards a predefined endpoint, but rather an exploration of how specific historical events, philosophical inquiries, political struggles, and institutional innovations have shaped and reshaped understandings and implementations of governance under law. We will examine key milestones, influential thinkers, and critical transformations, demonstrating that the Rule of Law is not merely a set of abstract principles but a dynamic concept forged in the crucible of human experience.

The journey begins in the ancient world, where foundational notions of written codes and impartial justice emerged. It proceeds through the medieval period, highlighting the crucial role of documents like Magna Carta and the development of legal systems that sought to constrain monarchical power. The Enlightenment era marks a pivotal turning point, providing the philosophical architecture for modern constitutionalism and embedding the Rule of Law within revolutionary frameworks. The 19th century witnessed attempts at systematic definition and consolidation, while the 20th century forced a confrontation with its antithesis – totalitarianism – leading to its internationalization and explicit linkage with human rights. Finally, we consider the contemporary landscape, where globalization, technology, and new political challenges continually test and reshape the Rule of Law's meaning and application. By understanding this rich and complex history, we can better appreciate both the enduring value and the inherent fragility of the Rule of Law today.

II. ANCIENT ROOTS AND PRECURSORS: ORDER, REASON, AND LAW

While the modern concept of the Rule of Law is distinct, its deepest roots lie in ancient civilizations' attempts to establish order and regulate social interactions through formalized

[3]United Nations, "What is the Rule of Law?", *United Nations and the Rule of Law*, available at https://www.un.org/ruleoflaw/what-is-the-rule-of-law/ (last visited on April 05, 2025)
[4] Tom Bingham, *The Rule of Law* (Penguin Books, 2011).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

rules.

1. Mesopotamia and the Codification of Law: Among the earliest examples is the Code of Hammurabi (c. 1754 BCE). Etched onto a stele for public view, it represented a significant step towards legal certainty and predictability. It proclaimed the king's desire "to make justice prevail in the land, to destroy the wicked and the evil, [so] that the strong might not oppress the weak."[5] While lauded for its attempt at comprehensive codification covering commercial, social, and criminal matters, Hammurabi's Code fell short of modern Rule of Law ideals. Penalties varied dramatically based on social status, starkly contradicting the principle of equality before the law. Its primary aim was arguably the consolidation of royal authority and the maintenance of social hierarchy through divine mandate, rather than limiting the ruler's own power under the law.[6] However, the very act of codifying and publicizing laws established a precedent for governance based on known rules rather than pure caprice.

2. Ancient Greece: Philosophy, Law, and *Isonomia*: Ancient Greek philosophy, particularly in Athens, engaged deeply with questions of law, justice, and governance. Plato, in *The Republic*, initially favored the rule of wise philosopher-kings over the rule of law, fearing the rigidity of laws could not adapt to complex situations. However, in his later work, *Laws*, he conceded the practical necessity of law's supremacy as a second-best solution in the absence of perfect rulers, arguing that a state where the law is subject to some other authority is on the highway to ruin.[7] His student, Aristotle, offered a more robust defense of the Rule of Law in *Politics*. He famously argued, "It is more proper that law should govern than any one of the citizens," contending that law represents reason free from passion.[8] While acknowledging laws could be flawed, he saw governance through established laws as generally superior to the rule of any individual, however wise, as it guarded against personal bias and arbitrary will. The Athenian concept of *isonomia* (equality before the law) also represented a crucial, albeit imperfectly realized, ideal within their democratic framework, suggesting that laws should apply uniformly to all citizens.[9]

3. Ancient Rome: From Twelve Tables to Natural Law: Roman civilization made monumental contributions to legal thought and practice. The Twelve Tables (c. 451-450 BCE), like Hammurabi's Code, aimed to codify existing customs and make law accessible, reducing the power of patrician magistrates to interpret unwritten law arbitrarily. Over

