



## ARTÍCULOS

UTOPIA Y PRAXIS LATINOAMERICANA. AÑO: 23, n° 82 (JULIO-SEPTIEMBRE), 2018, pp. 136-145  
REVISTA INTERNACIONAL DE FILOSOFÍA Y TEORÍA SOCIAL  
CESA-FCES-UNIVERSIDAD DEL ZULIA. MARACAIBO-VENEZUELA.  
ISSN 1315-5216 / ISSN-e: 2477-9555

# Humanization as a Phenomenon of Post-bipolar International Relations System

*La humanización como fenómeno del sistema de relaciones internacionales post-bipolar*

**Maxut B. SARSENOV**

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8847-3811>

[maksoutsarsenov@yandex.ru](mailto:maksoutsarsenov@yandex.ru)

*Department of International Relations, Ablai Khan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan*

**Dauletbek S. RAEV**

*Department of International Relations, Ablai Khan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan*

This paper is filed in Zenodo:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1495816>

### ABSTRACT

This work studies theoretical problems of international relations development in conditions of globalization. Main factors of humanization of current international relations system are characterized. There is represented complex analysis of modern national diplomacy as one of the main factors of international relations humanization. The analysis of CIS countries' modern politics in the context of international relations humanization. It is concluded that there are enough opportunities for humanization process in modern international relations.

**Keywords:** humanization; international relations system; world political process; world order.

### RESUMEN

Este trabajo estudia los problemas teóricos del desarrollo de las relaciones internacionales en condiciones de globalización. Se caracterizan los principales factores de humanización del actual sistema de relaciones internacionales. Existe un análisis complejo representado de la diplomacia nacional moderna como uno de los principales factores de la humanización de las relaciones internacionales. El análisis de la política moderna de los países de la CEI en el contexto de la humanización de las relaciones internacionales. Se concluye que hay suficientes oportunidades para el proceso de humanización en las relaciones internacionales modernas.

**Palabras Clave:** humanización; sistema de relaciones internacionales; proceso político mundial; orden mundial.

Recibido: 15-08-2018 • Aceptado: 10-09-2018



Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana publishes under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported license (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0). For more information go to <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/deed>

## **INTRODUCTION**

International relations are a specific type of public relations. They are related to the latter, not only because they are both the relations between social communities, but also because they include economic, social, political and spiritual and cultural aspects. In this context, international relations are considered to be the continuation and development of public relations built on national basis. In its turn, the difference between international relations and relations within public structures lies in that in the complex they form in terms of quality new system with characteristic features; they are of wider spacial and social dimension, since they characterize interactions at least between two and more countries; the main subjects in these relations are nations, states, public movements and organizations with their needs and interests; their functioning is connected not with some certain form of public (or governmental) authority, but with wide range of international norms and values, which humanity created in the course of long-term evolutionary and revolutionary development.

We have witnessed destruction of bipolar international relations system, which was followed by so-called polycentric unipolar system that is getting multipolar. In fact, there were at least three equilibrium poles (or centers) of modern international relations system: USA, European Union, and Pacific Rim, where China dominates. Some other integration associations and states (ASEAN, Brazil, Russia, India), which belong to BRICS, claim role of world political centers. Today Russia and China have similar views on world politics, therefore, these strong and self-reliant countries, which have their own political stance and take their stand, do not fit in Pax NATO scheme suggested by Americans with its unipolarity (or, as it is said, pyramidal structure of international system). Basic drawbacks of this unipolar (pyramidal) model of modern world system are evident. The thing is that many other world states will not agree with the role of weak ones.

What is more, these countries are definitely underestimated by unipolar strategists according to list of most important parameters of national strength (including nuclear potential, territory, population etc.). Having in mind special place and foreign policy and other resources, which possesses USA, we should mention that they are not enough for sole will exertion regardless other states, which either belong to circle of great countries (that is which possess big or comparable between each other potentials and total resources that in certain cases exceed resources of other countries), or belong to influential regional centers. One way or another, no world state, including the only one superpower - USA, has nowadays enough resources to function as "global policeman" in unipolar world. In addition to this, unipolar model directly contradicts many key and long-term tendencies of modern world development, which do not depend on short-term political situation. It is all about drastic changes in the modern world, especially that happening in the last decade, including growing democratization and globalization, which, in fact, presuppose global transformation of modern international relations system towards realizing age-long ideals of the world without violence, world culture, international relations humanization.

