

Politeja

No. 2(71), 2021, pp. 67-77

<https://doi.org/10.12797/Politeja.18.2021.71.03>

License: CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Ildus YARULIN 

Pacific National University

iarulin@mail.ru

Evgeny POZDNYAKOV 

Pacific National University

pozdneyakovev@mail.ru

ARE UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS UNIVERSAL?

ABSTRACT

One of the issues constantly discussed in the context of human rights is their assessment as universal or relative. International human rights norms are universal, which corresponds to the nature of human rights. The process of universalization of human rights began after the second world war with the creation of the United Nations, whose Charter declared its determination to *reaffirm faith in the fundamental rights of the individual, in the equality of men and women and in the equality of nations large and small*. These intentions of the organization were confirmed by the adoption of universal documents: the International Bill of Human Rights, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, the International Covenants on Human Rights, opened for signature on December 16, 1966, and other acts. However, the problem lies in the fact that human rights recognized at the international level as universal and enshrined in international instruments, which must be respected by all and everywhere, lose the signs and qualities of universality under the influence of various socio-cultural, national traditions and customs, religious and other factors, and acquire the meaning or status of relative ones.

Keywords: human rights, universality, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, national traditions and customs

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY “HUMAN RIGHTS”

The idea of human rights has come a long and difficult way in its development. In the 20th century, it was embodied in the relevant international documents.¹ Currently, there are more than 200 international human rights instruments developed only within the framework of the United Nations.²

The modern concept of human rights embodies the provisions of religious doctrines as well as philosophical, political, and legal teachings of different eras. At the same time, human rights activities are still far from being completed, and their ability to achieve their stated goals is often called into question. The key questions that need to be answered again and again are unchanged. What is the purpose of human rights? What should be the content of this concept? In what sense are human rights considered universal and can we even talk about it? Moreover, the question arises as to what exactly can be considered a successful complete implementation of the idea of human rights in the international arena.

As I. Wallerstein noted, *the concepts of human rights and democracy, the superiority of Western civilization due to the fact that it is based on universal values and truths, as well as the inevitable subordination to the market – all these concepts are offered to us as self-evident. But they are not self-evident. These are complex concepts that need to be carefully analyzed, freed from their harmful effects and non-essential features; this is necessary for their further balanced development, in order to put them at the service of the majority, and not the select few. Understanding how these ideas were formulated in their original form, by whom and for what purposes is a necessary part of the task of such development.*³ And he goes on to say: *The struggle between European universalism and universal universalism is the central ideological battle of the modern world, and its outcome depends on how the future world will be structured – the system in which we will live in 25-50 years. None of us can stay away from this battle. And we can't hide behind the position of equality of all points of view, where each individual idea supported in one or another part of the world is*

¹ The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, United Nations General Assembly, 10 December 1948, at <<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>>, 1 February 2021; The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966 entry into force 23 March 1976, in accordance with Article 49, *Bulletin of the Supreme Court of Russian Federation*, № 12 (1994); The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966 entry into force 3 January 1976, in accordance with article 27, at <<https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cescr.aspx>>, 1 February 2021; The Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly on 24 October 1970 (resolution 26/25 (XXV)), at <<https://www.un.org/ruleoflaw/files/3dda1f104.pdf>>, 1 February 2021.

² B. Boutros-Ghali, UN, *The United Nations and Human Rights. 1945-1995*, New York 1995, pp. 129-142, *The United Nations Blue Books Series*, Vol. VII.

³ И. Валлерстайн, “Европейский универсализм: риторика власти”, *Прогнозист*, no. 2(14) (2008), p. 5.

*recognized as equally valuable. This equality of all points of view is nothing more than an implicit form of giving up to the forces of European universalism and the power of the current state of affairs, which seek to preserve their unequal and undemocratic world system. If we want to create a real alternative to the existing world-system, we must be able to find a way to think about and implement universal universalism – the kind of universalism that can be reached, but which will not inevitably appear by itself.*⁴

For further analysis, it is necessary to define the terms. *Human rights*, observes Lawrence Friedman, *is unfortunately an obscure and slippery phrase.*⁵