[5]Prologue to the Code of Hammurabi, *as translated in* L.W. King, *The Code of Hammurabi* (1910).
[6] Marc Van De Mieroop, *King Hammurabi of Babylon: A Biography* 108-111 (Blackwell Publishing, 2005).
[7]Plato, *Laws*, Book IV, 715d.
[8] Aristotle, *Politics*, Book III, 1287a.
[9] Martin Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law: Law, Society, and Politics in Fifth-Century Athens* (University of California Press, 1986).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

centuries, Roman law evolved into a sophisticated system, developing concepts like *jus civile* (law for citizens) and *jus gentium* (law of nations, applied to foreigners and based on common principles). Roman jurists refined legal reasoning, procedure, and concepts of property and contract that profoundly influenced subsequent Western legal traditions.[10] The philosopher and statesman Cicero (106-43 BCE) articulated a powerful conception of natural law, arguing that "True law is right reason in agreement with nature; it is of universal application, unchanging and everlasting..."[11] This idea suggested that human-made laws should conform to higher, universal principles of justice accessible through reason, implying that even the state's laws could be judged against this standard – a nascent form of constitutionalism. However, Roman reality, like Greek practice, often fell short, with vast inequalities based on citizenship, slavery, and gender, and emperors eventually consolidating immense power, often placing themselves above the law (*legibus solutus*).

4. These ancient precursors, while not embodying the Rule of Law in its modern fullness, laid essential groundwork: the importance of written, public laws (Hammurabi, Twelve Tables), the philosophical ideal of law as reason superior to individual will (Aristotle), the concept of equality before the law (*isonomia*), and the notion of higher principles guiding positive law (Cicero's natural law).

III. MEDIEVAL FOUNDATIONS: MAGNA CARTA AND THE RISE OF COMMON LAW

The European Middle Ages, often characterized as a period of fragmented authority, nonetheless witnessed crucial developments, particularly in England, that laid institutional and conceptual cornerstones for the Rule of Law.

1. Magna Carta (1215): A Landmark Concession: Sealed by King John at Runnymede under duress from rebellious barons, Magna Carta is arguably the most iconic document in the Rule of Law's lineage.[12] While initially a specific agreement addressing feudal grievances, its principles resonated far beyond their original context. Most famously, Clause 39 declared: "No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any other way, nor will we proceed with force against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land."[13] This enshrined principles of due process, trial by jury (in nascent form), and, crucially, subjected the monarch himself to the "law of the land." Clause 40 added, "To

[10] Barry Nicholas, *An Introduction to Roman Law* (Oxford University Press, 1962).
[11] Cicero, *De Re Publica*, Book III, xxii.
[12] J.C. Holt, *Magna Carta* (Cambridge University Press, 3rd edn., 2015).
[13] Magna Carta (1215), Clause 39, *Translation from the British Library*, available at https://www.bl.uk/magna-carta/articles/magna-carta-english-translation (last visited on April 17, 2025).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay right or justice." Although many clauses dealt with specific feudal rights, these provisions established the enduring principle that even the sovereign was not above the law and that power should be exercised according to established legal procedures. While its immediate impact fluctuated, Magna Carta was repeatedly reissued and confirmed by subsequent monarchs, embedding itself in English legal and political consciousness as a symbol of liberty and limited government.[14]

2. The Development of English Common Law: Concurrent with Magna Carta, the English common law system evolved through the decisions of royal courts. Unlike the codified systems derived from Roman law prevalent in continental Europe, common law developed incrementally through judicial precedents (stare decisis). Royal judges traveled circuits, applying existing customs and issuing rulings that became binding on future courts.[15] This fostered predictability and consistency. The writ system, requiring specific legal forms to bring a case, standardized procedures. Legal scholars like Henry de Bracton (d. 1268) compiled treatises attempting to systematize the common law, famously asserting that the King himself was "under God and under the law, because the law makes the king."[16] This development of an independent body of law, interpreted and applied by a professional judiciary, created a crucial counterweight to arbitrary royal power.

3. Sir Edward Coke and the Supremacy of Law: In the early 17th century, the tension between monarchical claims of absolute power (divine right of kings) and the common law tradition came to a head. Sir Edward Coke, Chief Justice, became a formidable champion of the common law's supremacy against King James I. In famous confrontations, Coke asserted that the King could not judge cases personally and was subject to the law, which he argued was based on "artificial reason" acquired through long study and experience, not the King's natural reason.[17] His defense of the common law courts' independence and his interpretation of Magna Carta as guaranteeing fundamental liberties laid vital groundwork for future constitutional struggles in England and profoundly influenced legal thought in the American colonies.

