

УДК 341.018

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN THE TIME OF INFORMATION WARFARE

Andriy MELNYK,

post-graduate student, the Department of International Law of Ivan Franko
National University in Lviv

SUMMARY

Tackled in the paper is the problem of freedom of expression of the humankind as a carrier of the collective rights in the international community in the time of information warfare. Plausible formats of human communities as possible carriers of the legal personality and their priority before individual rights are analyzed.

Based on the analysis of international legal documents and practice of foreign organizations activities in the respective area (UN, Council of Europe, European Union), the work justifies the necessity to create new complex international and legal instruments that would become a standard for the search of legal regulators of ethical norms and values. New international and intrastate approaches and mechanisms for minimization of negative implications of diverse modern information wars are suggested.

Key words: individual rights, rights of the humankind, collective rights, international community, international legal personality, information warfare.

АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье рассматривается проблема свободы слова человечества как носителя коллективных прав в международном сообществе во время информационной войны. Проанализированы вероятные форматы человеческих сообществ как носителей юридической правосубъектности и их приоритет перед правами личности. На основе анализа международно-правовых документов и практики деятельности международных организаций в соответствующей сфере (ООН, Совета Европы, Европейского Союза), обосновывается необходимость создания новых комплексных международно-правовых инструментов, которые будут стандартом для поиска правовых регуляторов этических норм и ценностей. Предлагаются новые международные и внутригосударственные подходы и механизмы для минимизации негативных последствий современных, различных форм и видов, информационных войн.

Ключевые слова: права личности, права человечества, коллективные права, международное сообщество, международная правосубъектность, информационная война.

Introduction. The issues of freedom of expression in the age of the acceleration of civilization development and globalization take on a peculiar significance, it becomes an integral manifestation of the whole totality of rights and freedoms of man as well as a means to their enforcement and protection, thus constituting the man's sense-seeking, and sense-generating basis. The dramatic developments of the recent years have been related to civilizational rifts, information warfare, migration processes as well as threats of international terrorism. They induce the world community to look for legal regulators of the transition to a harmonious non-violent world. Freedom of expression under these circumstances becomes a prime instrument of cross-civilizational and cross-cultural dialogue that in the end will lead to the construction of a new non-violent world order.

Unfortunately, no comprehensive general theoretical study of the phenomenon of the right to freedom of expression as an integral expression of the entire system of human rights contributing to the elaboration of the said system's practical-communicative model and its application within and beyond the national-regional context has been offered so far in the legal science of this country. The said factor adds to the topicality of the current study. A number of scholars both in this country and elsewhere, among them P. Rabinovych [12; 13], Yu. Tyshchenko [14], N. Kovalko [5], T. Kovalyova [6], O. Hoefle [16] and T. Modood [17], have contributed to the study of the individual and collective rights to freedom of expression previously.

When analyzing human rights scholars tend to treat them primarily not in a universal-integral, international-legal setting, but rather in a narrow domestic, political-legal context. How-

ever, proceeding from the previously set anthropic principle of cultural universals of the existence, according to Krymskyi, of the "prevailing in history invariant cultural structures, the pro-forms (archetypes) of the world order" [7, p. 28] we seem to be capable of extracting a kind of universal mankind-relevant sense from the narrow national moral-legal view or specific mental-ethical codes.

The suggested approach makes it possible to reaffirm in the context of the international law the Gandhian principle of non-violence or the Freedom-Equality-Brotherhood motto of the French Revolution. Hence we are justified in assigning to the opinion of N. Khamitov that the Ukrainian outlook tolerance can become the morals of the postindustrial society [15, p. 409]. It is the archetype-encoded moral and legal orientation that, albeit all the difficulties of the national headway, gives a hope of self-realization as the peculiarly distinctive democratic-legal state to the Ukrainian society.

On another note, the philosophy of survival as a method of overcoming the catastrophic reality of modern existence of civilization requires that a personality be molded as a cosmopolite-citizen, the whole Earth guardian, that is, in its constructive, positive sense. It is a personality that without losing his own national identity simultaneously aims at a real and virtual belonging to the many cultures that can care for the planet's fate on the whole and spread the principles of reverence and awe for life and existence as such.

