



From Liberal to Social Vision of Human Rights: The Innovative Contribution of Socialism to Social and Economic Rights

Anselmo Vilanculo

Masters candidate in the Peace and Conflict Studies at the
Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice, St. Paul's College
University of Manitoba

ABSTRACT

Liberalism and Socialism as well as the contribution of Socialism to Social and Economic Rights (SER) is explored. Enjoyment of Human Rights in different milieus is a result of differences between Liberal and Social understanding and approaches of Human Rights. Liberal approaches founds their roots in the Enlightenment movement and values of nation-state, rights to life, freedom of expression, civil liberty and property. Socialism has its foundations in the Marxist theories. Social relativism and relativism of rights challenges the Liberal universalism of rights. In Socialism, Social and Economic Rights are emphasized. Both Liberalism and Socialism have strengths and weaknesses. As so, the future of Human Rights depends on the combination of approaches, complementarities and synergies, which will result in a multiplicity and plurality of approaches toward Human Rights protection and promotion.

Keywords: Social and Economic Rights; Liberalism; Socialism; Human Rights; Universalism and Relativism.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes that all human beings are bestowed with dignity, civil, political, social, economic and cultural rights. However, conception and enjoyment of the aforementioned Human Rights do not depend only on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Rather, enjoyment and understanding of rights follow the dynamics of time and space. This research paper explores the understanding, exercitation and satisfaction of Human Rights in both Liberalism and Socialism, focusing on the contributions made by Socialism to Social and Economic Rights (SER). Analyzing the foundations of both Liberalism and Socialism such as rationalism, universalism, relativism, contractualism of rights, social democracy and dialectic class relations, this article argues that, Socialism made a crucial contribution to Human Rights theory and practice, especially to the body of Social and Economic Rights, SER through advocacy of right of property and self-determination. Therefore, in this research paper, Liberal conception of Human Rights is presented. Second, foundations of Socialism are discussed. Third, contributions of Socialism to SER is examined. Fourth, strength and weaknesses of Liberalism and Socialism are analyzed. Fifth, future of Human Rights between Liberalism and Socialism is predicted and proposed.

LIBERALISM AND LIBERAL CONCEPTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The Liberal vision of Human Rights has its roots in the Enlightenment, which contributed immensely to the agency of Human Rights, as it is known today. Liberalism consists of

“structuring of individual interests in society on the basis of a set of rights that require human beings to respect each other’s liberty and equality” (Charvet and Kaczynska-Nay, 2008, p. 3). In this regard, liberal project aims at transforming the structures of modern and international societies in order to them to express liberal values (p. 5). As far as human rights are concerned, values of liberalism are as follows: the nation-state, the right to life, freedom of expression, civil liberty, and property, which can only be spread and protected through commercial enterprises and republican institutions, define the Enlightenment age and the liberal vision of Human Rights (Ishay, 2007, pp. 93-94). The aforementioned rights constitute the foundation of the liberal vision of Human Rights and philosophers such as John Milton (1608-1674), John Locke (1632-1704), Cesare Beccaria (1738-1794), Gerrard Winstanley (1609-1676), Maximilien Robespierre (1758-1794), Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and John Stewart Mill (1806-1873) in the eighteenth and nineteenth made their contribution to justify the rationale of the rights.

With regard to freedom of expression, John Milton (1608-1674) attests that, “liberty to know, to utter and argue freely according to conscience” (as cited in Ishay, 2007, p. 95) should be one of the cornerstone of the modern society, given the fact that, man is an image of God. Killing his reasoning reflected in books and other means of expression, would mean killing the creation of God, to whom freedom is a liberty (Ishay, 2007, pp. 96-97). Therefore, freedom of expression should not be restricted. In the same vein, to secure the enjoyment of freedom of expression and liberal values, liberal democracies should ponder the separation of religion from state and toleration of different religions. In John Locke (1632-1704), separation of religion and state is based on the fact that, no man should dictate the faith of another to confirm his own faith because the power of faith lives within every human being. As such, caring of the souls cannot be a task of civil magistrate, given the fact that, the power of the civil magistrate has its efficiency in the outward. The civil power cannot decide about the power of inward (John Locke, 1689, as cited in Ishay, 2007, pp. 96-99). In the wake of Locke (1689), Voltaire (1764) defends the freedom of religion denouncing the fanaticism through which men would kill each other, idolatry, superstition and clericalism, which are used to exploit the people of faith and the believers. Thus, freedom of religion in Voltaire (1764) as in Locke (1689) may consider toleration as it avoids killing and brings mutual respect (Ishay, 2007, pp. 93-102).