4. The medieval period, particularly in England, thus transformed abstract notions of legal limitation into concrete institutional practices. Magna Carta provided a foundational text,

[14] Claire Breay and Julian Harrison, *Magna Carta: Law, Liberty, Legacy* (British Library, 2015).
[15] J.H. Baker, *An Introduction to English Legal History* (Oxford University Press, 5th edn., 2019).
[16] Henry de Bracton, *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae*, f. 5b.
[17] *Prohibitions del Roy* (1607) 12 Co Rep 63. *See also* Roland G. Usher, "James I and Sir Edward Coke", 18 *The English Historical Review* 664-75 (1903).

while the common law offered a system through which principles of due process, judicial precedent, and the subordination of the sovereign to the law could gradually take root.

IV. ENLIGHTENMENT AND REVOLUTIONARY TRANSFORMATIONS: RIGHTS, REASON, AND CONSTITUTIONS

The Enlightenment of the 17th and 18th centuries provided the intellectual and philosophical engine for the modern conception of the Rule of Law, directly inspiring revolutionary movements that sought to embed it within new constitutional orders.

i. Philosophical Foundations: Enlightenment thinkers systematically challenged traditional sources of authority (divine right, hereditary privilege) and emphasized reason, individual rights, and popular sovereignty.

a. **John Locke (1632-1704):** In his *Two Treatises of Government*, Locke argued that individuals possess inherent natural rights (life, liberty, property) that predate government. Government is formed by social contract to protect these rights, deriving its legitimacy from the consent of the governed. Crucially, he advocated for limited government operating under established laws, stating, "Where-ever law ends, tyranny begins."[18]If the government violates the social contract and acts arbitrarily, the people have the right to resist.

b. **Montesquieu (1689-1755):** In *The Spirit of the Laws*, Montesquieu analyzed different forms of government and famously advocated for the separation of powers as essential for liberty. He argued that concentrating legislative, executive, and judicial powers in one body inevitably leads to tyranny. By dividing these functions among different branches, each could check the others, preventing any one from becoming too powerful and ensuring government action remained within legal bounds.[19] This structural principle became central to modern constitutional design aimed at upholding the Rule of Law.

c. **Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778):** While sometimes seen as ambiguous regarding individual rights versus the collective, Rousseau's concept of the "general will" in *The Social Contract* posited that legitimate law must reflect the common interest of the citizenry. Laws should apply equally to all, as the sovereign people cannot logically wish to impose unfair burdens upon themselves.[20] This emphasized the link between the Rule of Law, popular sovereignty, and equality.

[18]John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, Ch. XVIII, Sec. 202 (1689).
[19] Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws*, Book XI, Ch. 6 (1748).
[20] jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, Book II, Ch. 4 & 6 (1762).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

ii. The American Revolution and Constitution: The American colonists drew heavily on Enlightenment ideas, particularly Locke and Montesquieu, and the English common law tradition (including Coke's interpretation of Magna Carta) in their struggle against British rule. The Declaration of Independence (1776) invoked natural rights and listed grievances against King George III, many of which constituted violations of perceived Rule of Law principles (e.g., imposing taxes without consent, obstructing justice, keeping standing armies without consent of legislatures). The subsequent U.S. Constitution (1787) and Bill of Rights (1791) represented a landmark attempt to institutionalize the Rule of Law:[21]

a. It established a written constitution as supreme law, binding on all branches of government.

b. It implemented Montesquieu's separation of powers with a system of checks and balances.

c. It enshrined specific individual rights (freedom of speech, religion, due process, protection against unreasonable searches and seizures, right to counsel, trial by jury).

d. The later establishment of judicial review in *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) empowered the judiciary to strike down laws deemed unconstitutional, further solidifying the law's supremacy over political power.[22]

iii. The French Revolution and the Declaration of Rights: The French Revolution (1789) similarly aimed to replace arbitrary monarchical rule with a system based on law and popular sovereignty. The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1789) proclaimed fundamental principles like equality before the law (Article 6: "The law must be the same for all..."), protection against arbitrary arrest and detention (Article 7), the presumption of innocence (Article 9), and the separation of powers (Article 16: "Any society in which the guarantee of rights is not assured, nor the separation of powers determined, has no constitution.").[23] While the Revolution's subsequent trajectory, including the Reign of Terror, demonstrated the potential dangers of unchecked popular sovereignty and the fragility of establishing Rule of Law norms amidst radical upheaval, its core ideals profoundly influenced constitutional developments across Europe and beyond.