*To clarify what we mean when we talk about human rights, it is appropriate to distinguish three different levels of interpretation of this idea. The first level is purely speculative; it presupposes the existence of a belief that human rights truly exist and the translation of this belief into appropriate verbal forms. The most famous examples of such formulations are the Declaration of Human and Civil Rights of the French Revolution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations. The second level is the legislative consolidation of individual (or all) human rights at the level of national states. And the third level is the legal validity, that is, the implementation and operation of these laws, the actual observance or violation of human rights.*⁶

Human rights are certain standards developed as a result of the efforts of the entire world community; documents adopted within the framework of the world community establish the universal nature of human rights. These standards are largely derived from the concept of natural human rights, which proclaims the right of everyone to life, liberty, personal integrity, freedom of thought, conscience, religion, etc. The first of them was the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the UN General Assembly on December 10, 1948. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the United Nations without a special vote, but with eight States abstaining (the Belarusian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Saudi Arabia, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the Union of South Africa, and Yugoslavia). Many researchers argue that the declaration is the result of confrontation and compromise between different cultural, moral and political traditions and does not reflect mainly Western values, since it was attended by numerous non-European countries.⁷

Although this document is not binding, it can be considered a universal set of human rights and freedoms, on the basis of which a system of international standards in this area has been developed.

For a long time, it has been generally accepted that the concept of innate, inalienable human rights and freedoms is a universal form of realization of the humanistic

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ L.M. Friedman, *The Human Rights Culture: A Study in History and Context*, New Orleans 2011, p. 2.

⁶ С. Вейднер, "Права человека в «столкновении цивилизаций»: полезно ли сравнивать культуры?", *Неприкосновенный запас*, no. 2 (2017), p. 120.

⁷ A. Constantinides, "Questioning the Universal Relevance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights", *Cuadernos Constitucionales de la Cátedra Fadrique Furió Ceriol*, no. 62/63, p. 53, at <<https://www.corteidh.or.cr/tablas/r26749.pdf>>, 8 February 2021.

essence and regulatory functions of law, the basis of the legislative activity of international organizations.

However, in recent years, these views have been criticized, in particular the provisions on the basis of human rights. As Michael Ignatiev notes, *it would be tempting to derive the idea of human rights from such premises, for example, all people have an inherent or natural dignity, all people have an inherent intrinsic value, every human being is sacred. The problem, however, is that such postulates are not very clear and are quite contradictory. They are not clear because real men and women we encounter empirically are replaced there by the ideal men and women we would like to see. Sometimes men and women behave with amazing dignity. But it does not follow that all human beings have this inner dignity or the ability to demonstrate it. It is precisely because these ideas of dignity, worth, and sanctity replace what is proper that they are contradictory, and because they are contradictory, most often instead of being useful, they are harmful to the human rights cause. Moreover, they are also contradictory because every version of human rights viewed in this perspective contains some metaphysical statements about human nature, and this makes it inherently controversial.*⁸

CONTROVERSY OVER THE UNIVERSALITY OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The universality of human rights is at the heart of international law, and therefore, when analyzing the doctrine of human rights, it can be logically assumed that if human rights really exist, then the existence of a human community, or, in other words, a certain community of all people on earth, should be based on a common morality, and this premise should be accepted as the main basis for the existence of rights and freedoms.⁹

Discussions about the universality of human rights are often based on fairly simple arguments. According to one of them, universalism is valid because human rights are the same everywhere. According to other statements, it is useless to talk about the universalism of human rights since there are great differences in the conceptual order, that is, the concepts of human rights are different in different states. The third argument says that the concept of human rights was born in Europe, and it is not perfect, but other continents can only accept it.

Adherents of the so-called cultural relativism (relativity of human rights) deny the universal nature of human rights based on the obvious differences inherent in individual local cultures. They allow and justify all possible deviations or restrictions in relation to the latter, the introduction of various reservations to generally recognized human rights standards.

The ideas of cultural relativism were most definitely expressed by the delegations of China and Iran during the discussion of human rights issues in the framework of

⁸ М. Игнатъев, *Права человека как политика и как идолопоклонство*, Москва 2019, р. 89.

