



THE IDEA OF RIGHTS: A GLOBAL COMPARATIVE APPROACH

Shah Mohammad Omer Faruq Jubaer¹,

Research Manager at Shah Legal Aid and Research Centre,

E-mail: shahjubaer@lus.ac.bd smofjubaer@gmail.com

Shamsul Huda Mostofa²,

Senior Legal aid officer at Shah Legal Aid and Research Centre,

E-mail: rbhuuda@gmail.com

Bishal Deb³,

Junior Researcher at Shah Legal Aid and Research Centre,

E-mail: bishaldeb641@gmail.com

Aditi Moumi⁴

Junior Researcher at Shah Legal Aid and Research Centre,

E-mail: aditimou03@gmail.com

Fayzur Rahman⁵

Senior Researcher at Shah Legal Aid and Research Centre,

E-mail: thefayzur@gmail.com

Article history:	Abstract:
<p>Received: April 3rd 2021 Accepted: April 20th 2021 Published: May 6th 2021</p>	<p>Rights have become, in late years, a critical worry of legitimate scholars, just as of those engaged with the good and political way of thinking. This new article looks to push various discussions ahead by building up examining rights and centering upon more broad hypothetical contemplations identifying with rights. That separates into five sections. The first incorporates clarification of the part played by applied investigation inside statute, while the second directs a reevaluation of the examination of rights. This part manages the contentions progressed by various scholars. The third part contains the creator's structure for talking about rights, including models drawn from misdeed, established law, and global law, along with examining Unger's hypothesis of rights. This research article also focuses on the apparent struggle between the safeguards of a rights approach and the boss of utilitarianism and infers that neither arrangement with worries of profound quality on which based their hypotheses. The fifth part comprises an end which thinks about subjects and thinks about the job of rights inside the overall assumption. For understudies, accommodating highlights of the papers are the unmistakable thought of jurisprudential strategy and the chance to analyze various scholars connected by their different perspectives regarding rights.</p>

Keywords: Rights, Comparative approach of right, the hypothesis of right, jurisprudential view.

INTRODUCTION:

A right is a qualification or a legitimized guarantee. It means what we are qualified for as residents, as people, and as individuals. Rights are something that we consider to be because of us, something that the remainder of society should perceive just like a real case that should be maintained (Arzt, D. E. 1990). Rights are significant for us all for driving an existence of regard, and pride. Truth be told, one of the grounds on which rights have asserted is that they address conditions that we by and large seen as a wellspring of self-confidence and nobility (Moravcsik, A. 1995) For example, the privilege to work may view as fundamental for driving an existence of nobility. Being profitably utilized gives individual financial freedom, and this is vital to the individual aristocracy. Having our necessities met provides us the freedom to seek after our abilities and interests. In a majority rules system, for the most part, individuals or residents reserve the privilege to articulation. Residents can communicate openly unexpectedly (Weissbrodt, D. S., & De La Vega, C. 2007). The opportunity of expression offers us the chance to be inventive and unique, regardless of

¹ Research Manager at Shah Legal Aid and Research Centre, E-mail: shahjubaer@lus.ac.bd smofjubaer@gmail.com

² Senior Legal aid officer at Shah Legal Aid and Research Centre, E-mail: rbhuuda@gmail.com

³ Junior Researcher at Shah Legal Aid and Research Centre, E-mail: bishaldeb641@gmail.com

⁴ Junior Researcher at Shah Legal Aid and Research Centre, E-mail: aditimou03@gmail.com

⁵ Senior Researcher at Shah Legal Aid and Research Centre, E-mail: thefayzur@gmail.com

whether it records as a hard copy, or some other imaginative movement (Benhabib, S. 2009). Freedom of articulation is fundamental and helpful for majority rule government too. As this opportunity permits the free speech of convictions and assessments, the public authority can know the triumphs or disappointments or wants or disliking of individuals (Reif, L. C. 2004). Rights are fundamental for the whole world or entire people moreover. Rights like the privilege of vocation, or opportunity of articulation, would be significant for all people who live in the public eye, and consequently, they are portrayed as all-inclusive (Condä, H. V. 2004). Another premise on which asserted rights is that they are vital for our prosperity. They assist people with building up their abilities and abilities. A correct like the privilege to schooling, for instance, build up our capacity to reason, gives us valuable abilities, and empowers us to settle on educated decisions throughout everyday life (Roth, K. 2004).

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Rights are legitimate, social, or moral standards of opportunity or privilege; that is, rights are the major standardizing rules about what permits of individuals or owed to individuals as per some set of laws, social show, or moral hypothesis. Rights are of fundamental significance in such trains as law and morals, particularly speculations of equity and deontology (Gilbert, J. 2016). Basic freedoms are fundamental rights that have a place with us all essentially because we are human (Buergethal, T. 2006). They encapsulate vital qualities in our general public like reasonableness, poise, correspondence, and regard (Cook, R. J. 1993). They are methods for insurance for us every one of us, the individuals who may confront misuse, disregard, and seclusion (Askin, K. D., & Koenig, D. 1999). Above all, these rights give us power and empower us to make some noise and challenge helpless treatment from a public position (Sikkink, K. 2008). There are numerous meanings of rights, and for our motivation, some are expressed (Williams Jr, R. A. 1990). One such definition is rights are a legitimate or moral acknowledgment of decisions or interests to which join specific weight. Various other options or decisions confront an individual, and he is to choose a couple of them (Slaughter, J. 1997). This opportunity is the focal thought of rights. The individual will have the full opportunity to choose the necessary number of choices. The arrangement of rights, consequently, indicates "a type of circulation of opportunity" (Russell, P. H. 1983).