As was aptly remarked by the founder of transpersonal psychology S. Groff "there is no contradiction between being a Ukrainian and a citizen of the planet at the same time. On the contrary, only that who is deeply rooted in his own culture

can reach through it a source that all cultures of the world tap from. Therefore, Ukrainians ought to cherish their own national peculiarity, arousing the feeling of belonging to the common spring" [9].

Transculturalism is a prototype at the root of the modern Ukrainian nation, of a Ukrainian aspiring at the country's territorial conciliarism or simply unity and integrity of all Ukrainian lands, a man that thinks globally, but acts locally. He is a man capable of transcending the native culture, subjecting it to an in-depth reflection: what are its strongholds, what is archaically obsolete, what needs saving, what makes it a model or vector of the future, what should be rejected because it no longer meets the requirements of the present day. Thus, in the legal field a Ukrainian sharing the ideas of the country's integrity is an individual who rose to the integral understanding of human rights as an organic combination of the rights of an individual, the rights of a community and the rights of humanity as a cosmic and planetary integrity.

The making of human rights is intimately connected with the evolution of the understanding and existential realization of the phenomenon of freedom that many thinkers took for a determining property of man, his essential strength and the basis for his creativity. The search for ways of creating conditions for the realization of a creative world relation by releasing man from all possible forms of compulsion, censorship, mind or word control, restrictions that go beyond the scope of a natural necessity for the society to preserve itself is a great achievement of the free thought.

However today, in the age of all-pervasive information warfare and medial-cultural imperialism, serious doubts appear as to the possibility of warranting freedom of speech and thought as a result of the inefficiency of efforts exerted to introduce into the civilization niche the mass-media that manipulate the collective consciousness and behavior of the people on the basis of the artificially constructed myths or especially carved mythologemes.

In this context it is necessary to stress that ensuring the protection of a right to freedom of speech, and self-expression of communities on post-soviet space that has seen the creation of new independent states has a special significance for defending the latter's sovereignty and identity. The point is that the processes of ethno-national globalization and cases of national renaissance are nonlinear, which means that they take place at diverse rates and penetrate into different depths in specific regions facing stiff resistance from the former metropolises that resort to information onslaught on freedom of expression as a basic fighting method against new national identities. Currently a very special effort to destroy the Ukrainian identity by means of information warfare and thus to contribute to the new Eurasian identity is being undertaken by Russia. Ukraine, in its turn, is doing its utmost to shy away from a distressing identity that bears encoded historical losses and failures.

The factors described above foreground with renewed strength the expedience to include into the Declaration on Human Rights a provision for the protection of national identities along the plane of information. It should stipulate legal sanctions in relation to the facts of waging information warfare against ethno-national communities with the aim of their assimilation by means of a forced change of identity.

Analyzing the correlation between the collective and individual rights and acknowledging that collective rights are equal and symmetric with individual ones it must, nevertheless, be emphasized that collective rights as well as collective rights of cultural groups are genetically secondary to individual rights,

which follows from the fractal nature of man. The creative nature of man calls for a right to diversity, a right to take retreat from one's native cultural group, lest a specific culture, even one's native culture, and especially the anti-liberal one, should throttle one's individual culture.

Some researchers have raised the question of the legal personality of the humankind, the presence of the individual interests that do not concur with the interests of other subjects of international relations. Thus, P. Rabinovych contends that the basic rights of humanity are its certain possibilities indispensable for its existence and development as a unitary integral subject of world history, a carrier of earthly civilization. They are objectively pre-defined by the condition of social and natural environment and envisaged in international normative documents. To such basic rights he attributes the right of humanity to permanent existence (the right to immortality), the right to revival and maintenance of harmony with nature (the right to ecological safety), the right to conservation, use and development of the material and spiritual values that are common to all mankind (cultural, spiritual scientific and other legacies) [12, p. 571–572].