In defense of the right to life, a fundamental principle of liberalism, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) argues that, a social contract made by individuals should respect the right to life to guarantee peaceful coexistence. The Hobbesian thinking is that, the right to life is equivalent to the right of nature, which is “liberty each man has to use his own power, as he will himself to preserve his life” (Hobbes, 1652, as cited in Ishay, 2007, p. 104). In his right to life, man longs for peace and when he fails to attain it, he seeks help and advantages of war. In this regard, given the fact that man wishes to defend himself at all costs, he falls into war against others and only a contract through which he transfers mutually his rights to the state can help to end the mutual war. Therefore, protection of the right to life is possible through a social contract (pp. 104-107). On the other hand, Beccaria (1738-1794), argues that the right to life should be protected through abolishment of punishment, which is tyrannous if it does not derive from absolute necessity (p. 107). Physical force inflicted on man cannot be identified with justice, but an abuse. In the same way, torture used to make man confess a crime is a cruelty and it is not a fit mean of discovering the truth (pp. 108-110). Rather, it is a part of war against society and

citizens, and it comes to destroy them, because there are no basis that justifies the necessity of the death of a citizen (pp. 110-113).

In the matter of right to property as third cornerstone of the liberalism age, land should be not denied to people, especially the poor. Thus, Winstanley (1649) affirms in confrontation with the lords of England that, "land/earth was not made purposely for the Lords, nor peoples to be slaves and servants and beggars of the Lords" (Winstanley, 1649, as cited in Ishay, p. 114). Rather, land was made to become a common livelihood. Similarly, Locke (1689) claims that, "man has property in his own person; this means that nobody has any right to, but himself" (Locke, 1689 as cited in Ishay, 2007, p. 119). According to Locke (1689), man labor on the earth that he received from God, introduces the concept of private possession, as property is a result of man's labor and work (pp. 119). Robespierre (1793), however, argues that although the right of property may be inviolable it may need to be limited. While exercising the right of property, one should not jeopardize the security, liberty or the right of property of his neighbor (p. 123). Robespierre (1793) defines the right to property as the "right each and every citizen has to enjoy and dispose of the portion of goods that is guaranteed to him by law." (Robespierre, 1793 as cited in Ishay, 2007, p. 121). The conditions that Robespierre (1793) consider that should be followed with regard to the enjoyment of the right of property are as follows: it is limited in other to respect the right of property of others. It cannot be exercised in prejudice to security, liberty and existence of others. If these conditions are infringed, the right of property is unlawful and immoral (pp. 121-123).

Another relevant question to Liberalism is related to how the rights that embody the Liberal system can be exercised and protected to prevent war. Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) responds to this question postulating the doctrine of just war, which would be regulated through the laws of nations that are different from the laws within state. In other words, international law could regulate and prevent occurrence of war (Grotius, 1625, as cited in Ishay, 2007, pp. 127-132). To Rousseau (1756), the idea of general will, cooperation and separation of powers is crucial to maintain the Liberal system of Human Rights sane. In addition, trade between states should depend on self-sufficiency and independence to avoid war between states (Rousseau, 1756, as cited in Ishay, 2007, pp. 139-142). Contrarily, Adam Smith (1723-1790) argues that capitalism and free trade should be considered. In this regard, Government should not interfere in economy and competition, and self-interest should characterize the economy. Otherwise, monopoly would bring inefficiency and injustices (Smith, 1776, as cited in Ishay, 2007, pp. 142-148). To the same question, Thomas Paine (1737-1809) argues that, peace could be achieved through life, liberty, and republican governance, separation of powers, property and commerce (Paine, 1792 as cited in Ishay, 2007, p. 148-153). In the end of the Modern Age, Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) proposes that a perpetual peace would be possible through a metaphysics of morals, prevention of aggression, expansion of commerce and Republican governance (Kant, 1797, as cited in Ishay, 2007, pp. 153-160).