Rights are frequently viewed as key to any progress, for they are also viewed as set up mainstays of society and culture. Throughout the entire existence of each privilege and its turn of events find the historical backdrop of social struggles (Viljoen, F. 2012). As indicated by the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "rights structure the type of governments, the substance of laws, and the state of profound quality as it is as of now saw" (Ali, S. S. 2000).

The research address this inquiry of consistency by zeroing in on the conduct of abusive states specifically. Through a progression of cross-public investigations on the effect of two main common liberties deals, the article exhibits that (1) government, including abusive ones, often make legitimate responsibilities to freedoms settlements, buying into perceived standards of assurance and setting out open doors for socialization and limit building essential for enduring changes;

(2) These responsibilities generally effectively affect the world's most horrendous repressors even long into the future; and

(3) Practical institutional changes will likely not assist with taking care of this issue.

COMMON CONCEPT OF RIGHTS:

A right is a force or advantage given to an individual demandable from someone else. It might likewise allude to interest or title in an item or property (Milanovic, M. 2011). A right, by and large, includes two subjects: a functioning subject, which alludes to the individual qualified for the rights and its implementation, and an aloof subject, which is the individual obliged to regard or endure the authorization of such right.

Illustration: Shah owes Omer 1,000.00 to pay following a year. After the pass of one year, Omer can be paid the cash owed by Shah. Omer is the dynamic subject, while Shah is the uninvolved subject. Rights might be named genuine or individual.

Genuine rights (otherwise called *jus in re* or *jus in rem*) are those enforceable against the entire world. Individual rights (additionally alluded to as *jus in personam* or *jus promotion rem*) are those enforceable against a particular individual or people?

Illustration: Bishal purchases a bundle of land from Aditi. Upon conveyance, Bishal has the privilege to have such property. Such right of ownership is right; all people on the planet will undoubtedly regard Bishal's advantage of ownership. In the interim, Bishal just paid somewhat for the offer of land, Aditi is entitled to get the remainder of the price tag. The privilege to installment is an individual right of Aditi against Bishal; Aditi may just conflict with Bishal and no one else at the installment of procurement cost for the land package.

UNIFIED PROCEDURE AND METHOD OF RIGHTS:

Basic liberties are inalienable to all people, paying little heed to their identity, race, sex, religion, language, or sexual direction. The idea of freedoms may not be new, yet it's gone through critical changes after some time (Saeed, D., & Ahmad, R. 2013). In 1948, the recently framed United Nations General Assembly received the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). UDHR arranged the need for freedoms for all. International law, public constitutions, and different shows uphold and develop the UDHR. What sorts of freedoms exist? Hypothetical arrangements: A few hypotheses assist us with understanding where the idea of current-day primary liberties comes

from (Gardbaum, S. 2008). "Normal rights" are an old philosophical idea. Identified these with any administration or culture (Steiner, H. J., et al. 2008). By being human, an individual is qualified for their regular rights. That is the place where we get the idea of all-inclusive fundamental liberties.

Another illustration of essential freedoms order is the qualification between affirmative rights and negative rights. The state should admit to positive rights, similar to food, lodging, schooling, and medical care (Bantekas, I., & Oette, L. 2013). Negative rights allude to independence from specific things, similar to subjugation, torment, and concealment. The state's part to guarantee these infringements don't happen (Meron, T. 1984). In the "three ages" system of common freedoms law, which has most affected Europe, negative rights are original, while positive rights are essential for the second and third ages.

FINANCIAL, PUBLIC, AND COMMON RIGHTS:

The UDHR and different archives spread out five sorts of essential liberties: financial, social, and political. Economic, social, and social rights incorporate the option to work (Eckert, A. 2001), the privilege to food and water, the privilege to lodging, and the privilege to schooling. Reports like the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, which was set in 1976, ensure these rights. Shows like the Convention on the Rights of the Child defend the financial, social, and social privileges of explicit gatherings. Likewise, with a wide range of freedoms, the state must secure, advance, and execute financial, social, and social rights (Moeckli, D. et al. 2014). Explicit models in this class include:

1. The choice to work in a protected climate for a reasonable pay
2. The option to get to clinical consideration, including psychological wellness care
3. The privilege to available instruction
4. The privilege to sufficient food, dress, and lodging (Neumayer, E. 2005)
5. The opportunity to reasonable disinfection and clean water
6. The option to partake in social life (Lauren, P. G. 2011).
7. The option to appreciate the advantages of logical advancement
8. The right to retirement and aid in Common and political rights (Hannum, H. 2004)