## **GLOBALIZATION IN THE MODERN WORLD IN THE CONTEXT OF MULTIPOLAR WORLD DEVELOPMENT**

Current globalization is not a linear process, it goes along with world fragmentation, recurrent religious and ethnic fundamentalism etc. True multipolarity has not been completed yet, it is still developing. Therefore, the modern world is often considered to be a fantastic hybrid – "unimultipolar" system (or even "pluralistic unipolarity"). However, as it is shown, the notion "asymmetric multipolarity" clearly reflects the character of current world system, which is perceived in this case as transient stage of the modern world development and which reflects the specificity of certain (and thus, inevitably transient) power and resource distribution in kind of general "force field" of the aforementioned world tendencies.

Transient character of current stage lies also in that "bipolarity", "unipolarity", and "multipolarity" are just certain and, to a great extent, formal fixations of distributing collective power and national strength in world, and are definitely not characteristics of modern international relations. Therefore, for instance, in the multipolar world several hostile and almost equally strong states can confront; on the other hand, in that formal scheme of national strength distribution, these states can cooperate. In other words, formal structure of new developing world order should acquire its own meaning.

It will to a great extent depend on subjective factors, including certain foreign policy strategies and tactics, concepts and doctrines, which are chosen by key players on the modern international stage, including Russia, of course. Thus, the developing conceptual aspects of the strategic way we perceive modern international relations, and world concept in XXI century in particular, are of great significance.

As for the aforementioned developing world concept of XXI century, it is to emphasize that this concept is based on the necessary building of globalization mechanism that is adequate in content and functionally cooperative. The efficiency of such governance will mostly depend on its combination of national and international efforts with UN as the only universal mechanism supporting international peace and security. Admitting the appearance of, in terms of quality, new dangers to modern multipolar world order (such as distributing weapon of mass destruction, regional conflicts of new generation, risk of new arms race, the growing gap between rich and poor countries, spreading global terrorism, pressing population and health service issues etc.), it is necessary to predicate on strategic long-standing goals, which reflect adequate understanding of not short-term, but leading world policy tendencies under conditions of globalization in the modern world.

With that in mind, strategic goals of international relations democratization and humanization should be of high priority for leading countries' foreign policy. Certainly, the way to these goals cannot be easy and fast, especially in current political situation. Whichever the obstacles are, steps to the aforementioned goals could be as following:

- to stop claiming against unilateral dominance, acknowledge and move towards multipolarity;
- to establish efficient international and national mechanisms and procedures of right enforcement for national minorities within sovereign state;
- to involve civilians in solving international problems;
- to provide minimal coercive measures approved by international law;
- to set humanitarian limits on international sanctions;
- to give national and international guarantees of human rights and freedoms observance etc.

Truly multipolar world order of XXI century is possible only if the majority of world community, and its real and potential power centers, are willing to. Moreover, development and improvement of true partnership between members of modern international relations, which are based on the general understanding of new world policy architecture of XXI century, play an important role. Taking into consideration all the aforementioned, we can say that international relations include the most powerful leverage influencing both political and non-political international processes. It includes:

- politically significant activity of UN and other legitimate international bodies, organizations and institutions;
- political actions of international, supranational institutes, and also corresponding public groups, associations and unions;
- sovereign countries' foreign policy, which shapes world policy, international relations and connections.

This leverage imposes demanding requirements for:

- subjects and members of international relations, especially for their behavior in critical situations;
- norms of international law, which they are guided by;
- security services, which are brought into action, when international security is undermined;
- political decisions, which authorized bodies make;
- administrative management apparatus responsible for current bureaucratic work.

The mentioned leverage poses for subjects and members of international relations many problems concerning their funding. International relations clearly tend to globalization, that is to spreading and interpenetration, complementation and mutual enrichment. It is, primarily, due to drastic changes in Central and East Europe, in CIS (including Central Asia and Kazakhstan). The barriers that divide international relations according ideology are being broken; the world division into two conflicting political camps with their closed political and state systems, and the confrontation as well, recede into past; the model of bipolar world, which was represented by two "superpowers" – USA and USSR, loses its meaning. Globalization of political international relations stems from growing role and meaning of universal (global) problems in the modern world, which have socio-environmental, socio-economic, personal and socio-political character:

- preventing nuclear war;
- stopping arms race, disarmament;
- peaceful settlement of regional, interstate and international armed conflicts;
- non-violent world building based on trust in international relations;
- security system reinforcement.