With the abovementioned reflection, it is possible to understand that, the main idea behind Enlightenment and Liberalism was to create a new international order, where equality and liberty were the basic principles, and welfare rights would be a necessary condition for their materialization (Charvet and Kaczynska-Nay, 2008, p. 6). In such an order, liberal values would define and characterize all aspects of life and the international relations between states following international documents and treaties that in the late stage would have the United

Nations as the patronage for their application (Charvet and Kaczynska-Nay, 2008, p. 1). In fact, rights to freedom of expression, to life, of property and many other civil rights conceptualized and theorized by Friedman, Beccaria, Locke, Hobbes and Rousseau were, in the later stage made provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In other words, the articles 3, 5, 12 of the United Nations Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, regulate the right to life. Likewise, the article 17 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights regulates the right for property.

FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIALISM AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RIGHTS

Exploring the experience of Socialism is important to understand the past, the present and the future of Human Rights, especially the Social, Economic and Cultural Rights. The Social vision of Human Rights founds its roots on Marx and Engels theories, which “opposed the Liberal and ahistorical character of Human Rights” (Ishay, 2007, p. 197). The Economic, Social and Cultural Rights “draw on Marxist-socialist and welfare state conception that citizens have rights in a state rather than against it” (Messer, 1997, p. 296). According to Messer (1997), precedents of engagement in Socialist approaches are cited in Russian and Mexican revolutions and in their contributions, which established the people’s rights to land and economic well-being. Another precedent is the International Labor Organization Convention of 1919, which articulated principles of social justice, just work conditions, and the wages (Jenks, 1968, as cited in Messer, 1997, p. 296). However, hermeneutic of history and scholarship illustrates that the Socialism and advocacy of the SER phenomenon can be traced very before the Russian and Mexican revolutions. For instance, according to Ishay (2007) it was in the context of Liberalism, where Socialist thinkers started to denounce the contradictions of Liberalism and capitalism, arguing that working class conditions and legal rights were restricted by the contingencies of Liberalism and capitalism. In this regard, it is possible to understand that Socialism, in the first place, was against the pursuance of the unlimited right of property advocated by Liberalism. Starting from this point on, efforts were made by Socialism to address inequalities in both voting rights and SER disparities (pp. 194-196). This first moment was followed by the “bloodshed in Paris that further galvanized the growing labor movements, which regarded the right to vote as political mean to improve the SER and conditions of the working class” (p. 198). Scholarship points to Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865) precursors of Socialism. With regard to social and right of property-based inequalities, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1840), on one hand, admonished that, “the rich are irrationally favored over the poor when it comes to right of property” (Proudhon, 1840, as cited in Ishay, 2007, pp. 208-214). In a socialist manner, Proudhon (1840) defended the right of those excluded from the social sphere. On the other hand, Marx (1871) wrote his theories to demand and alert about the social and economic rights that were not secured by capitalism, including the right to the limitation of the working day, freedom of association, universal health care, national public education and prohibition of the child labor (Ishay, 2007, pp. 218-222). The abovementioned contributions and those of other socialist philosophers led to the introduction of the SER in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948).

The discourse of the foundations of SER takes into account the question on how to promote Social and Economic Rights. Answers to that question challenge the Liberalism and they can be traced in Marx (1871), Karl Kautsky (1854-1938) and Rosa Luxembourg (1870-1924) to whom free trade would provide new political space for working class solidarity across borders (pp. 225-228). To Marx (1848) revolution was inevitable to redress oppression. However, a just war through a nonviolent revolution like in the case of the revolution in Amsterdam (1872) would

be an alternative, where revolutionary means should include caveats in order to workers attain their objectives peacefully (Marx, 1848, as cited in Ishay, 2007, pp. 232-234). In the same spirit, Kautsky (1918) would vehemently condemn the outcome the Bolshevik revolution as an acceptable mean to attain power and establish socialist rights. Therefore, political will and maturity of the working class and moral standards were the cornerstone to achieve social rights (Kautsky, 1918, as cited in Ishay, 2007, pp. 239-242).