Common and political rights incorporate articles from the initial segment of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Ghandhi, P. R., & Ghandhi, S. 2012). They express that individuals should be permitted to partake unreservedly in political existence without confronting constraint or segregation. While financial, social, and outline social rights as rights, an individual is qualified for, generally affable and political rights are about insurance from specific things, similar to torment and servitude (Di Donato, L., & Grimi, E. (Eds.). 2019). Reports like the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its two Optional Protocols layout rights, for example, Activities like passing by torment, disregard, and utilization of power disregard the right to life (Kälin, W., & Künzli, J. 2019) Confining admittance to thoughts and restricting press opportunity disregard the right to the opportunity of articulation

9. The right to protection, which is abused by encroaching upon an individual's sexual life or individual information. Expelling somebody to a country where their lives are in danger abuse the right to refuge (Donnelly, J. 1986)
10. The right to a reasonable preliminary and fair treatment, which is abused by a court that is not fair-minded, and exorbitant postponements

EXTENSION OF RIGHTS AND EVALUATION:

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) gives laws of Human Rights, the Commission on Human Rights (CHR) draft this in 1947, and embraced it by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1948. The UDHR sets out, in concise terms, the essential rights and opportunities that every single individual, paying little mind to race, shading, sex, language, religion, political or another assessment (Olayemi, A. A. M., et al. 2015), identity, and public foundation are qualified for appreciate. In some structures, these rights have been perceived for quite a long time however it was not until the formation of the Universal Declaration that they were extensively classified with the help and understanding of the global-local area.

These rights are not simply a development dependent on Western standards. They have profound roots in the practices, everything being equal. The drafters of the Declaration drew upon the standards cherished in public laws and constitutions (Woods, A. K. 2010). They alluded not exclusively to customary law frameworks of equity yet additionally to common law nations and communist frameworks. They did as such to make certain its general application. The rights cherished in the UDHR have been additionally expressed in resulting shows. In 1966, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) were embraced by the General Assembly (Burke, R. 2011). Together, the Declaration, shows, and their discretionary conventions comprise an International Bill of Rights (Hannum, H. 1998).

Other significant common freedoms settlements managing explicit topics have likewise been established. They remember the Convention for the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD); Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW); the Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CROC); and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (MWC)

Conventions tending to the privileges of Indigenous people groups and handicapped people are currently being arranged (Ssenyonjo, M. 2016).

Perfect and Imperfect Rights: The ideal right has the accompanying highlights (Shelton, D. 2015) It is perceived by law. It is enforceable by law. Along these lines, on account of penetration of this right, an individual may go to court for upholding this right (Thio, L. A. 2008). Along these lines, every crucial right, viz. Right to equity, right to religion, and so forth are ideal rights as these are enforceable by law. The flawed right has the accompanying highlights (Frederick, W. C. 1991):

It isn't enforceable by law. Implies that an individual can't go to court to penetrate of blemished right (Meron, T. 1986). All the time-bound cases or obligations go under the class of defective rights.

Positive and Negative Rights: The premise of recognizing directly as affirmative or negative is the idea of correlative obligation it conveys with it. Under Positive rights, the individual needs to play out some obligation to satisfy this right. Antagonistic rights forestall an individual to do some demonstration related to a negative obligation (Baderin, M. A., & Ssenyonjo, M. 2010). Model: The right to life under the constitution is an adverse right since it forestalls an individual to murder someone else (Cardenas, S. 2004).

Genuine and Personal Rights: Genuine right or right in-rem relates to the obligation forced upon individuals all in all. It is accessible to the entire world when all is said in done (Edwards, A. 2010). Model: Tort or wrongdoing is a right. Individual right or right in-persona is accessible against an individual, and it relates to the obligation forced upon a specific individual. Consequently (Flowers, N. 1998), the right, by and large, emerges out of legally binding commitment. Model: penetrate of agreement is an individual right.

The idea of vulnerability and its relationship to human rights: Weakness is an idea full of a Vicious circle. In the first place, the idea is in like manner utilize; however, its importance is loose and challenged. Confusing, complex, obscure, vague are nevertheless a couple of the names researchers across disciplines have used to allude to it (Cook, R. J., & World Health Organization. 1994). (Bio) ethics and law, specifically, are disciplines that have brought forth broad writing on weakness. As the reason for this point is to examine the sending of the helpless gathering idea, we will base our record of weakness principally on the lawful grant (Provost, R. 2002).

Implications of vulnerability: A focal focus of vulnerability is that it is both general and specific. Both of these highlights emerge in any case from our embodiment: as exemplified creatures, we are generally defenseless, however, we experience this weakness through our bodies (Doise, W., et. al. 1994). The centrality of the human component of weakness is reflected in the term's historical background: the term comes from the Latin values, which signifies "wound." Turning first to the significance of weakness in the general sense, it shocks no one that mischief and enduring element halfway in many records of weakness.

Along these lines, as vulnerable subjects, we are continually defenseless to hurt. Mischief comes in numerous assortments that converge and support each other (Morawa, A. H. 2003). Wounds can be substantial, moral, mental, monetary, and institutional, just to refer to a couple (Ayres, J. R. D. C. M., Paiva, V et al. 2006). These various types of mischief now allude to the manners by which weakness is specific (just as general). Our "various types of epitome" and our various situations inside "networks of monetary and institutional connections" imply that every one of us encounters weakness interestingly (Andorno, R. 2016). The experience of weakness "is significantly affected by the quality and amount of assets we have or can order."