The paradigm of humanity which is dominant in the present-day world puts on the agenda the main tasks – to realize the protection of the crucial interests that reflect both negative and positive globalization processes, which is actually evinced in the cosmopolitan right of the world community. Today, the significance of the realization of the right of humanity as legal personality to freedom of self-expression and thought can hardly be overestimated.

The prerogative of the legal personality of the humankind is control over knowledge the spreading of which may lead to catastrophic consequences: prevention of the spread of forbidden knowledge and technologies that pose a threat to the very existence of humankind (nuclear technologies, biotechnologies, development of psychotropic weaponry, etc.). In the apt opinion of Pocheptsov, "there is no need to forbid knowledge, one should just not disseminate it" [11, p. 112]. And conversely, the knowledge the concealment of which may threaten not only national security, but also the security of the whole regions or even the planet as a whole is to be declassified. A vivid example to the effect is the information black-out concerning the localization and dynamics of radioactive contamination in the wake of the Chernobyl disaster of 1986. Thus, the violation of the right of the people to being briefed on certain vital issues can be qualified as a crime against peace and humanity.

Not less unpredictable collisions in the realization of the right to freedom of expression may arise in the case of an artificial clash between the rights of man with the rights of humanity as an integral whole. Modood was right in emphasizing that we give preference to individual rights, the rights of nations will be dissolved in them: the right to self-determination, the right to statehood ... But if we decide that the rights of nations are more important, we will surely come to discrimination [16, p. 85]. The emergence of humanity (in the form of an international community) as a new legal personality in international relations is predetermined by the main interest to guarantee the survival of human civilization as such as well by the desire to overcome or mitigate the pending anthropogenic-ecological disaster.

In the modern civilizational dimension, freedom as internal creativity, and spontaneity is constituted as an integral principal of the organization of a civic society, the construal of a complete system of human rights. We live under the conditions of extreme uncertainty, bifurcation of the historical development

when the moral-legal foundations of classical humanism based on the priority of human rights over any other rights tend to lose their immediate significance. A new vision of humanism in the cosmologically politicized legislation is to be built upon the probability logic, rather than algorithmic logic, of the moral-legal choice. That is why in the conditions of the impending disaster the civilizational choice is not a moral maneuver, but the logic of the rescue risk. Then, it is not always possible to consider a human being as a goal, because humans are ambivalent by nature. In this context, a likely order to destroy the Boeing jet with passengers on board, if there is a terrorist among them ready to drop a bomb on a city, is a compromise for the sake of the lesser evil.

The problem of the correlation between the notions “humanity as a value” and “individuality of man” as a separate subject of morals and law is quite a debatable question. Today we cannot but admit that more and more scholars in Ukraine and in other countries come to the conclusion about the growing dominance of the general, the common, the collective in a globalization-civilization process. For instance, a German researcher Beck in his work *Cosmopolitan Vision* analyzes the logic of the globalization process in the context of a tendency towards the formation of the “globe identity”, a “unified civilization order”, which is connected not so much with the deepening of human civilization as with growing consolidation of the “cosmopolitan vision” [2, p. 241].

Indeed, the notions of “a citizen of the world” and “common value” are now shifting from the category of hypothetical ideas and lofty metaphors to everyday life. Nevertheless, the non-linear character of globalization processes, which combines two seemingly opposite tendencies – simultaneous integration with differentiation of the subject, calls for the adjustment of the traditional views on cosmopolitanism that were focused on its alleged “rootlessness” and “homelessness”.

As a result of the intercultural dialogue of societal identities there will be formed, and of necessity, a new common-human civic society, which is inconceivable without a cosmopolitan orientation as a constituent of social consciousness. That is why the emergence of such categories as “supranational citizenship”, “supranational society”, “cosmopolitan democracy”, “cosmopolitan law” is quite natural.

A cosmopolitan in a constructive sense is not the one without motherland, but the one who adjusts his duty to the motherland to the interests of the world community. Of course, it is an ideal, but without the transformation of social consciousness, including the legal one, humanity simply faces no future along these lines. Globalization processes, on the one hand, blur classical national sovereignties, but on the other hand they promote the national consciousness of small peoples, and national minorities, thus stimulating the formation of non-ethnic communities and augmenting the number of subjects of international law.