The Enlightenment and the subsequent revolutions transformed the Rule of Law from a set of historically contingent limitations on power into a foundational principle of legitimate government, grounded in reason, natural rights, and popular consent, and structurally

[21] Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Harvard University Press, 1967).
[22] *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).
[23] Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1789).

embedded within written constitutions featuring separation of powers and explicit guarantees of rights.

V. THE 19TH CENTURY: FORMALIZATION, CONSTITUTIONALISM, AND CHALLENGES

The 19th century witnessed the consolidation of nation-states, the spread of constitutionalism, and influential attempts to define the Rule of Law more systematically, alongside the emergence of new challenges.

i. **A.V. Dicey's Formulation:** The most influential definition of the Rule of Law during this period came from British jurist A.V. Dicey in his *Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution* (1885). Dicey identified three core meanings within the British context:[24]

a. **Supremacy of Regular Law:** "The absolute supremacy or predominance of regular law as opposed to the influence of arbitrary power... a man may be punished for a breach of law, but he can be punished for nothing else." This emphasized legal certainty and constraint on discretionary authority.

b. **Equality Before the Law:** "Equality before the law, or the equal subjection of all classes to the ordinary law of the land administered by the ordinary Law Courts." This meant everyone, including government officials, was subject to the same laws and courts.

c. **Constitution as a Result of Ordinary Law:** Rights are secured not by abstract constitutional guarantees but by the remedies provided by the ordinary law enforced by the courts (drawing on the common law tradition).

Dicey's formulation became highly influential, particularly in the common law world. However, it also attracted criticism. Critics argued it was overly formalistic, potentially overlooking unjust laws as long as they were properly enacted. It underestimated the growing importance of administrative law and discretionary powers necessary for the functioning of a modern state, and its third limb was specific to the uncodified nature of the British constitution.[25]

a. **Spread of Constitutionalism:** Throughout the 19th century, many European and Latin American nations adopted written constitutions, often inspired by the American and French models. These documents typically included bills of rights and established

[24] A.V. Dicey, *Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution* 183-205 (Macmillan, 8th edn., 1915).
[25] Ivor Jennings, *The Law and the Constitution*, Appendix II (University of London Press, 5th edn., 1959).

frameworks for government based on legal principles, furthering the institutionalization of Rule of Law norms, albeit with varying degrees of effectiveness in practice.[26]

b. **Rise of Legal Positivism:** This era also saw the rise of legal positivism, exemplified by thinkers like John Austin, who defined law simply as the command of a sovereign backed by sanctions.[27] While distinct from the Rule of Law (which involves normative constraints on how law is made and applied), positivism's emphasis on clear sources of law contributed to legal certainty. However, it also raised concerns, particularly later, about its potential indifference to the moral content of law, potentially legitimizing "Rule by Law" where oppressive laws are used as instruments of state power.

c. **Emerging Challenges:** Industrialization created new social problems and demands for state intervention, leading to an expansion of administrative bodies and regulations that challenged Dicey's ideal of "ordinary law" and raised new questions about controlling bureaucratic power. Nationalism and imperialism also presented complex challenges to universal Rule of Law ideals.

The 19th century, therefore, solidified the Rule of Law as a central concept of Western constitutionalism, marked by Dicey's influential definition and the spread of constitutional government, but also shaped by the rise of positivism and the emerging complexities of the modern administrative state.

VI. THE 20TH CENTURY: GLOBAL CRISES, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND INTERNATIONALIZATION

The 20th century subjected the Rule of Law to its most severe tests while simultaneously propelling its evolution onto the global stage.

i. **The Trauma of Totalitarianism:** The rise of fascist, Nazi, and communist regimes in the first half of the century demonstrated the horrific consequences when the Rule of Law collapses or is perverted into mere "Rule by Law." These regimes systematically dismantled legal constraints on state power, suppressed judicial independence, disregarded fundamental rights, and used law as an instrument of terror and oppression.[28] The experiences of World War I and, especially, World War II and the Holocaust underscored the fragility of legal norms and the profound dangers of unchecked state power operating outside genuine legal constraints.