⁹ *Венская декларация и Программа действий. 25 июня 1993 г., Действующее международное право: В 3 т.*, Сост. Ю.М. Колосов, Э.С. Кривчикова, т. 2, Москва 1999, pp. 94-104.

the UN and the World Conference on Human Rights, which was held in Vienna in 1993. Thus, China stated that the concept of human rights is a product of historical development. Countries at different stages of development or with different historical traditions and cultural values have different understandings and practices in regard to human rights. Accordingly, the human rights standards and models adopted by some countries cannot be assumed to be the only ones, and all countries cannot be required to comply with them. Attempts to impose human rights criteria adopted by some countries or regions lead to a violation of the sovereignty of countries and interference in their internal affairs. The view that the principle of non-interference in internal affairs is not applicable in this area is only a form of political pressure.¹⁰

As Christina Cerna rightly points out, *the fundamental international legal documents that reveal the meaning of human rights and regulate the norms of their legislative support state that fundamental human rights and freedoms are universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated. However, representatives of different cultures and civilizations have their own understanding of rights and freedoms, and this diversity is not integrated on the basis of the most developed, 'advanced,' but not universal legal consciousness of the Western European type. In this regard, a number of countries (including China, Colombia, Cuba, Indonesia, Iran, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Singapore, Vietnam, Yemen) propose to redefine the content of the concept of 'human rights,' seeing in the existing definition the ideological patrimony of Western civilization, since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 reflects Western values, and not their own.*¹¹

In an article dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Cypriot researcher Aristotelis Constantanides notes that *there is a great deal of conceptual confusion about the meaning of universality. Scientists have identified many senses in which universality is understood and discussed. They range from applicability and inclusiveness, formal acceptance and commitment, historical origin, formal origin and norm-making, to anthropological and philosophical acceptance, uniformity, indivisibility, legitimacy.*¹²

He continues: *The most heated and interesting debates revolve around the anthropological universality and philosophical and historical origins of human rights. Universal recognition in this sense is widely regarded as a necessary condition for universality. Many non-Western scholars have tried to show that the concept and foundations of human rights are universal in the sense that they are rooted in all cultures and are the product of long discussions, disputes and negotiations between different nations with different civilizational characteristics, backgrounds. However, others argue that such arguments confuse the values of justice, honesty and humanity with practices aimed at realizing these values, and argue that most non-Western traditions have not developed a concept of human rights in this sense.*¹³

¹⁰ Всемирная конференция по правам человека – Вена, 17 июня 1993 г.

¹¹ Ch.M. Cerna, "Universality of Human Rights and Cultural Diversity: Implementation of Human Rights in Different Socio-Cultural Contexts", *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 4 (1994), p. 740.

¹² A. Constantinides, "Questioning the Universal Relevance...", p. 52.

¹³ Ibid., p. 53.

According to the position of A. Constanides, *the very existence of a long and persistent debate on the universality of human rights indicates that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the idea that a specific human rights regime, as formulated in the Universal Declaration, represents once and for all the truth about human rights. The development of human rights thinking and practice reinforces these concerns and suggests that there are alternative concepts of human rights that go beyond the specific concept reflected in the UDHR and the human rights regime. They all point to the fact that any discussion of rights cannot escape a given time and the specific cultural and historical circumstances surrounding it. Thus, human rights norms should not be regarded as fixed and fixed principles whose content and cultural significance are beyond doubt; they are a product of civilization, not of nature, because historical rights are changeable and therefore subject to change, because historical rights are changeable and therefore subject to transformation and growth.*¹⁴

According to Catherine McNeil's approach, *one way to productively return human rights to radical politics is to borrow from the radical democratic tradition. Radical democratic thought provides resources to address the shortcomings of liberal human rights and allows for the inclusion of human rights within the purview of a broader political project that takes a critical approach to current power relations. (...) the concept of human rights should be perceived as conditioned by specific cultural and political-historical contexts. In other words, the universality of human rights is a particular universality.*¹⁵

There are many other diverse approaches to the universality of human rights.¹⁶ One of them belongs to Jack Donnelly, who claims that *human rights are 'universal' rights in the sense that they are 'universal' for all people. Conceptual universality is, in fact, another way of saying that human rights are by definition equal and inalienable. Conceptual universality, however, only establishes that if such rights exist, then they belong to everyone equally/universally. It does not show that such rights exist. Conceptually, universal human rights can be so small or concretized at such a high level of abstraction that they have no practical significance. And conceptual universality says nothing about the central question in most modern discussions of universality, namely, whether the rights recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are recognized. Human rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights are universal. It's a matter of substance.*¹⁷ And he concludes that *the universality of international law is one of the greatest achievements of the international human rights movement. (...) And all this matters both directly to tens or hundreds of thousands of people, and indirectly to the many hundreds of millions whose*

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 56.