Many Research has depicted vulnerability as a heuristic gadget that permits us to "look at covered up presumptions, and inclinations collapsed into legitimate rehearses." The way that vulnerability can be utilized as a heuristic gadget focuses on the following mystery innate in the idea: it very well may be conveyed both to analyze the "is" and the "should." as such, weakness is systematically both an unmistakable and prescriptive apparatus (Merry, S. E. 2007). Researchers from various controls concur, nonetheless, that utilizing weakness as a principle instrument includes investigating how cultural or institutional courses of action begin, maintain, and support weaknesses (Boyce, J. K. 2000). As was referenced above, part of the motivation behind why individuals are powerless is that they are unavoidably reliant on the participation of others. Weakness is like this inalienably a "social" idea, which supplements "consideration regarding the individual subject by setting him/her in friendly setting (Nesiah, V. 2009)." In the following area, we will receive an also context-oriented way to deal with a weakness for our situation law examination (Bilder, R. B. 1969).

Constitutional Right: The expression "protected rights" alludes to the rights that the Constitution certifications to all residents. For instance, established rights incorporate the ability to speak freely and the opportunity of the press (Alexy, R. 2010). Assuming anybody endeavors to prevent somebody from practicing his protected rights, this is an expected infringement, and the casualty has the option to record a claim against that individual. To investigate this idea, think about the accompanying sacred rights definition (Waldron, J. 1993). The Founding Frame marked the Constitution, and the reason for drafting the Constitution was to build up a more grounded, more brought together government comprising of three branches:

- a. Executive Branch
- b. Legislative Branch
- c. Judicial Branch

They likewise arranged balanced governance to guarantee that nobody individual, nor one the public authority's areas of expertise or branches, became excessively incredible. Preceding marking the Constitution, the public government was powerless, and each state worked like its own free country (Neuman, G. L. 2002). The marking of

the Constitution united the states under one bound together pennant. The initial ten corrections to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, ensure and ensure rights, like speaking freely and the opportunity of religion. Unavoidable rights, or "normal rights," are those rights that people can inherently appreciate. These are rights that can't be removed through laws made by man. Natural rights are not quite the same as lawful rights (Heuman, S. 1998), which are rights given to a person by the overall set of laws, like the privilege to a lawyer and the option to stay quiet. Researchers accept that Thomas Jefferson, who drafted the Declaration of Independence, took a significant number of his thoughts from the English rationalist John Locke. Locke was renowned for saying that each person has a characteristic right to "life, freedom, and property." Locke accepted that each individual has the privilege and duty to battle for his endurance (Rivers, J. 2002). Killers were the exemption, be that as it may, as they were to relinquish their own lives in return for acting absurdly.

The rule of Law and Rights: The spine of the freedom to live in dignity is the international human rights framework, together with international humanitarian law, international crook regulation, and worldwide refugee law (Scheiber, H. N. 1984). Those foundational components of the normative framework complement our bodies of law that share a common goal: the protection of the lives, fitness, and dignity of persons. The rule of regulation is the automobile for the promoting and safety of the frequent normative framework. It offers a shape thru which the exercising of energy is subjected to agreed rules, guaranteeing all human rights (Blattman, C. et al. 2014). The rule of regulation has played a vital part in anchoring economic, social, and cultural rights in country-wide constitutions (Hickman, T. R. 2005), laws and regulations. Where such rights are justiciable, or their felony protection is otherwise ensured, the rule of law affords the ability to redress when those rights are not upheld, or public sources are misused (Peerenboom, R. 2004).

The rule of law, narrowly defined, is fascinated in preserving equality earlier than the law. Felony gadget beneath the rule of law has processes that provide people, regardless of their status, equally get admission to the rights they are entitled to under the law (Haggard, S., & Tiede, L. 2011., for example, Equality before the law in the criminal trial process capacity that all are entitled, regardless of their fame in society or the crime they are accused with, to the presumption of innocence and the possibility to put their case before an independent and independent court.

While universally agreed on human rights, norms and requirements supply its normative foundation, the rule of regulation needs to be anchored in a countrywide context, such as its culture, history, and politics (Komesar, N. K. 2001). States, therefore, do have one-of-a-kind countrywide experiences in the development of their structures of the rule of law. Nevertheless, as affirmed utilizing the General Assembly in decision 67/1, there are common facets headquartered on international norms and standards (Alston, P., & Goodman, R. 2013).

The basic concept of rights in social and political theories: Rights are those fundamental states of public activity without which no individual can for the most part understand his best self (Risse-Kappen, T. et al.1999). These are the fundamental conditions for the strength of both the individual and his general public. It is just when individuals get and appreciate rights that they can build up their characters and contributes their best administrations to society (Claude, R. P., & Weston, B. H. 1992). . In straightforward words, rights are the basic cases of individuals which each enlightened society perceives as fundamental cases for their turn of events, and which are subsequently authorized by the state. The privileges of people or the privileges of people have for quite some time been a subject of political hypothesis. If we take a gander at the historical backdrop of the western political idea we will track down that in antiquated Greek city-expresses the rights as such had no presence (Wronka, J. 1998).