[26] Maurizio Viroli, *Constitutionalism* (Oxford University Press, 2020).
[27] John Austin, *The Province of Jurisprudence Determined* (1832)
[28] Ernst Fraenkel, *The Dual State: A Contribution to the Theory of Dictatorship* (Oxford University Press, 1941); Richard Overy, *The Dictators: Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia* (W. W. Norton & Company, 2004).

ii. **Post-War Reconstruction and International Human Rights:** The Allied victory and the desire to prevent future catastrophes led to a renewed emphasis on the Rule of Law and its explicit linkage with universal human rights.

- The **United Nations Charter (1945)** enshrined principles of international law, human rights, and fundamental freedoms.
- The **Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (1948)**, while not initially legally binding, proclaimed a common standard of achievement for all peoples and nations. It explicitly referenced the Rule of Law in its preamble ("it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law") and included numerous articles reflecting Rule of Law principles (e.g., equality before the law, presumption of innocence, right to a fair trial, prohibition of arbitrary arrest).[29]
- Regional instruments like the **European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) (1950)** created legally binding obligations and enforcement mechanisms (the European Court of Human Rights), allowing individuals to challenge state actions that violated convention rights, thereby internationalizing judicial oversight of national adherence to Rule of Law standards.[30]

iii. **Constitutional Courts and Substantive Review:** In the post-war era, many countries, notably Germany and Italy, established powerful constitutional courts. These courts were often empowered not just to ensure procedural regularity but also to review the substantive content of legislation against constitutional principles, including fundamental rights. This marked a significant shift towards a more "substantive" conception of the Rule of Law, where law must not only be correctly enacted and applied but must also align with fundamental values of justice and human dignity.[31]

iv. **Decolonization and Legal Transplants:** As colonial empires dismantled, newly independent nations in Asia and Africa often adopted constitutional frameworks and legal systems modeled on those of their former colonizers, incorporating Rule of Law principles. However, transplanting these institutions into vastly different social, economic, and political contexts proved challenging, often leading to gaps between formal legal rules and practical

[29] Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. Res. 217 A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948).
[30] Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, Nov. 4, 1950, 213 U.N.T.S. 221 (European Convention on Human Rights).
[31] Alec Stone Sweet, *Governing with Judges: Constitutional Politics in Europe* (Oxford University Press, 2000).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

realities, and struggles to establish judicial independence and effective legal constraints on executive power.[32]

v. **The Cold War Divide:** The Cold War presented an ideological contest between Western conceptions of the Rule of Law linked to liberal democracy and individual rights, and the "socialist legality" proclaimed by the Soviet bloc, which emphasized law as an instrument of the Communist Party and the state to achieve collective goals, subordinating individual rights and legal constraints to political objectives.[33]

The 20th century thus dramatically reshaped the Rule of Law. Horrific failures spurred its elevation as a universal ideal intrinsically linked to human rights, leading to its internationalization and the development of stronger national and supranational mechanisms for its enforcement, particularly in the form of constitutional review focusing on substantive justice.

VII. CONTEMPORARY ERA: GLOBALIZATION, TECHNOLOGY, AND NEW CHALLENGES

In the late 20th and early 21st centuries, the Rule of Law continues to evolve, facing a complex array of new opportunities and significant challenges.

i. **Globalization and Transnational Law:** Increasing global interconnectedness in trade, finance, and communication has led to the rise of transnational legal regimes (e.g., WTO law, international arbitration) and international courts (e.g., the International Criminal Court). This raises questions about accountability, democratic legitimacy, and the interaction between national and international legal orders in upholding Rule of Law principles globally.[34]

ii. **The Digital Age:** Rapid technological advancements present profound challenges. Issues of mass surveillance, data privacy, algorithmic bias in decision-making (e.g., predictive policing, sentencing), cybercrime, and the regulation of online platforms require new legal frameworks and test traditional Rule of Law safeguards like due process, transparency, and protection against arbitrary intrusion.[35]

iii. **Terrorism and the Security State:** The response to international terrorism, particularly after the 9/11 attacks, led many states to enact laws expanding surveillance