Analysis of Socialism and Social and Economic Rights reveals that at the heart of Socialist philosophy there is a conception of rights that challenges the pretended Liberal universalism of rights. In other words, cultural relativism between states and the rise of non-state players that do not identify with the universalism of Human Rights contest the Enlightenment of Human Rights. From this point of view, it is possible to affirm that, relativism and particularism is a defiance even to the United Nation desire of universalism (Bring et al., 2017, p. 549). The debate between relativism and universalism as two essential concepts of Liberalism and Socialism of Human Rights resides in the fact that, Human Rights are universal as they apply to all peoples and countries. However, they also accept a regional and contextual qualification. In this sense, cultural norms may be opposed to universality (p. 551).

INNOVATIVE CONTRIBUTION OF SOCIALISM TO SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RIGHTS

The history of Human Rights has been identified with the universalistic Enlightenment and Liberalism until Socialism came into play an innovative role in the evolution of societies and in the conceptualization of Human Rights. On to what degree Socialism contributed innovatively to the concept, body and structure of Human Rights, an analysis of the Liberalism vision of Human rights is needed. In Liberalism, Human Rights are inherently confined with Enlightenment origins, bias and they served to legitimize ideology of rising property-based, Western capitalist civilizations. In addition, intellectual roots of Human Rights are individualist, egoist, racist, male, hetero-normative, Eurocentric, colonialist, bourgeois or classical liberal. For instance, the founder fathers owned slaves. Rights protected wealth and property from distributive legislation (Horwitz, 1998, as cited in Aliviar, et al., 2015, p. 8). On the contrary, in Socialism, Social and Economic Rights are advocated. The proponents of this view seem to have found the “medium sufficiently plastic to incorporate claims for substantive equality, communal rights, and intersectional justice. Therefore, SER perspectives reflect the voices of women, dominated races, ethnic groups, marginalized and non-confirming people. In Socialism’s vision of Human Rights, “concepts acquire a thick meaning in the context of popular mobilization” (Klare, 2015, as cited in Aliviar, et al., 2015, pp. 7-9). Within this framework, pointing out the differences between Liberalism and Socialism, Tully (2014) finds in both theories two traditions of Human Rights, where Liberalism asserts the unilaterality and authority of Human Rights as self-evident and universal truths that can be exercised through a set of political, legal and economic institutions, which cannot be debated. Contrarily, innovation of Socialism as tradition of Human Rights consists of defining rights as proposals in the sense that they need to be suggested to fellow humans by fellow humans. From this perspective, Human Rights cannot be imposed and declared by an authority because they are not self-evident and they do not depend only on universal institutions to be exercised, promoted and protected (Tully, 2014 as cited in Lutz-Bachmann and Nascimento, 2014, pp. 139-142).

Beyond the aforementioned differentiation between the Liberal and Social philosophies, there are several aspects, which lead us to affirm the innovative approach of Socialism to SER. First,