The global character of modern international political relations also requires new mechanism for their regulation, including considerable reestablishment of existing international organizations and building new ones (Plotnikova, 2004; Baranovsky, 1999; Tsygankov, 1998).

### **COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL RELATIONS**

International political relations considerably influence international and world order. As far as international order is concerned, it means such an international relations organization, which is supposed to ensure good functioning of states and other international institutes, and to build and maintain corresponding conditions for their existence, security and development. As for world order, its sense lies in meeting human requirements, including survivability, well-being and justice in regard to certain people. International political relations influence international and world order in the way that they possess great capabilities – diplomatic, organizational and legal, material and technical, and informative-outreach – to implement in interstate and international relations such principles as:

- preservation and approval of universal political and moral values;
- commitment to fair international and national security, and also peaceful settlement of controversial international issues and conflicts;
- respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty;
- non-intervention in each other's internal affairs;
- absolute precedence of international law over political and state communities.

Finally, international political relations at current developmental stage tend to democratization, demilitarization and humanization. Democratization, though having different forms and results in different nations and states, is reflected in universal aspiration to, on the one hand, eliminate authoritarian-bureaucratic and totalitarian regimes, and on the other hand – build advanced society and legal state. Demilitarization is surely based on global disarmament, but is not reduced only to it. It also includes:

- elimination of military-political units;
- drastic transformation of arms industry ;
- quality change of scientific, state and managerial units, public institutes, lifestyle and consciousness of many people burdened with stereotypes from "Cold War" times.

International political relations humanization means that politics and state cease being self-goal and self-value. They become means of meeting the growing human requirements, defending their rights, freedoms and interests. International political relations humanization presupposes increasing meaning of non-governmental subjects and members, and representatives of national diplomacy (scientists, culture and art workers, members of public, religious and other organizations) in particular, in the relations system. In modern political literature, there is no opinion on question about who the main subject of international political relations is. One point of view remains widespread, according to which state or group of states are such a subject, because state is the only national institute authorized to carry out internal policy, take part in relations with other states and international organizations, conclude contracts, declare war etc. This so-called statist (governmental) approach to international relations forming and functioning, which appears to be the result of legal tradition in modern political thought, has been reflected in the formation of different interstate associations, unions and organizations aimed at ensuring national security in regions, and in the world in general . Over the last years this approach was complemented with broader – political – approach, according to which main subject of international political relations is national political system. Supporters of this approach think that its advantage lies in that it allows involvement in international political relations of not only state but also other equally important institutes: national political organizations and establishments, political-cultural and legal communities.

Along with statist approach, there is also antistatist approach. Its followers consider non-governmental and even non-political organizations and movements as main subjects of international political relations. Their arguments are reduced to that the authority of state as the main element of international political mechanism is going down: firstly, due to its inability to manage deep crisis phenomena in the world; secondly, due to paralysis, stagnation and absence of state's will; thirdly, due to obvious state's immorality, which "plays in great power games and fools its citizens".

Antistatists consider that the authority of non-governmental organizations in international political relations system is constantly growing and expanding, what shows the general tendency towards increasing role of civil structures in the world. To their mind, it is evident due to multinational corporations (MNC), which transform all sides of human activities, including political one, and transmit the global community to new historical epoch.

International political relations need analyzing not only in terms of the way they develop and function, but also in terms of their theoretical substantiation. Such a substantiation can be represented in different ways. The first method is to develop globalist-futurological concept. These concepts have the following characteristics: future society is supposed to be financially and politically strong and stable ; its spiritual and political basis consists of global consciousness and the corresponding type of political thinking; human norms and values, which are supposed to change human lifestyle and behavior, play the leading role; the necessary condition for its establishment and development .is structures of civil society and, primarily, human resources and knowledge.

These characteristics are completely reflected in the concept of "Sustainable Society", which is considered the first one in modern foreign, and American in particular, global studies-21. The concept of "Sustainable Society" covers almost all main aspects of world community life, including political one.