In any case, the decision class and high societies of the city-states were not unconscious of rights and this is the show from the idea of citizenship (Doise, W. 2003). In the city-states, just a small bunch of people were blessed to be residents and they appreciated certain advantages which were rights. By far most of the populace were not residents and had no rights (Ife, J. 2012). The idea of rights previously showed up in the hypothesis of normal law which existed in the condition of nature. In the condition of nature, individuals appreciated certain rights authorized by a regular law. The common law, truth be told, administered the general public and no one had any ability to disregard the characteristic rights and regular law (O'Byrne, D. 2014). It was additionally kept up that both normal law and regular rights depended on ethical quality.

As such, both were good requests. Any human position, what we currently call state or government, could not abridge the characteristic rights or meddle with the common law. In this manner idea of rights came to be related to political hypothesis since state or government is essential for legislative issues (Gregg, B. 2011). The common agreement hypothesis makes an unmistakable commitment to making rights a component of political hypothesis. It was expected that individuals of the condition of nature, under the commonness of regular law, appreciated normal rights. Yet, because of certain unavoidable conditions (the control of which was passed their capacity), they couldn't make appropriate use of these rights (Landman, T. 2006). A choice was taken that common authority was to be set up whose, entomb Alia, the capacity makes strides for the security of the regular rights. This methodology got further significance in the possession of Locke who expected that rights were to be seen with regards to common society (Greer, S. 2006). The principle capacity of the authority of common society is to ensure rights (Meyer, J. W. et al. 2010).

Even though common rights had the option to draw the consideration of an enormous number of individuals they got a mishap on account of utilitarian's and Marxist (Engle, E. 2008)s. "Generally, the convention of characteristic rights has experienced the notions of political and scholarly style. It was well known in the seventeenth century

however endured because of the utilitarian's and Marxists" (MacIntyre, A. 1985). The utilitarian thinker had no confidence in the hypothesis of common rights. Each privilege should be seen behind the scenes of society, state, and governmental issues. The utilitarian's along these lines made rights a component of the state. They additionally imagined that it was the obligation of the state to ensure rights or to make plans for the security of the rights (Kolakowski, L. 1983). The Marxists have ventured forward. Rights must be perceived inside the setting of specific monetary and social conditions. With the ascent of the intricacies of social construction, its organization (Slaughter, J. R. 2006), and the connection among people and state, rights, at last, became essential pieces of political hypothesis and prime worry of the state. Particularly the last was the outcome of the fast development of popular government. Today we can't separate rights from state and governmental issues (Risse, T., & Ropp, S. C. 1999). The close connection between right, state, and the law was offensively contended by the savants of utilitarianism and this methodology established the framework of the idea rights and political hypothesis. From the center of the nineteenth century, this propensity has gotten common.

CONCLUDING REMARK:

On these remarkable occasions, we are completely compelled to take a gander at things from an alternate point of view. For most sensible individuals, this may likewise incorporate a bit of inconvenience (Francioni, F. 2010). I carry this up as a preface to this idea: "What makes you think your privileges are a higher priority than my privileges?" Despite your political alliance, race, nationality, doctrine, or another self-declared social identifier, here in countries we are expected to be equivalent. In these seasons of social strengthening and change, let us not fail to remember that fairness implies only that equivalent (Simmons, B. A. 2009). Given this uniformity hypothesis, which has at long last gone to the cutting edge of the national mind, assuming we are on the whole genuinely equivalent (Henkin, L. 1979), what makes you imagine that your entitlement to decide to not wear a face-covering is a higher priority than my entitlement to a sound space and climate? Face-covering is fundamental to shield others from your germs, not shield you from theirs.

REFERENCES:

1. Alexy, R. (2010). *A theory of constitutional rights*. Oxford University Press, USA.
2. Ali, S. S. (2000). *Gender and human rights in Islam and international law: equal before Allah, unequal before man?*. Brill.
3. Ayres, J. R. D. C. M., Paiva, V., França Jr, I., Gravato, N., Lacerda, R., Della Negra, M., ... & Silva, M. H. (2006). Vulnerability, human rights, and comprehensive health care needs of young people living with HIV/AIDS. *American journal of public health, 96*(6), 1001-1006.
4. Andorno, R. (2016). Is vulnerability the foundation of human rights?. In *Human Dignity of the Vulnerable in the Age of Rights* (pp. 257-272). Springer, Cham.
5. Alston, P., & Goodman, R. (2013). *International human rights*. Oxford University Press.
6. Askin, K. D., & Koenig, D. (1999). *Women and International Human Rights Law (3 vols)*. Brill Nijhoff.
7. Arzt, D. E. (1990). The application of international human rights law in Islamic states. *Hum. Rts. Q., 12*, 202.
8. Blattman, C., Hartman, A. C., & Blair, R. A. (2014). How to promote order and property rights under weak rule of law? An experiment in changing dispute resolution behavior through community education. *American Political Science Review, 100*-120.
9. Baderin, M. A., & Ssenyonjo, M. (2010). Development of International Human Rights Law before and after the UDHR. *DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW BEFORE AND AFTER THE UDHR, Mashood A. Baderin & Manisuli Ssenyonjo, eds., Ashgate Publishing*.
10. Bantekas, I., & Oette, L. (2013). *International human rights law and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
11. Bilder, R. B. (1969). Rethinking international human rights: Some basic questions. *Wis. L. Rev., 171*.
12. Boyce, J. K. (2000). Let them eat risk? Wealth, rights and disaster vulnerability. *Disasters, 24*(3), 254-261.
13. Buergenthal, T. (2006). The evolving international human rights system. *Am. J. Int'l L., 100*, 783.
14. Burke, R. (2011). *Decolonization and the evolution of international human rights*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
15. Benhabib, S. (2009). Claiming rights across borders: International human rights and democratic sovereignty. *American Political Science Review, 691*-704.
16. Cardenas, S. (2004). Norm collision: Explaining the effects of international human rights pressure on state behavior. *International Studies Review, 6*(2), 213-231.
17. Carothers, T. (1998). The rule of law revival. *Foreign Aff., 77*, 95.
18. Cook, R. J. (1993). Women's international human rights law: the way forward. *Hum. Rts. Q., 15*, 230.
19. Cook, R. J., & World Health Organization. (1994). *Women's health and human rights: the promotion and protection of women's health through international human rights law*. World Health Organization.
20. Condä, H. V. (2004). *A handbook of international human rights terminology* (Vol. 8). U of Nebraska Press.
21. Claude, R. P., & Weston, B. H. (Eds.). (1992). *Human rights in the world community: issues and action*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
22. Di Donato, L., & Grimi, E. (Eds.). (2019). *Metaphysics of Human Rights 1948-2018: On the Occasion of the 70th Anniversary of the UDHR*. Vernon Press.

23. Doise, W., Spini, D., Jesuino, J. C., & Ng, S. H. (1994). Values and perceived conflicts in the social representations of human rights: feasibility of a cross-national study. *Swiss Journal of Psychology/Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Revue Suisse de Psychologie*.
24. Doise, W. (2003). *Human rights as social representations*. Routledge.
25. Donnelly, J. (1986). International human rights: a regime analysis. *International Organization*, 599-642.
26. Eckert, A. (2001). Universality by Consensus: The Evolution of Universality in the Drafting of the UDHR. *Human Rights & Human Welfare*, 1(2), 5.
27. Edwards, A. (2010). *Violence against women under international human rights law*. Cambridge University Press.
28. Engle, E. (2008). Human rights according to Marxism. *Guild Prac.*, 65, 249.
29. Flowers, N. (1998). *Human Rights Here and Now: Celebrating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Human Rights USA Resource Center, 229 19th Avenue South, Suite 439, Minneapolis, MN 55455.
30. Frederick, W. C. (1991). The moral authority of transnational corporate codes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10(3), 165-177.
31. Francioni, F. (2010). International human rights in an environmental horizon. *European Journal of International Law*, 21(1), 41-55.
32. Gilbert, J. (2016). *Indigenous peoples' land rights under international law: from victims to actors*. Brill Nijhoff.
33. Ghandhi, P. R., & Ghandhi, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Blackstone's international human rights documents*. Oxford University Press.
34. Gardbaum, S. (2008). Human rights as international constitutional rights. *European Journal of International Law*, 19(4), 749-768.
35. Gregg, B. (2011). *Human rights as social construction*. Cambridge University Press.
36. Haggard, S., & Tiede, L. (2011). The rule of law and economic growth: where are we? *World development*, 39(5), 673-685.
37. Heuman, S. (1998). *Kistiakovsky: The Struggle for National and Constitutional Rights in the Last Years of Tsarism* (p. 47). Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
38. Greer, S. (2006). *The European Convention on Human Rights: achievements, problems and prospects*. Cambridge University Press.
39. Hannum, H. (1998). The UDHR in national and international law. *Health and Human rights*, 144-158.
40. Haas, M. (2013). *International human rights: A comprehensive introduction*. Routledge.
41. Hickman, T. R. (2005). Between human rights and the rule of law: Indefinite detention and the derogation model of constitutionalism. *The Modern Law Review*, 68(4), 655-668.
42. Hannum, H. (2004). *Guide to international human rights practice*. Brill Nijhoff.
43. Henkin, L. (1979). Rights: American and human. *Colum L. Rev.*, 79, 405.
44. Ife, J. (2012). *Human rights and social work: Towards rights-based practice*. Cambridge University Press.
45. Kolakowski, L. (1983). Marxism and human rights. *Daedalus*, 81-92.
46. Komesar, N. K. (2001). *Law's Limits: Rule of Law and the Supply and Demand of Rights*. Cambridge University Press.
47. Kälin, W., & Künzli, J. (2019). *The law of international human rights protection*. Oxford University Press, USA.
48. Lauren, P. G. (2011). *The evolution of international human rights: Visions seen*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
49. Landman, T. (2006). *Studying human rights*. Psychology Press.
50. MacIntyre, A. (1985). Rights, practices and marxism: reply to six critics. *Analyse & Kritik*, 7(2), 234-248.
51. Milanovic, M. (2011). *Extraterritorial application of human rights treaties: law, principles, and policy*. Oxford University Press.
52. Merry, S. E. (2007). Introduction: Conditions of vulnerability. In *The practice of human rights: Tracking law between the global and the local* (pp. 195-203). Cambridge University Press.
53. Morawa, A. H. (2003). Vulnerability as a concept of international human rights law. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 6(2), 139-155.
54. Meron, T. (1986). On a hierarchy of international human rights. *Am. J. Int'l L.*, 80, 1.
55. Meyer, J. W., Bromley, P., & Ramirez, F. O. (2010). Human rights in social science textbooks: Cross-national analyses, 1970–2008. *Sociology of Education*, 83(2), 111-134.
56. Moeckli, D., Shah, S., Harris, D., & Sivakumaran, S. (Eds.). (2014). *International human rights law*. Oxford University Press.
57. Moravcsik, A. (1995). Explaining international human rights regimes: Liberal theory and Western Europe. *European Journal of International Relations*, 1(2), 157-189.
58. Nesiha, V. (2009). The specter of violence that haunts the UDHR: the turn to ethics and expertise. *Md. J. Int'l L.*, 24, 135.
59. Neuman, G. L. (2002). Human rights and constitutional rights: Harmony and dissonance. *Stan. L. Rev.*, 55, 1863.
60. Neumayer, E. (2005). Do international human rights treaties improve respect for human rights?. *Journal of conflict resolution*, 49(6), 925-953.