[32] Martin Krygier, "Transitional Justice and the Rule of Law", 12 *Journal of Transitional Justice* 21-39 (2018).
[33]Harold J. Berman, *Justice in the U.S.S.R.: An Interpretation of Soviet Law* (Harvard University Press, 1963).
[34] Anne-Marie Slaughter, *A New World Order* (Princeton University Press, 2004).
[35] Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information* (Harvard University Press, 2015); Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (PublicAffairs, 2019).

powers, modifying detention rules, and altering trial procedures. This created significant tension with core Rule of Law principles, sparking debates about the appropriate balance between security and liberty, and the dangers of eroding legal safeguards in the name of counter-terrorism.[36]

iv. **The Resurgence of Populism and Illiberalism:** Recent years have witnessed a rise in populist and illiberal political movements in various parts of the world, including some established democracies. These movements often exhibit hostility towards Rule of Law constraints, challenging judicial independence, attacking legal checks on executive power, undermining minority rights, and prioritizing the perceived will of the "people" (as defined by the leader) over constitutional norms and procedures.[37] This constitutes a direct assault on the foundations of the Rule of Law.

v. **Formal vs. Substantive Debate:** The distinction, highlighted by theorists like Lon Fuller (who emphasized the "internal morality" of law, requiring clarity, consistency, prospectivity, etc.)[38] and Joseph Raz (who argued for a more formal conception, focusing on law guiding behavior effectively, distinct from its moral content),[39] remains crucial. Is the Rule of Law satisfied if laws are clear, public, stable, and applied equally, even if they are unjust (formal conception)? Or must the law also embody certain substantive values, such as human rights and justice (substantive conception) Most modern international formulations lean towards a substantive view, linking the Rule of Law intrinsically to human rights protection.[40]

vi. **Measuring and Promoting the Rule of Law:** Recognizing its importance for development, democracy, and peace, international organizations and NGOs have developed indices (e.g., the World Justice Project Rule of Law Index) to measure adherence to Rule of Law principles across countries. Significant resources are invested in Rule of Law promotion programs, although their effectiveness and methodologies remain subjects of debate.[41]

The contemporary era shows the Rule of Law is not a settled achievement but a site of

[36]Kim Lane Scheppele, "Law in a Time of Emergency: States of Exception and the Temptations of 9/11", 6 *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law* 1001-83 (2004).
[37] Kim Lane Scheppele, "Autocratic Legalism", 85 *The University of Chicago Law Review* 545-83 (2018); Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt, *How Democracies Die* (Crown, 2018).
[38] Lon L. Fuller, *The Morality of Law* (Yale University Press, Revised edn., 1969).
[39]oseph Raz, "The Rule of Law and its Virtue", *in* Joseph Raz, *The Authority of Law: Essays on Law and Morality* 210-232 (Oxford University Press, 1979).
[40] Brian Z. Tamanaha, *On the Rule of Law: History, Politics, Theory*, Ch. 7-8 (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
[41] Thomas Carothers (ed.), *Promoting the Rule of Law Abroad: In Search of Knowledge* (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2006); World Justice Project, *Rule of Law Index*, available at https://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/ (last visited on April 17, 2025).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

ongoing contestation. Globalization, technology, security concerns, and political trends continuously force re-evaluation and adaptation, while the fundamental challenge remains ensuring that power, whether public or private, is exercised within a framework of just, predictable, and equally applied laws.

VIII. CONTEMPORARY ERA: INTENSIFYING CHALLENGES AND EVOLVING UNDERSTANDINGS

i. Digital Transformation and Algorithmic Governance: In India, the Supreme Court's landmark judgment in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India* (2017) unequivocally declared the Right to Privacy a fundamental right inherent in Article 21 (Right to Life and Personal Liberty), providing a crucial constitutional anchor for challenging state surveillance and shaping ongoing debates around data protection laws.[42] This case provides a vital Rule of Law safeguard against potential overreach in the digital age.