Socialism came as an alternative to society that was based largely on private ownership, private profit and inequalities. In such a society, generations of Socialists envisaged a world with a common ownership, where economic and political power would be more evenly distributed, where ordinary people would have greater control over their lives and over conditions of their work (Arocena, 2020, p. 230). In addition, in Socialism fight against inequalities and subjection to market forces, as well as better living conditions for ordinary people are the defining normative and end of the philosophy (p. 231). Second, according to Paul (1981), Socialism has introduced bottom-up strategies, where rural poor were not simply objects of development; rather they provide the sources of and force behind efforts to change condition, which produce their impoverishment. Aforementioned bottom-up strategies “were to not only call for redistribution of essential resources such as land, credit and services, but for creation of new social structures, such as communal villages, peasant associations, self-manage collectivities” (pp. 237-240). Taking this Paul’s reflection in consideration is possible to understand that, Socialism has introduced social laws, SER to development in Third World countries. Evidence demonstrates that, Socialist countries were the first to move ahead with new set of SER. For instance, Cuba, Chile and Panama included SER in their constitutions promising their people modification of living conditions (Davy, 2014, pp. 219). To be more precise, Cuba defined in the article 60 of its constitution that “labor was an inalienable right of individual” (pp. 220). The same would benefit from a minimum wage with defined minimum working hour per day (pp. 220). In the same vein, Weitz (2019) argues that, USSR contributed to the history of Human Rights, and especially SER through alliances forged with countries of the Global South supporting decolonization, self-determination and SER policies opposed by liberalism and Liberal states such as the United States of America, Great Britain and France (pp. 298-299). In the third place, it is possible to mention that, on one side, Socialism fought to extend and promote universal suffrage and social rights to dispossessed, on the other side, it contributed to ending slavery and advancing the rights if children, women and marginalized minorities (Ishay, 2007, p. 189). Fourth, no one can deny that Socialism has influenced the breakthrough of the Human Rights movements in mid 1960s and 1970’s such as Amnesty International, doctors without borders, black consciousness movements in South Africa, which contributed indirectly to satisfaction of SER and the idea of basic rights (Eckel and Moyn, 2014; Moyn, 2010, pp. 202-207; Weitz, 2019, p. 297). In the 1960’s and 1970’s the Human Rights movements coming from intelligentsia, were influenced by the Soviet Union and they were interested in fulfilling the Soviet law. Following this assertion, it is fair to affirm that the USSR is a major actor in the creation of the post war Human Rights system and SER as well as emergence of domestic dissident Human Rights movements from 1960 onward (Weitz, 2019, pp. 301-302). The fifth innovation of Socialism with regard to SER are the concepts of basic rights and self-determination. With regard to basic rights, scholarship affirmed that, human beings have basic needs: food, shelter, clothing, health, education, and that process of growth could not be secured without satisfaction of basic rights (Sen, 1970; Mac Namara, 1970; Ward, 1970 as cited in Moyn, 2018, pp. 125-137). On the same topic, John Rawls (1921-2002) recognized that, basic rights protect development and exercise of moral power. One of the crucial moral powers that gave its roots in Socialism is work (Rawls, 1971, as cited in Von Platz, 2016, p. 289). The power to engage in socially productive work and the capacity to work to as basic right embodies the Rawl’s Theory of Justice (Von Platz, 2016, pp. 289-290). Turning to the concept of self-determination, it has its roots in the Enlightenment thanks to articulations of the German philosopher, Fichte (1762-1814). However, the concept of self-determination was developed in the nineteenth century through doctrines of national liberation, which led many countries to

support the resistance against colonization, and support the Global South states toward their independences (Weitz, 2019, p. 302). It seems that there are linkages that can be made between Socialism, the concepts of basic rights, self-determination and the action taken by some states after their vulgarization through Socialist and anti-capitalist struggles. To illustrate this, Murray (2015) affirms that contemporary anti-capitalist struggles reinvigorated debates on SER and self-determination of labor movements and states. Additional evidence indicates that, labor movements inspired the USSR revolution in 1917. The fight for the Irish Free State and the 1917 constitution inspired the anti-colonial battle by the Irish Republican Army (IRA's) (Forbath, 2012; Langford et al., 2013; Young 2012, p. 12 as cited in Murray, 2015, pp. 488-494).