61. Peerenboom, R. (2004). Human rights and rule of law: What's the relationship. *Geo. J. Int'l L.*, 36, 809.
62. Provost, R. (2002). *International human rights and humanitarian law* (Vol. 22). Cambridge University Press.
63. Olayemi, A. A. M., Hamzah Alabi, A., & Hidayah Buang, A. (2015). Islamic Human Rights Law: A Critical Evaluation of UIDHR & CDHRI In Context of UDHR. *Journal of Islam, Law and Judiciary*, 1(3), 27-36.
64. O'Byrne, D. (2014). *Human rights: An introduction*. Routledge.
65. Reif, L. C. (2004). *The ombudsman, good governance, and the international human rights system* (Vol. 79). Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
66. Rivers, J. (2002). A Theory of Constitutional Rights.
67. Risse, T., & Ropp, S. C. (1999). International human rights norms and domestic change: conclusions. *Cambridge Studies in International Relations*, 66, 234-278.
68. Risse-Kappen, T., Risse, T., Ropp, S. C., & Sikkink, K. (Eds.). (1999). *The power of human rights: International norms and domestic change* (No. 66). Cambridge University Press.
69. Roth, K. (2004). Defending economic social and cultural rights: Practical issues faced by an international human rights organization. *Hum. Rts. Q.*, 26, 63.
70. Russell, P. H. (1983). The political purposes of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. *Can. B. Rev.*, 61, 30.
71. Risse-Kappen, T., Risse, T., Ropp, S. C., & Sikkink, K. (Eds.). (1999). *The power of human rights: International norms and domestic change* (No. 66). Cambridge University Press.
72. Viljoen, F. (2012). *International human rights law in Africa*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
73. Saeed, D., & Ahmad, R. (2013). Human Rights in Islam and West:(The Last Sermon of the Prophet and UDHR). *Jihāt al-Islām*, 6(2).
74. Ssenyonjo, M. (2016). *International human rights law: six decades after the Udhhr and beyond*. Routledge.
75. Shelton, D. (2015). *Remedies in international human rights law*. Oxford University Press, USA.
76. Scheiber, H. N. (1984). Public rights and the rule of law in American legal history. *Calif. L. Rev.*, 72, 217.
77. Sikkink, K. (2008). From pariah state to global protagonist: Argentina and the struggle for international human rights. *Latin American politics and society*, 50(1), 1-29.
78. Steiner, H. J., Alston, P., & Goodman, R. (2008). *International human rights in context: law, politics, morals: text and materials*. Oxford University Press, USA.
79. Slaughter, J. (1997). A question of narration: The voice in international human rights law. *Hum. Rts. Q.*, 19, 406.
80. Simmons, B. A. (2009). *Mobilizing for human rights: international law in domestic politics*. Cambridge University Press.
81. Thio, L. A. (2008). Reading rights rightly: The UDHR and its creeping influence on the development of Singapore public law. *Sing. J. Legal Stud.*, 264.
82. Waldron, J. (1993). A right-based critique of constitutional rights. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 13(1), 18-51.
83. Woods, A. K. (2010). A behavioral approach to human rights. *Harv. Int'l LJ*, 51, 51.
84. Weissbrodt, D. S., & De La Vega, C. (2007). *International human rights law: an introduction*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
85. Wronka, J. (1998). *Human rights and social policy in the 21st century: A history of the idea of human rights and comparison of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights with United States federal and state constitutions*. University Press of America.
86. Williams Jr, R. A. (1990). Encounters on the Frontiers of International Human Rights Law: Redefining the Terms of Indigenous Peoples' Survival in the World. *Duke LJ*, 660.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Alston, P. (1982). A third generation of solidarity rights: progressive development or obfuscation of international human rights law?. *Netherlands international law review*, 29(3), 307-322.
2. Afshari, R. (2007). On Historiography of Human Rights Reflections on Paul Gordon Lauren's" The Evolution of International Human Rights: Visions Seen". *Human Rights Quarterly*, 29(1), 1-67.
3. An-Nacim, A. A. (1992). Human Rights in.
4. Börzel, T. A., & Risse, T. (2004, October). One size fits all! EU policies for the promotion of human rights, democracy and the rule of law. In *Workshop on Democracy Promotion* (Vol. 4, pp. 509-523). Center for Development, Democracy, and the Rule of Law, Stanford University.
5. Benton, T. (1993). *Natural relations: Ecology, animal rights and social justice*. Verso.
6. Buergenthal, T., & Torney-Purta, J. (1976). *International human rights and international education*. US National Commission for UNESCO, Department of state.
7. Carozza, P. G. (1997). Uses and misuses of comparative law in international human rights: some reflections on the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights. *Notre Dame L. Rev.*, 73, 1217.
8. Cardenas, S. (2010). *Conflict and compliance: State responses to international human rights pressure*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