¹⁵ K. McNeilly, "After the Critique of Rights: For a Radical Democratic Theory and Practice of Human Rights," *Law and Critique*, vol. 27, no. 3 (2016), p. 14.

¹⁶ See: G. Alfredsson, A. Eide (eds.), *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights – A Common Standard of Achievement*, The Hague 1999; N. Jayawickrama, *The Judicial Application of Human Rights Law*, Cambridge 2002; H. Hannum, "The Status of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in National and International Law", *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law*, no. 25 (1995/1996), pp. 287-397.

¹⁷ J. Donnelly, "The Relative Universality of Human Rights", *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 2 (2007), p. 284.

*lives have been improved by internationally recognized human rights. Human rights are not an escape from the world's problems. However, they fully deserve the attention they have received in recent years. For the foreseeable future, human rights will remain a vital element in the national, international and transnational struggle for social justice and human dignity. And the relative universality of these rights is a powerful resource that can be used to help build more just and humane national and international societies.*¹⁸

It seems that it is necessary to agree with the chief researcher of the Department of Political Science of the Institute of Philosophy, Political Science and Religious Studies (Republic of Kazakhstan) V. D. Kurganskaya that *in (...) the constitutional consolidation of the principles of human rights and freedoms, the conceptual content of a certain range of philosophical, anthropological and socio-philosophical ideas, a certain worldview paradigm is legally formalized. Anti-universalism as the postmodern social discourse's focus on cultural fragmentation leads not so much to a critical revision of the educational concept of human rights as to the dismantling of the legal field of multicultural society.*¹⁹

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

Constructed in the West, universal human rights have, however, become quite a powerful tool in the hands of European and American politicians. Compliance or non-compliance with Washington's criteria can serve as an excellent method of putting pressure on states acting as opponents. China remains the most criticized in terms of non-compliance with human rights. Time after time, when trying to reach agreements with Beijing, Western countries use the problems of civil society in the Middle Kingdom as a bargaining chip. Thus, the issue of the situation of the Uighurs has again become an important factor in the discussion of the trade agreement between China and the European Union.²⁰

Nevertheless, the population of China itself does not seem particularly concerned about the issue of its own 'oppression.' It is important to understand that the ideology around which the worldview of the people of the Middle Kingdom has been built for several thousand years is Confucianism – a political doctrine that simply does not contain such a thing as 'human rights.' This term has an external nature that does not particularly affect the state of affairs within the PRC. Moreover, the Western concept is alien to the Chinese, because their own perception is more focused on what a person should, rather than may, do.

Thus, according to Confucianism, a noble husband should maintain harmony around him. Quarrels, conflicts, clarification of relations – all this is alien to the

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 506.

¹⁹ В.Д. Курганская, "Дискурс прав человека и универсалии культуры в концепциях радикальной демократии", in *Контуры будущего в контексте мирового культурного развития: XVIII Международные Лихачевские научные чтения, 17–19 мая 2018 г.*, СПб.: СПбГУП 2018, p. 512.

²⁰ T. Mitchell, K. Manson, "Xi's Trade Deal with EU Rings Alarm Bells in US", *Financial Times*, 1 January 2021, p. 4.

worldview of the Middle Kingdom. When a controversial situation arises, it is necessary to come to a common denominator 'in a good way,' and here such a concept as 'sons of respect,' that is, reverence for the authority of the elder, comes into force. A well-known Chinese saying goes: *The ruler is the boat; the people are the water; the water carries the boat.*²¹ Here we are directly confronted with the importance of harmony: subordinates cannot be very 'worried' or else in order that the sailing vessel capsizes. This attitude is also supported by such important Confucian concepts as 'faith' and 'loyalty.'