LIBERALISM AND SOCIALISM: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Liberalism and Socialism, which translate the universalism and relativism of Human Rights, end up being two important global traditions that define and conceive the enjoyment of the rights in different perspectives. Examining the two traditions can help to understand their strengths, deficiencies and dysfunctionalities. In this regard, it follows that, as far as Human Rights concerns, Liberalism is the "doctrine of sovereign individuals" (Blau and Moncada, 2015, p. 94). While individual rights such as freedom of expression and religion have been campaigned in the universalistic Liberalism, in the relativist Socialism, SER are the cornerstone of the system. This does not mean that, Liberalism does not consider SER, but there have been a reluctance from the liberal states to conceptualize and theorize SER. For instance, the American Bar Association's House of delegates opposed the Declaration of Human Rights because it contained SER in 1948 (p. 95). In addition, while Liberalism is characterized by the principle of liberty and equality for individuals, Socialism can be understood as a society where desire for equality and freedom for all its members is a purpose of the struggle. In fact, the struggle in Socialism and the social movements dream is reaching the point where private property is cancelled and does not belong to only a small minority of people (Singer, 2020, p. 152). Another difference between Liberalism and Socialism with regard to rights is that, in Socialism workers may have the possibility to apply their direct action in the ESR fields, while in Liberalism the mode of production do not allow all labor force to be employed. Rather, capitalist enterprises may discard workers they consider incompetent, and may exclude those seen as undesirable due to schooling, gender and age, contributing directly to the unemployment, impoverishment of population and social exclusion (Brundenius, 2020, pp. 152-154). Along positive sides, there are negative aspects that characterize both Liberalism and Socialism. First, in both Liberal and Socialist context, "States bear the primary responsibility for protecting the Human Rights of their members" (Lafont, 2014, as cited in Lutz-Bachmann & Nascimento p. 45). This state-centric understanding of Human Rights imposes a gap with regard to any duty that states may have in the treatment of citizens of other states either through direct action or through indirect action as members of global governance organizations (p. 46). Second, from Liberalism point of view, the right of property, liberalization of markets and economic integration are positive aspects (Blau and Moncada, 2005, p. 94). The negative side comes up when globalism, which promotes transparent governance and democracy is forgotten. For instance, the United States of America tries to use protectionism with regard to its commodities. In addition, it prioritizes the commercialization of American arms and crops, promotes IMF in trade liberalization, which interest clashes with that of the third world countries (p. 106). The list of blames against Liberalism is long. Ghodsee (2018) argues that, while Liberal values such as capitalism foster gender inequalities and disadvantage women in the contemporary West, Socialism serves women better. Therefore, women have better sex in Socialism than in Liberalism because in

Liberalism, women do not enjoy SER and they do not have economic independence (pp. 17-20). Third, although Socialist countries have contributed to SER through their movements in 1970's leftists in the same period, were fanatic activists. Evidence is provided by the case of Cuba of Fidel Castro and Che Guevara to whom Human Rights became influential for revolution endangering the enjoyment of Human Rights (Davy, 2014, p. 20). Fourth, if we consider nationalization of all means of production and properties, defining characteristic of Socialism, which followed the independences in African countries, it becomes very difficult to find the sense of protection of right to property to socialists. At this point, it seems that Socialism is an imposition against the will of the owners of the means of production, which also means infringement of the property right (Machaj et al., 2018, p. 134). In other words, in a paradoxical sense, Socialism advocates non-privatization of the means of production, but it makes normal the nationalization of individual properties violating the right of property. Fifth, although Socialism has contributed largely to SER, anti-imperialism and self-determination in some contexts of reference such as Africa, Latin America and East Europe, it should be noted that there were registered cases of violent propaganda of Human Rights in South America, politicization of Human Rights in Africa (Brundenius, 2020, p. 3; Davy, 2014, p. 223). As above illustrated, there are strengths and weaknesses in both Liberalism and Socialism. The way forward would be imagining the future of Human Rights taking in consideration the two systems and maybe proposing an effective approach that can favor protection and promotion of Human Rights.