So, there is a tendency at pluralistic globalization that begins to develop and calls for an appropriate international legal support. It gives an opportunity to mold a systemic whole built not on the basis the horizontal, equal in rights, networking cooperation, with the provision of the legal protection of the preservation of personal, individual, ancestral, religious, national, or civilizational differences refuting the principles of force-induced unification and vertical subservience of subjects of the national and international legal order.

The inevitable emergence of a new subject in international relations – the humankind (“supranational society”, “world community”, “cosmopolitan democracy”) that has particular strategic global-civilizational interests, detriment to the inter-

ests of individual countries or regional integrated unions, will entail abandoning the binding model of cooperation between states underlying the present world order as well as accepting the concept of global government and securing the survival of humanity as a cosmo-planetary phenomenon.

At the same time it is justified to agree with Merezhko that there are some crucial questions arising at this point: “Who can speak on behalf of humanity, who can be its voice?” [10, p. 113]. At the present stage of international relations the United Nations is legitimately considered to be such a spokesman as the most authoritative international organization with a potential and true built-in function and premise to represent the interests of the entire mankind.

As is minutely shown in Hoeffe’s *Democracy in an Age of Globalization* the problem of the international legal personality and evolution of the subjective structure of the international law in the direction of its cosmopolitization can be resolved only on the basis of humanism as a legal principle. The researcher points out: “Four virtues in particular are important at the global level, and they follow those that apply to the individual state. They correspond to four kinds of world citizens: the morally modest world citizen, the constituent member of a positive world legal order, is content with a sense of the global rule of law, with faithfulness and submission to a global legal order... Consistent with the two parts of the world republic, all four of the global civic virtues come in two guises: that related to international law and that related to world citizenship. In the case of natural subjects, we speak of a sense of the cosmopolitan rule of law and a sense of cosmopolitan justice, a sense of cosmopolitan community, and a cosmopolitan civic sense. In the case of the constituent states we refer to the virtues as a sense of the world-federal rule of law and a sense of world-federal justice, a sense of world-federal community and a world-federal civic sense. In so far as both, the cosmopolitan and the world-federal are referred to simultaneously, we speak of a sense of the global rule of law, a sense of global justice, and so on” [4, p. 310].

That very criterion must underlie the selection of a subjective structure of the international community. In particular, it concerns the involvement of non-governmental organizations in the work of the UN bodies. These, first of all, are the international organizations which in their international legal rule-making and implementation activities reflect the interests and defend the rights of those social groups and communities that reveal some interest to the entire humanity. Among the international organizations as unofficial representatives of the UN, a special place belongs to Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch as well as Greenpeace. These represent “world public opinion” or the international civic society.

The multistage character of the legal personality is also referred to in P. Rabinovych: “The natural global social human rights are certain possibilities of the members of social life, called forth by the level of civilization, and must be unified for all its subjects”. Depending on the type of carriers of these possibilities, the author distinguishes between the rights of a human as an individual, person, personality, rights of social communities and rights of humanity [13, p. 9].

The rights of humanity manifest themselves, for example, in the supranational nature of the European Union and in the legal procedures of constitutionality of European integration. Thus, for instance, the European Council decreed in one of its documents that the community establishes a new international legal order for the sake of which the states restrict, though only in certain spheres, their sovereign rights, and the subjects of

this are not only the member states, but the emigrants of these countries as well. However, to be a working cosmopolitan model of legal order, this model should be focused not on unipolar, but rather on pluralistic model of globalization, based on recognition of the fact that human rights are not the product of one culture but the corresponding common standards of human rights produced by the efforts of the international community. Therefore, the cosmopolitan model of human rights and freedoms must be built on the principle of complementarity, interaction of different systems of human rights. Only then can we avoid double standards of imposing legal norms and principles on other cultures that are not common to them.