The concept of harmony, which is key in Confucianism, is generally aimed at the 'social' rather than the 'individual.' Taking into account the fact that this teaching has largely influenced the education system of China, it can be said that the priority of the state before the individual is instilled in young residents of the People's Republic of China from childhood on. Unlike in Western countries, teachers in China do not pay close attention to the issue of 'human rights' in the educational process. This is partly because the Confucian system was originally formed as part of the training of future politicians, that is, the state sought to create capable personnel for future work within the apparatus. This task puts at the forefront the development of such qualities as obedience and loyalty.²² Until now, Chinese schools have not sufficiently worked out the issue of 'self-knowledge' of the student: creative tasks are not aimed at forming and expressing their own unique point of view, but rather require a harmonious 'embedding' of the individual position in the social mechanism. This approach is radically different from the Western one, where gaining the knowledge of the inner self is an important factor in education. The ancient Confucian wisdom says that "a noble man is indifferent to words, but demanding of deeds." This idea perfectly describes educational institutions even in modern China: students rarely express their own opinion, but are actively involved in the social life of the university. A large number of events causes the need for organizers, who are members of the teaching staff, which once again symbolizes the concept of a harmonious society according to Confucius: young people are guided by a strong authority. Hence, the hierarchy of the society of the Middle Kingdom, which is due to the ancient teachings of the middle state, can be seen in sufficient detail. A clear distinction between 'senior leader' and 'junior subordinate' is contrary to Western concepts, because by and large, the basic provisions of human rights may be reduced to the sole right to equality, which as such is alien to the Chinese public.²³

Thus, we can conclude that the very concept of human rights is not represented at all in Confucianism, the ideology on the basis of which, in fact, the statehood of the Middle Kingdom was created. That is why we cannot demand that China fully share Western values, but we can ask the question: Are China's traditional views compatible

²¹ 李洁. 儒家思想对现代社会影响之我见. at <<https://www.docin.com/p-2355369234.html>>, 19 January 2021.

²² 黎鸣. 为什么中国人严重缺乏“人权”意识. 天下民勤: at <<https://coefficient.com/news/23505>>, 19 January 2021.

²³ 李洁. 儒家思想对现代社会影响之我见. at <<https://www.docin.com/p-2355369234.html>>, 19 January 2021.

with European ideas? Several answers can be given, depending on the researcher's worldview concepts.

The first position will read as follows: *Confucianism is able to support human rights completely*. Chinese philosopher of the mid-twentieth century, Luo Zhongshu, argued that despite the lack of disclosure in the future, ideas about human rights originated in the Middle Kingdom quite early. The second position will be the statement that *Confucianism is incompatible with the concept of human rights*. Proponents of this opinion say that the Chinese civilization was formed separately from the rest of the world, and as a result any borrowing from the outside will push the harmonious system to instability. The third position is to accept the fact that Confucianism has failed to develop its own understanding of human rights, but it is willing to accept some of the ideas of the West. The philosopher Zhang Zuwei emphasized in particular that the interpretation of human rights should not be an ultimatum of the West, but rather a local, domestic matter.²⁴

Regardless of what position a researcher takes, the example of China clearly demonstrates the existence of cultures where the very fact of consent to universal human rights is questioned. In the modern world, reproaches about the oppression of the civilian population by the state have become a political tool of pressure rather than a meaningful attempt to restore justice based on universal concepts. Thus, human rights should remain an internal matter of each individual country because the universal formulation of the issue will undoubtedly conflict with the provisions of the culture of a particular society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alfredsson G., Eide A. (eds.), *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights – A Common Standard of Achievement*, The Hague 1999.
- Boutros-Ghali B., UN, *The United Nations and Human Rights. 1945-1995*, New York 1995, *The United Nations Blue Books Series*, Vol. VII.
- Cerna Ch.M., "Universality of Human Rights and Cultural Diversity: Implementation of Human Rights in Different Socio-Cultural Contexts", *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 4 (1994), pp. 740-752, <https://doi.org/10.2307/762567>.
- Constantinides A., "Questioning the Universal Relevance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights", *Cuadernos Constitucionales de la Cátedra Fadrique Furió Ceriol*, no. 62/63, pp. 49-63, at <<https://www.corteidh.or.cr/tablas/r26749.pdf>>.
- The Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly on 24 October 1970 (resolution 26/25 (XXV)), at <<https://www.un.org/ruleoflaw/files/3dda1f104.pdf>>.