THE FUTURE OF HUMAN RIGHTS BETWEEN LIBERALISM AND SOCIALISM

Human dignity is the principle at the heart of Human Rights and such a principle do not change throughout the human history. What is flexible are the conceptions of the principle of human dignity and the ways it may be protected and promoted. I would like to draw some insights on the future of Human Rights and protection of human dignity from Liberalism and Socialism, putting forward a proposal for a Human Right approach that can explain the vague concept of human dignity and propose concrete strategies for its protection. Following the analysis of both Liberalism and Socialism in this research, it becomes clear that, the relation between Liberalism and Socialism in most of the time, antagonistic and dialectic. In other words, on one side, Liberalism proclaims universalism and on the other side, Socialism preaches relativism and particularism. The West adopts and promotes the Liberalism vision of Human Rights, while the Global South and some Asian states endorse Socialism. The question that may be made is, can Socialism and Liberalism visions of Human Rights survive in their contexts. With regard to Liberalism, it may not survive so long as "it undermines the social and economic institutions, which protects it, and inevitably, creates conditions in which it will not be able to live, pointing Socialism to take the stage" (Schumpeter, 1950, p. 61). As far as Socialism is concerned, it may also struggle to endure, because "regimes claiming Socialism to take power are also facing limitations in their capacity to transform the society they propose to govern. There are historical gaps between governors and the governed in Socialist milieus" (Paul, 1981, p. 236). Related to this, in Socialist countries, there political exclusion, social gaps between poor and urban elites and this may not be sustainable for lasting relations (p. 237). In addition, it also seems that, Socialists have been abandoning Socialist policies and adopting Liberal values of private property and capitalism. With no interference of Liberalism, Socialist countries are putting in practice some liberal values (Singer, 2020, p. 152). Some optimistic scholars insist on Socialism given its advocacy of SER. For instance, Cowen (2021) argues that, "social, economic and cultural liberties are necessities that should be extended equally to all. Regimes that fail to include SER in the basic structures open the channels to people complaining with regard to

enjoyment of civil liberties” (pp. 135-137). In the same vein, Tomin (1983) sees a better world in Socialism since SER are respected and this would lead societies to produce silent majorities and reject the minorities. In addition, Socialism can succeed because it legalizes gender equality (pp. 119-120). Although SER are the core issue in the protection of Human Rights, its protection may not depend only on Socialism or one vision of Human Rights. Therefore, I agree with Messer (1997) that pluralist approaches beyond the dialectic and antagonistic relations between Liberalism and Socialism are crucial for Human Rights and SER protection. There should be emphasized “a unity-in-diversity in modern Human Rights approaches” (p. 294). For this to happen, any approach, pluralistic approach should take SER at its core reflection and acknowledge the importance of extra-legal dimensions and the grassroots to Human Rights and SER to be achieved (p. 295). Moyn (2010) proposes revision of the history of Human Rights and deconstruction of the links between the past and the present (p. 3). I believe that revision and deconstruction of the history of Human Rights should consider plurality of approaches, including indigenous approaches of protection of Human Rights, where the states are not the only actors to protect Human Rights. In this regard, “a polycentric view of Human Rights, which approves adaptation of Human Rights according to the circumstances and situation is fundamental” (Davy, 2014, p. 223). A polycentric view on Human Rights may take in consideration all the possible actors that can contribute to protection of Human Rights. In this regard, not only economical, legal, political institutions are responsible on exercitation of rights, but also grassroots and social movements have a role with regard to Human Rights and SER protection. I also believe that, SER may continue embodying each and every approach, structural system, institution and mechanism that aim at protecting Human Rights, given the fact that, “SER framework is a necessary variant that affects the realization of Human Rights in many parts of the world” (Simmons, 2009a, as cited in Langford, 2013, p. 2).

CONCLUSION

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights puts the human being at the center of the system of Human Rights. Understanding, enjoyment and exercise of Rights depends of the approach, actors, mechanisms and the circumstances of protection and promotion of Human Rights. In this essay, Liberalism that translates the universalism of Human Rights and Socialism, which explains the relativism of Human Rights, are explored and affirmation that Socialism contributed to SER is elucidated. In this paper, first, Liberal and Social conception of Human Rights is discussed. Liberalism conceives Human Rights as individual values, where liberty and equality embodies the concept of Human Rights. Socialism conceive Human Rights as community, social and collective values, where Social and Economic Rights are at the heart of the system. Second, philosophical foundations of both Liberalism and Socialism are examined. Liberalism has its foundation in the Western philosophy of Enlightenment, while Socialism has its roots in the Marx theories. Third, innovative contribution of Socialism to SER is justified. Socialism has contributed to SER because it influenced the introduction of SER in constitutions of Socialist milieus; it also contributed to decolonization and self-determination in the Global South. Fourth, Liberalism and Socialism strengths and weaknesses are analyzed. Liberalism may need to consider and respecting Social, Economic Rights, and Socialism may need to foster the enjoyment of rights at grassroots levels and eliminate inequalities. Lastly, the future of Human Rights between Liberalism and Socialism is proposed. Multiplicity of Human Rights approaches that include a large number of actors, considering the SER as a crucial variant for protection and promotion of Human Rights may help to overcome the weaknesses of both Liberalism and Socialism. Synergies and constructive complementarities between Liberalism

and Socialism within the framework of promotion of SER may be considered. Otherwise, exclusive and discriminatory efforts to promote Human Rights are doomed to fail.