As for the humanitarian intervention in the event of violation of the right to freedom of expression, speculative use or concealment of information in different parts of the world, it should, in our view, provide legal assessment of the means and spheres of information and communication mind control, freedom of thought, freedom to receive and disseminate information that threatens the physical and spiritual foundations of civilization.

A significant threat to international security, human rights and freedoms as well as dignity is the phenomenon as information wars that are increasingly spreading in the modern world. They are a manifestation of the conflicting interests (especially economic and political ones) that are implemented not by physical but rather informational means.

Whereas in the time of the Cold War confrontation was an expression of information struggle between two opposite social and economic systems, in the era of globalization, information warfare has become an instrument of desovereignization of certain countries and communities through instigating versatile forms of the “color revolutions” that are not always in the national interests. This can be exemplified in various degrees in some of the events taking place in Libya, Syria, Egypt and, unfortunately, in Ukraine.

In legal terms, states that wage information wars should remember that in adherence to the principles formulated in the Report of the Committee of Ministers of the European Union “any restrictions imposed on the freedom of thought is incompatible with the nature of a democratic society. States should not seek to subject their citizens to ideological transformation and divide people on the basis of the ideas they hold. Moreover, assistance from the state of one-sided information dissemination can be a serious unacceptable obstacle to the free expression of thought” [17, p 413].

Today, information warfare’s becoming the norm. Protection of victims of information aggression is possible only on the basis of supranational international legal organizations. The fact that the spread of information and communication aggression, firstly, requires the international community to create separate legal norms and appropriate penalties to protect the interests of victims of aggression.

Secondly, humanitarian technologies for managing the thoughts and sentiments of the population require the international legal evaluation. We are talking about such things as the newest methods of neurolinguistic programming and subconscious suggestion, the formation of mass consciousness to ensure the necessary level of loyalty to a particular ideology or community as well as the creation of the virtual worlds that are desirable for the ruling elites in the minds of the population.

Thirdly, efforts of certain countries, corporate communities with a purposeful change of identities of the peoples or entire regions require an international legal evaluation and appropriate sanctions. An example would be a negative evaluation by

the top leadership of the EU of the undisguised Russian information war against Ukraine in order to change the mental attitudes of the population in favor of the Customs Union and the Eurasian Economic Space.

Fourthly, it is necessary to establish an international supranational control over information flows that circulate on the Internet. This very system is currently the most powerful tool for forging a unified noosphere consciousness, but concrete results of its impact on globalization processes are far-mixed. It should be noted that, according to recent research, the noosphere, “information field of the Earth” is an existing physical object that has its own information structure and is able to affect human activity [1, p. 11].

The Internet as a communicative technical means is absolutely neutral regarding consciousness and spiritual values that it distributes. Computer network technologies, on the one hand, can stimulate the emergence of mass democratic movements as well as the development of freedom of expression of the individual, on the other hand, it can be a tool for the establishment of network-terrorist structures and pseudo-revolutions in the countries where the elite use the Internet for accomplishing their selfish ends. The Internet is a truly global tool, so the consciousness of its subjects must also be cosmopolitan and global. Unfortunately, the Internet is filled not only with the constructive information and values but also with frankly illegal ideological rubbish as well as hedonistically and sometimes aggressively oriented members of the Internet communication.

Today, all the attempts of some countries within the national legal framework to suspend unlawful use of the Internet network and cyber communication remain futile. The Internet fundamentally divorced from the possibilities of the state control over it. Moreover, network communications are creating new threats, since the state is no longer able to control them in full. Under these circumstances, only the regulatory mechanisms of international law are capable of providing not only the freedom of internet-communication but also protection for its use with the adverse and inhuman purposes.

Therefore, there is a need for an international legal framework to detect and neutralize network communications, and structures that became the model of functioning of terrorist groups and totalitarian religious sects. Morally corrupt network communications create not only regional but also global threats through the totalitarian nature of these communities, which tightly control the minds of their adherents, including the use of suggestive pre-programmable technologies. Therefore, both on national and international scales a legislative framework is necessary not only for the neutralization of these communities but also for the deprogramming of members of charismatic totalitarian sects.