²⁴ 儒家和人权。个人图书馆: at <<http://www.360doc.cn/mip/923310030.html>>, 19 January 2021.

- Donnelly J., "The Relative Universality of Human Rights", *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 2 (2007), pp. 281-306.
- Friedman L.M., *The Human Rights Culture: A Study in History and Context*, New Orleans 2011, p. 2.
- Hannum H., "The Status of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in National and International Law", *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law*, no. 25 (1995/1996), pp. 287-397.
- Ignatev M., *Prava človeka kak politika i kak idolopoklonstvo*, Moskva 2019, p. 89.
- The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966 entry into force 23 March 1976, in accordance with Article 49, *Bulletin of the Supreme Court of Russian Federation*, № 12 (1994).
- The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966 entry into force 3 January 1976, in accordance with article 27, at <<https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cescr.aspx>>.
- Jayawickrama N., *The Judicial Application of Human Rights Law*, Cambridge 2002.
- Kurganskaa V.D., "Diskurs prav človeka i universalii kultury v koncepciah radikalnoj demokratii", in *Kontury buduščo v kontekste mirovogo kulturnogo razvitia: XVIII Mežunarodnye Libačvskie naučye čenia*, 17-9 maa 2018 g., SPb.: SPbGUP 2018.
- McNeilly K., "After the Critique of Rights: For a Radical Democratic Theory and Practice of Human Rights", *Law and Critique*, vol. 27, no. 3 (2016), pp. 269-288, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10978-016-9189-9>.
- Mitchell T., Manson K., "Xi's Trade Deal with EU Rings Alarm Bells in US", *Financial Times*, 1 January 2021.
- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, United Nations General Assembly, 10 December 1948, at <<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>>.
- Vallerstajn I., "Evropejskij universalizm: ritorika vlasti", *Prognozis*, vol. 2, no. 14 (2008), pp. 1-56.
- Vejdner S., "Prava človeka v «stolknovenii civilizacij»: polezno li sravnivat kultury?", *Nepriko-snovennyj zapas*, no. 2 (2017).
- Venskaâ deklaraciâ i Programma dejstvij. 25 iúnâ 1993 g., Dejstvuiúšee meždunarodnoe pravo: V 3 t.*, sost. Ŭ.M. Kolosov, È.S. Krivčikova, t. 2, Moskva 1999, pp. 94-104.
- Vsemirnaâ konferenciâ po pravam človeka – Vena, 17 iúnâ 1993 g.*
- Валлерстайн И., "Европейский универсализм: риторика власти", *Прогнозис*, vol. 2, no. 14 (2008), pp. 1-56.
- Вейднер С., "Права человека в «столкновении цивилизаций»: полезно ли сравнивать культуры?", *Неприкосновенный запас*, no. 2 (2017).
- Венская декларация и Программа действий. 25 июня 1993 г., Действующее международное право: В 3 т.*, Сост. Ю.М. Колосов, Э.С. Кривчикова, т. 2, Москва 1999, pp. 94-104.
- Всемирная конференция по правам человека – Вена, 17 июня 1993 г.
- Игнатьев М., *Права человека как политика и как идолопоклонство*, Москва 2019, p. 89.

Курганская В.Д., “Дискурс прав человека и универсалии культуры в концепциях радикальной демократии”, in *Контуры будущего в контексте мирового культурного развития: XVIII Международные Лихачевские научные чтения, 17–19 мая 2018 г.*, СПб.: СПбГУП 2018.

儒家和人权。个人图书馆: at <<http://www.360doc.cn/mip/923310030.html>>.

李洁. 儒家思想对现代社会影响之我见. at <<https://www.docin.com/p-2355369234.html>>.

李洁. 儒家思想对现代社会影响之我见. at <<https://www.docin.com/p-2355369234.html>>.

黎鸣. 为什么中国人严重缺乏“人权”意识. 天下民勤: at <<https://coefficient.com/news/23505>>.

Ildus YARULIN – doctor of Political Science, Professor, Director of the Institute of Socio-Political Technologies and Communications of the Pacific National University (Khabarovsk, Russia).

Evgeny POZDNYAKOV – master’s degree student of the Department of Sociology, Political Science and Foreign Regional Studies of the Pacific National University (Khabarovsk, Russia).