References

- Alviar, G., Klare, K. E., & Williams, L. A. (2015). *Social and economic rights in theory and practice: a critical inquiry*. Routledge.
- Arocena, R. (2020). The Socialism of Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. In: Brundenius, C. (eds) *Reflections on Socialism in the Twenty-First Century*. Springer, Cham. https://doi-org.uml.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33920-3_12
- Blau, J., & Moncada, A. (2005). *Human rights: beyond the liberal vision*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Brezhnev, L. (1981). *Socialism, democracy and human rights*. Leonid Brezhnev's new book. Soviet Life (Washington), 2.
- Bring, O., Mahmoudi, S., Pellet, A., Crawford, J., Koroma, A. (2017). The Notion of Human Rights and the Issue of Cultural Relativism. In *The International Legal Order: Current Needs and Possible Responses* (pp. 544–558). https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004314375_036
- Brundenius, C. (2020). *Reflections on Socialism in the Twenty-First Century: Facing Market Liberalism, Rising Inequalities and the Environmental Imperative*. Springer International Publishing AG. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33920-3>
- Charvet, J., & Kaczynska-Nay, E. (2008). *The liberal project and human rights: the theory and practice of a new world order*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cowen, N. (2021). *Neoliberal Social Justice: Rawls Unveiled*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Davy, U. (2014). How human rights shape social citizenship: on citizenship and the understanding of economic and social rights. *Washington University Global Studies Law Review*, 13(2), 201.
- Eckel, J., & Moyn, S. (2014). *The breakthrough: human rights in the 1970s*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ghodsee, K. (2018). *Why women have better sex under socialism: and other arguments for economic independence* (First edition.). Nation Books.
- Ishay, M. (2007). *The human rights reader: major political essays, speeches, and documents from ancient times to the present*. (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Langford, M. (2014). *Socio-economic rights in South Africa: symbols or substance?* (Langford, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Lutz-Bachmann, M., & Nascimento, A. (2014). *Human rights, human dignity, and cosmopolitan ideals: essays on critical theory and human rights*. Ashgate.
- Machaj, M & Potocki, K. (2018). *Capitalism, socialism and property rights: why market socialism cannot substitute the market*. Agenda Publishing Limited.
- Messer, E. (1997). Pluralist Approaches to Human Rights. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 53(3), 293–317. <https://doi.org/10.1086/jar.53.3.3630956>
- Moyn, S. (2010). *The last utopia : human rights in history*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Moyn, S. (2018). *Not Enough: Human Rights in an Unequal World*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv24trcgs>
- Murray, T. (2015). Socio-Economic Rights Versus Social Revolution? Constitution Making in Germany, Mexico and Ireland, 1917–1923. *Social & Legal Studies*, 24(4), 487–508. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663915578186>
- Paul, J. (1981). Introduction: Law, Socialism, and the Human Right to Development in Third World Countries. *Review of Socialist Law*, 7(1), 235–241. <https://doi.org/10.1163/187529881X00137>
- Schumpeter, J. (2010). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. In *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203857090>

Singer, P. (2020). Reflections on Socialism. In: Brundenius, C. (Eds) Reflections on Socialism in the Twenty-First Century. Springer, Cham. https://doi-org.uml.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33920-3_6

Tomin, Z. (1983). Human Rights and Socialism. Crane Bag, 7(1), 119–121.

Von Platz, J. (2016). Social Cooperation and Basic Economic Rights: A Rawlsian Route to Social Democracy. Journal of Social Philosophy, 47(3), 288–308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josp.12153>

Weitz, D. (2020). The Ernest Gellner Nationalism Lecture: The Soviet Union, self-determination, and the creation of the postwar human rights system. Nations and Nationalism, 26(2), 297–307. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12576>