ii. Geopolitical Instability and the Strain on International Law: [...] The challenges faced by the International Criminal Court (ICC) in securing cooperation and enforcing arrest warrants against powerful actors illustrate these difficulties.[43]

iii. Democratic Backsliding and Autocratic Legalism: Examples include challenges to judicial appointment processes or attempts to curtail judicial review powers. In the UK, the *Miller* cases (*R (Miller) v Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union*, 2017 and *R (Miller) v The Prime Minister*, 2019) grappled with the extent of executive prerogative power and the justiciability of parliamentary prorogation, affirming the role of courts in upholding constitutional principles like parliamentary sovereignty even in highly charged political contexts.[44] In India, the Supreme Court's decision in *S. R. Bommai v. Union of India* (1994) remains a critical precedent asserting judicial review over the President's power to dismiss state governments (Article 356), curbing executive arbitrariness and protecting federalism as part of the Constitution's basic structure. Recent controversies around electoral funding transparency, leading to the striking down of the Electoral Bonds Scheme in *Association for Democratic Reforms v. Union of India* (2024), also highlight the judiciary's ongoing role in scrutinizing laws impacting democratic processes and accountability

[42] *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) & Anr. v. Union Of India & Ors.*, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
[43] Referencing ICC situation reports and challenges noted in academic analyses of international criminal justice effectiveness.
[44] *R (Miller) v Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union* [2017] UKSC 5; *R (on the application of Miller) v The Prime Minister* and *Cherry v Advocate General for Scotland* [2019] UKSC 41.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

iv. **Climate Crisis and Environmental Justice:** Courts in various jurisdictions (e.g., the Netherlands in the *Urgenda* case, Germany's Constitutional Court on climate targets) are increasingly holding governments accountable for climate commitments based on constitutional and human rights grounds.[^46a]

v. **Economic Inequality and Access to Justice:**

vi. **Identity Politics and Legal Rights:** The Rule of Law principle of equality before the law is central to contemporary struggles for the rights of marginalized groups. Landmark cases like *Obergefell v. Hodges* (2015) in the US, recognizing marriage equality,[45] or *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India* (2018) in India, which decriminalized consensual same-sex conduct by reading down Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code based on rights to privacy, dignity, and equality, demonstrate the judiciary's role in evolving legal interpretations to align with fundamental rights and constitutional morality.[46] Similarly, cases like *Independent Thought v. Union of India* (2017), striking down the marital rape exception for minors, show courts intervening to ensure equal protection for vulnerable groups even within traditional legal frameworks.[47]

vii. **The Enduring Formal vs. Substantive Debate in Practice:** [...] The US Supreme Court's handling of cases related to national security detention post-9/11, such as *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld* (2004) and *Boumediene v. Bush* (2008), which affirmed detainees' rights to due process and habeas corpus review even in the context of the "war on terror," illustrate the tension between security imperatives and fundamental Rule of Law safeguards requiring judicial oversight of executive action.[48]

IX. CONCLUSION

The evolution of the Rule of Law is a testament to humanity's enduring aspiration for governance based on reason, fairness, and predictability, rather than arbitrary will. From the tentative steps towards codified order in ancient Mesopotamia and the philosophical inquiries of Greece and Rome, through the landmark constraints on sovereignty embodied in Magna Carta and the English common law, the journey gained profound philosophical grounding during the Enlightenment. This era fueled revolutionary transformations that sought to institutionalize limits on power through written constitutions, separation of powers, and guaranteed rights.

[45] *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644 (2015).
[46] *Navtej Singh Johar & Ors. v. Union of India thr. Secretary Ministry of Law and Justice & Ors.*, AIR 2018 SC 4321.
[47] *Independent Thought v. Union of India & Anr*, (2017) 10 SCC 800.
[48] *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507 (2004); *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723 (2008).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

The 19th century saw attempts at formal definition, notably by Dicey, alongside the broader spread of constitutionalism, while the 20th century, scarred by totalitarianism, responded by forging an inextricable link between the Rule of Law and universal human rights, promoting its internationalization and strengthening mechanisms for its enforcement, including substantive constitutional review.

Today, the Rule of Law faces novel and complex challenges stemming from globalization, technological disruption, security threats, and political illiberalism. The debates between formal and substantive conceptions continue, but the dominant international understanding embraces a vision where law serves not only order and predictability but also justice and the protection of human dignity.