The system of basic guidelines and values, which "Sustainable Society" is based on, are of special interest. It is to emphasize that founders of "Sustainable Society" concept look far beyond the aforementioned systems development, which are necessary, they say, to ensure world strength and stability. They strive to build futurological picture of "Sustainable Society" based on these systems and introduce new ideal of public-political humanity development. The aforementioned and many other ideas of "Sustainable Society" concept are represented in different world order models. Many respectful futurologists study this society as one of the crucial goals of global human evolution.

The second method is related to creating general methodological theories, which are supposed to shape key principles and techniques of scientific analysis of international political relations. To these theories belong the following: H. Morgentau's theory of political realism, R. Aron's peace and war theory, Q. Wright's theory of factors, G. Liska's equilibrium (balance-of-power) theory and J. Galtung's world systems theory. Among these theories, H. Morgentau's theory of political realism plays an important role. Its sense consists of the following basic statements. First of all, international relations represent ancient as well as self-reliant political system. A characteristic feature of the international relations studies after the World War II lies in that they are carried out on the basis of behaviorism, system analysis, game theory, modelling and general methodology, which have one common aim – to substantiate global international relations optimization by means of modern theory, to ensure true predictions in this sphere and so get rid of unpredictable political actions. In this context, real international politics can be compared to rational theory as photo to portrait drawn with brush. Rational international politics is efficient, if it reduces risks and increases benefits that is when it relies on rationality and requirements for success.

Second of all, most important guideline allowing political realism to find meaningful and rational way in international politics is "notion of interest which is defined in categories of governance". Moreover, in general theory notion of interest can have various meanings depending on certain subject character, in international politics theory this notion is usually introduced as "national interest". According to H. Morgentau, the notion of national interest in international political relations consists of the following factors: interest character, which should be protected; political environment, where interest operates; and rational need, which restricts the choice of goals and means for all the figures on the international stage. Any foreign policy should be built on physical, political and cultural reality, which nation represents. In the world divided by rivalry and fight for power between different sovereign nations, foreign policy of any nation should meet its primary requirement – to survive. Therefore, all nations, according to their capabilities, strive to one thing – to protect its physical, political and cultural identity in the face of possible external intrusion.

Finally, pragmatists and political realists realize moral meaning of political actions and inevitable confrontations between moral laws and requirements for effective political activity. However, they emphasize that moral principles can be implemented in states and nations' actions according to particular circumstances of time and place rather than in an abstract way. H. Morgentau point out that sense of pragmatism and political realism "lies in the choice not between moral principles and national interest without moral virtue, but between one set of moral principles beyond political reality and another set of principles corresponding to reality". In this context, pragmatism and political realism deny identification of certain nations' aspirations with world moral laws. Truth does not align with public opinion. All nations try to relate their private aspirations to world moral goals, but it does not mean that they are right. Interest in categories of international political power builds chances of fair treating all nations, because it protects from moral pretension and political pressure from any nation. As H. Morgentau writes, "careless speculation about that carrier and representative of moral good is a certain nation, and another nation embraces evil, is

invalid in both moral and intellectual contexts. Such a speculation leads to values distortion and mad violent crusades".

The peculiarity of the third method of international political relations substantiation is building special concepts about analysis of particular functioning problems in these relations. The following theories can be examples of such concepts: international systems, international organizations, international roles, international conflict, national interest etc. The global security concept belongs to these concepts and is based on the following statements:

**The first statement** – the global security concept represents new principles of approach to security problems in nuclear world, rather than new complex of ideas and practical suggestions. Politicians, scholars, public communities from different countries have introduced and discussed principles and ideas of this concept for the last decades.

**The second statement** – crucial principles, which contribute to implementation of global security idea, are the following: to admit that it is impossible to survive and gain victory in global nuclear war; in the modern world full of nuclear weapon, great states cannot resort to armed means of political or ideological conflict settlement; parity, observance of equality principle and equal security under conditions of strong confrontation do not guarantee security, and the only way to achieve it is to decrease dramatically military confrontation level; the most reliable way to curb and restrict arms race may be "reasonable adequacy" model, which breaks both "communicating vessels" model and "zero balance" model; complete international security cannot be ensured in one-way fashion, by means of drastic arms reduction by one or two countries – simultaneous and collective actions of many countries are needed.

**The third statement** – the aforementioned principles will definitely need further specification and development. Correlation of foreign policy and leading countries' military doctrine according to these principles as well, will also be complicated. It is concluded from the work of Palme Commission that no country can be eligible for monopoly in building the global security concept.