9. Cole, W. M. (2005). Sovereignty relinquished? Explaining commitment to the international human rights covenants, 1966-1999. *American Sociological Review*, 70(3), 472-495.
10. Darrow, M. (2003). *Between light and shadow: the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and international human rights law* (Vol. 1). Hart Publishing.
11. Donnelly, J. (1982). Human rights and human dignity: An analytic critique of non-Western conceptions of human rights. *The American political science review*, 303-316.
12. Droege, C. (2007). The interplay between international humanitarian law and international human rights law in situations of armed conflict. *Isr. L. Rev.*, 40, 310.
13. Fisher, P. (2012). Ethics in qualitative research: 'Vulnerability', citizenship and human rights. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 8(1), 2-17.
14. Frey, B. A. (1997). The legal and ethical responsibilities of transnational corporations in the protection of international human rights. *Minn. J. Global Trade*, 6, 153.
15. Haggard, S., MacIntyre, A., & Tiede, L. (2008). The rule of law and economic development. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 11, 205-234.
16. Hafner-Burton, E. M., Tsutsui, K., & Meyer, J. W. (2008). International human rights law and the politics of legitimation: Repressive states and human rights treaties. *International sociology*, 23(1), 115-141.
17. Hawkins, D. G. (2002). *International human rights and authoritarian rule in Chile* (Vol. 6). U of Nebraska Press.
18. Heinze, E. (1995). *Sexual orientation: a human right: an essay on international human rights law*. Brill Nijhoff.
19. Holston, J. (2009). Dangerous spaces of citizenship: gang talk, rights talk and rule of law in Brazil. *Planning theory*, 8(1), 12-31.
20. Lillich, R. B. (1995). The growing importance of customary international human rights law. *Ga. J. Int'l & Comp. L.*, 25, 1.
21. Lukes, S. (1986). Marxism and morality. *Capital & Class*, 10(2), 220-222.
22. Parkes, A. (2013). *Children and international human rights law: The right of the child to be heard*. Routledge.
23. Rodriguez-Pinzon, D., & Martin, C. (2002). The international human rights status of elderly persons. *Am. U. Int'l L. Rev.*, 18, 915.
24. Simmons, B. A. (2009). *Mobilizing for human rights: international law in domestic politics*. Cambridge University Press.
25. Stromseth, J., Wippman, D., & Brooks, R. (2006). *Can Might make Rights?: building the rule of law after military interventions*. Cambridge University Press.
26. Sceats, S., & Breslin, S. (2012). *China and the international human rights system*. Chatham House, The Royal Institute of International Affairs.
27. Shivji, I. G. (1989). *The concept of human rights in Africa*. African Books Collective.
28. Slaughter, J. R. (2006). Enabling Fictions and Novel Subjects: The "Bildungsroman" and International Human Rights Law. *PMLA*, 1405-1423.
29. Shelton, D. (Ed.). (2013). *The Oxford handbook of international human rights law*. Oxford University Press.
30. Shestack, J. J. (1998). The philosophic foundations of human rights. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 20(2), 201-234.
31. Stephens, B. (2002). Translating Filártiga: a comparative and international law analysis of domestic remedies for international Human Rights violations. *Yale J. Int'l L.*, 27, 1.
32. Tierney, B. (2001). *The idea of natural rights: studies on natural rights, natural law, and church law, 1150-1625* (Vol. 5). Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
33. Triantafyllou, D. (2002). The European Charter of Fundamental Rights and the "Rule of Law": Restricting Fundamental Rights by Reference. *Common Market Law Review*, 39(1).
34. Wotipka, C. M., & Tsutsui, K. (2008, December). Global Human Rights and State Sovereignty: State Ratification of International Human Rights Treaties, 1965–2001 1. In *Sociological Forum* (Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 724-754). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
35. Wright, S. (2001). *International human rights, decolonisation and globalisation: Becoming human* (Vol. 3). Psychology Press.