The history of the Rule of Law reveals its contingent and contested nature. It is not a natural state of affairs but a hard-won, fragile achievement that requires constant vigilance, adaptation, and recommitment. Its principles – accountability, equality, fairness, legal certainty, and the supremacy of law – remain indispensable pillars for just societies, democratic governance, and sustainable peace. Understanding its long and complex evolution underscores both its profound significance and the perpetual need to defend and strengthen it against the ever-present temptations of arbitrary power.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

X. REFERENCES

1. Aristotle. *Politics*.
2. Austin, John. *The Province of Jurisprudence Determined* (1832).
3. Bailyn, Bernard. *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*. Harvard University Press, 1967.
4. Baker, J.H. *An Introduction to English Legal History*. Oxford University Press, 5th edn., 2019.
5. Berman, Harold J. *Justice in the U.S.S.R.: An Interpretation of Soviet Law*. Harvard University Press, 1963.
6. Bingham, Tom. *The Rule of Law*. Penguin Books, 2011.
7. Bracton, Henry de. *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae*.
8. Breay, Claire and Julian Harrison. *Magna Carta: Law, Liberty, Legacy*. British Library, 2015.
9. Carothers, Thomas (ed.). *Promoting the Rule of Law Abroad: In Search of Knowledge*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2006.
10. Cicero. *De Re Publica*.
11. Dicey, A.V. *Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution*. Macmillan, 8th edn., 1915.
12. Fraenkel, Ernst. *The Dual State: A Contribution to the Theory of Dictatorship*. Oxford University Press, 1941.
13. Fuller, Lon L. *The Morality of Law*. Yale University Press, Revised edn., 1969.
14. Holt, J.C. *Magna Carta*. Cambridge University Press, 3rd edn., 2015.
15. Jennings, Ivor. *The Law and the Constitution*. University of London Press, 5th edn., 1959.
16. King, L.W. (Tr.). *The Code of Hammurabi* (1910).
17. Krygier, Martin. "Transitional Justice and the Rule of Law". 12 *Journal of Transitional Justice* 21-39 (2018).
18. Levitsky, Steven and Daniel Ziblatt. *How Democracies Die*. Crown, 2018.
19. Locke, John. *Second Treatise of Government* (1689).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

20. Mieroop, Marc Van De. *King Hammurabi of Babylon: A Biography*. Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

21. Montesquieu. *The Spirit of the Laws* (1748).

22. Nicholas, Barry. *An Introduction to Roman Law*. Oxford University Press, 1962.

23. Ostwald, Martin. *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law: Law, Society, and Politics in Fifth-Century Athens*. University of California Press, 1986.

24. Overy, Richard. *The Dictators: Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia*. W. W. Norton & Company, 2004.

25. Pasquale, Frank. *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Harvard University Press, 2015.

26. Plato. *Laws*.

27. Raz, Joseph. "The Rule of Law and its Virtue". *In* Joseph Raz, *The Authority of Law: Essays on Law and Morality*, 210-232. Oxford University Press, 1979.

28. Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract* (1762).

29. Scheppele, Kim Lane. "Autocratic Legalism". 85 *The University of Chicago Law Review* 545-83 (2018).

30. Scheppele, Kim Lane. "Law in a Time of Emergency: States of Exception and the Temptations of 9/11". 6 *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law* 1001-83 (2004).

31. Slaughter, Anne-Marie. *A New World Order*. Princeton University Press, 2004.

32. Stone Sweet, Alec. *Governing with Judges: Constitutional Politics in Europe*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

33. Tamanaha, Brian Z. *On the Rule of Law: History, Politics, Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

34. United Nations. "What is the Rule of Law?". *United Nations and the Rule of Law*. available at https://www.un.org/ruleoflaw/what-is-the-rule-of-law/ (last visited on April 17, 2025).

35. Usher, Roland G. "James I and Sir Edward Coke". 18 *The English Historical Review* 664-75 (1903).

36. Viroli, Maurizio. *Constitutionalism*. Oxford University Press, 2020.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

37. World Justice Project. *Rule of Law Index*. available at https://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/ (last visited on April 17, 2025).

38. Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. PublicAffairs, 2019.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]