### ***CURRENT STATE AND PERSPECTIVES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS HUMANIZATION***

When talking about international relations humanization, we resort to the experience of previous studies. In international political theory, international relations "humanization" is considered as growing impact of moral norms on this sphere, making it more human, in order to acknowledge human self-value as a complete rights and freedoms enforcement. In UNDP (United Nations Development Program), human development is defined as a process, where every population representative throughout their lives has a wide range of alternatives. Meanwhile, in academic, and in political environment as well, the problem of international relations humanization is a point of fierce dispute. Indeed, on the one hand, the opinion on dominance of selfish national interests, geopolitical imperatives and force arguments (not only in military, but also in economic and socio-cultural contexts), which do not leave any place for morality and care of a person, in international relations is getting more influential. On the other hand, it is claimed that international relations humanization is not only wish of national diplomacy actors cherishing illusions, and that taking into consideration all the drawbacks of international organizations, they still function for person security and contribute to morality observance in this sphere.

These two stances are plausible, since they are based on substantial statements. However, regardless their externally incompatible character, it is supposed that their opposition is relative. There is an opinion that not only does international politics humanization have its place in public relations sphere, but also it is one of the important tendencies to its changes. Nevertheless, its manifestation and consequences do not leave a place for some visions of inevitable progress of positives forces and building the international humanist society. This is evident from the meaning that individual moral has in international relations; from

the role that legal norms play here – primarily, norms that are related to human rights and humanitarian law; finally, from the impact that private groups and individuals with their "human", rather than state interests, have on international relations functioning.

International relations humanization plays an important role in its system. As it has been already mentioned, humanization presupposes growing impact of moral norms on this sphere, making it more human, in order to acknowledge human self-value as a complete rights and freedoms enforcement. It is to point out that there is no unanimity on this issue, and it remains one of the controversial issues in international political theory. International relations scholars' opinions are at variance concerning this problem, and they reflect discussions between realists and liberals on international politics, subjects' behavior motives and role of law and moral in international relations.

International relations humanization is manifested within several directions:

1. increasing role of "ethics of persuasion", according to Max Weber, or, in other words, individual ethics, which comes out in growing impact of international public opinion on world politics;
2. increasing efficiency of international humanitarian law in protection of human rights and limit on means and forms of armed conflicts;
3. growing impact of private groups and individuals with their "human", rather than state interests, that is who represent national diplomacy, on international relations functioning.

International relations humanization is an objective process, and contradictions and problems in this sphere are of massive character. The analysis of international morality, law, humanitarian cooperation and human rights shows progress as well as limitation and inconsistency of this sphere (United Nations, 1993; Fourth World Conference on Women, 1995; United Nations, 1997; United Nations, 2000; United Nations, 1992; United Nations, 2007).

The aforementioned proves that humanization in modern international relations is a controversial and inconsistent phenomenon. In international political theory, humanization is defined as growing role and impact of moral and moral norms in international relations, including complete rights and freedoms observance in all human activities, considering human to be of an utmost value.

International moral norms are enshrined, primarily, through law. Therefore, firstly, the conditions of human rights and international humanitarian law should be studied. Here we can point out several positive tendencies, which are evidence for continuing humanization process: First of all, it is an adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948 (United Nations, 1948), the International Covenants on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and on Civil and Political Rights 1966 (United Nations, 1966; United Nations, 1966), regional declarations and conventions: European Convention on Human Rights (European Court of Human Rights, 1950), American Convention on Human Rights (Inter-American Specialized Conference on Human Rights, 1969), African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, 1987), Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam (Organisation of the Islamic Conference, 1990). Even though declarations are not of a binding nature, and Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam is not even a document, which after its execution and ratification by the corresponding states is supposed to be manifested in the sphere of international relations (Organisation of the Islamic Conference, 1990), they still play an important role in the process of basic rights and freedoms validation. As for UN Covenants, they are enforceable by every state, which signed and ratified it. Currently, more than 140 countries have ratified Covenants. They impose obligations on these countries to introduce to UN official information about state of human rights. In 1993, at the World Conference of Human Rights one very important document was adopted Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, which included norms from Universal Declaration 1948, Covenants and additional protocols to them (World Conference on Human Rights, 1993).

Thus, it can be stated that basic norms and principles are constantly improving, and more countries undertake a commitment to their observance, that is the tendency to human rights internationalization appears.

Surely, major problem of modern international relations is global terrorism, which constitutes huge menace. However, countries often violate human rights in light of fight against this menace. For instance, in European states the severe problem consists in limitation of migrant and refugee's rights, and in some cases - ill-treatment towards them. In 2006, a terrorist threat made several European states adopt laws loosening human rights guarantee, and some states tried to deport foreign suspects in terrorism to countries, which are well-known for their tortures. Let us not forget about recent scandal over secret prisons operated by the CIA, where tortured suspects in terrorism served their time.

International relations humanization is closely connected with environmental safety, nature protection for the sake of humanity, because every person has right to live in clean environment, breathe fresh air and eat health food. And that is, probably, the most topical and complicated task for now. According to United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), 152 multilateral agreements concerning this sphere are registered. UNEP together with World Meteorological Organization and Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change work on this issue.

## **CONCLUSION**

Considering all the aforementioned, we can conclude that humanization is a controversial, but quite possible process in the modern world. It is slowly coming true, sometimes followed by inconsistent processes. Of course, humanization does not cover all the international relations. There are many difficulties, problems, which cannot be solved just like that. It can also be stated that humanization is elective, regional, as not all the spheres and regions in international relations undergo humanization. Finally, humanization has not reached that level yet, where an individual is considered an utmost value in international relations. The value of group of people is likely to be acknowledged. An international community starts responding only to massive murders. There are even debates on the topic how many victims are needed to consider crime a genocide. Surely, it is inappropriate in terms of humanity, but so is a modern reality. There is such a situation in the modern world, where the world community considers one group of people more valuable than others. Perhaps, it will be so to some extent. More importantly, we move towards humanization, anyway.

To sum up, there are enough opportunities for further humanization in modern international relations, an important task is to seize them. Certainly, we will not manage to build global humanistic community in the near future, but we can approach it. Having analyzed contemporary politics in CIS countries, including Kazakhstan, in terms of international relations humanization, we can claim that it is controversial. On the one hand, the absence of democratic tradition, consequences of totalitarian state collapse, USSR's legacy in the form of complicated economic, international situation and weak civil society are evidence for many human right problems in the country and Russian incoherent foreign policy in this sphere. On the other hand, there is a progress in human rights in comparison to Soviet period and reaching out to international European standards in this sphere.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY REFERENCES**

- African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights. (1987). *African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights*. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from <http://www.achpr.org/instruments/achpr/#ch1.1>
- Baranovsky, V.G. (1999). *International organizations as mechanisms of international relations regulation*. Russian political encyclopedia, Moscow.
- European Court of Human Rights. (1950). *European Convention on Human Rights*. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from [https://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention\\_ENG.pdf](https://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_ENG.pdf)
- Fourth World Conference on Women. (1995). *Beijing Declaration*. Retrieved January 20, 2018, from <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/declar.htm>
- Inter-American Specialized Conference on Human Rights. (1969). *American Convention on Human Rights*. Retrieved January 21, 2018, from <https://www.cidh.oas.org/basicos/english/basic3.american%20convention.htm>
- Organization of the Islamic Conference. (1990). *Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam*. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from <http://www.fmreview.org/Human-Rights/cairo.html>
- Plotnikova, O.V. (2004). *Theory, system and practice of international relations of the regions*. Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk.
- Tsygankov, P.A. (1998). International relations humanization: contradictions and paradoxes, *Social Sciences and Contemporary World*. 1: pp. 51-59.
- United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>
- United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. Retrieved January 25, 2018, from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx>
- United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. Retrieved January 20, 2018, from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cescr.aspx>
- United Nations. (1992). *Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities*. Retrieved January 27, 2018, from <https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/47/135>
- United Nations. (1993). *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women*. Retrieved January 29, 2018, from <https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/48/104>
- United Nations. (1997). *Crime prevention and criminal justice measures to eliminate violence against woman*. Retrieved January 29, 2018, from <https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/52/86>
- United Nations. (2000). *Women 2000: Gender Equality, Development and Peace for the Twenty-first Century*. Retrieved January 28, 2018, from <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/followup/session/presskit/gasp.htm>
- United Nations. (2007). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Retrieved January 28, 2018, from <https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/61/295>
- World Conference on Human Rights. (1993). *Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action*. Retrieved January 20, 2018, from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/vienna.aspx>