In addition, the international community must be prepared, in legal terms, to carry out a project of transformation and design of human corporeality (physicality) which is entering the stage of completion. The main idea of this project is to create and edit the human genetic map of the person. The probability of its uncontrolled use will pose a threat of the information confidentiality about a person, which can be used with adverse speculative purposes. The development of a legal regulation and limits to the use of such research projects is all the more necessary, since until now the experts cannot legally agree on what research can and which cannot be carried out in the sciences of man, his life and consciousness. Although in the legal and regulatory practice such an example of this global consensus already exists – in the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction.

So, summing up, it should be noted that more than fifty years ago, when the Declaration of Human Rights was adopted, many global problems, in particular the possibility of systemic anthropo-ecological information and communication crisis were barely visible. It is therefore logical that to some specific legal and moral regulators to ensure the survival of the mankind, the preservation of its spiritual status as a subject of international law the Declaration does not apply.

The real threat of anthropo-ecological disaster that is looming over the mankind in our time, urgently requires a new comprehensive international legal instrument that would become a benchmark for seeking such legal regulators as well as ethical norms and values, where life itself, being as such, its preservation are seen as the main value and standard-setting principle.

At the same time, it should be noted that the tragic events (the murder of cartoonists committed by terrorists in France or the Rushdie affair) show that the interpretation of the freedom of speech only on the basis of the European system of the protection of man without ethno-national legal mentality of immigrants will inevitably lead to bad, or even fatal, consequences. Therefore, our age, according to many researchers, should be the century of the common basic paradigms of human existence on Earth, the century of scientifically oriented association of people, in which freedom of expression should help, not hinder. Even before the adoption of the Declaration on Human Rights a group of scientists from the American Anthropological Association headed by Melville Herskovitz warned against this.

In particular, they noted that the legal standards and values are specific to different cultures, and therefore biased attempt to formulate the tenets of human rights, which are based on the concepts and moral codes of only one culture, will resist the spread of such morality and pertinent legal norms for the humanity in general. Therefore, as in 1978 Levi-Strauss rightly wrote, the world civilization cannot be anything but a coalition of cultures, each of which retains its identity [8, p. 30].

References:

1. Багров Н. Ноосферогенез: информационное общество, киберпространство и образовательные стратегии в современном мире / Н. Багров, И. Черванев // Ноосферология: наука, образование, практика / под общ. ред. О. Габриеляна. – Симферополь : Феникс, 2008. – С. 11–53.
2. Бек У. Космополитическое мировоззрение / У. Бек. – М. : Свободная мысль, 2008. – 336 с.
3. Гришук О. До проблеми обмеження права на свободу вираження поглядів / О. Гришук // Теорія та історія держа-

ви і права. Вісник Хмельницького інституту регіонального управління та права. – 2003. – № 2 (6). – С. 7–13.

4. Гьоффе О. Демократія в епоху глобалізації / О. Гьоффе ; пер. з нім. Л.А. Ситніченко, О.Ж. Лозінська. – К. : ППС-2002, 2007. – 436 с.

5. Ковалко Н. Деякі аспекти співвідношення індивідуальних та колективних прав / Н. Ковалко // Вісник Вищої ради юстиції. – 2013. – № 2 (14). – С. 209–214.

6. Ковальова Т. Індивідуальні і колективні мовні права: проблеми диференціації та реалізації / Т. Ковальова // Теорія та практика державного управління. – 2012. – Вип. 4 (39). – С. 83–91.

7. Кримський С. Запити філософських смислів / С. Кримський. – К. : ПАРАПААН, 2003. – 240 с.

8. Леви-Стросс К. Структурная антропология / К. Леви-Стросс ; пер. с фр. В.В. Иванова. – М. : ЭКСМО-Пресс, 2001. – 512 с.

9. Людство єдине у суті й розмаїте у формах, тому плекайте власну національну ідентичність : інтерв'ю з доктором філософії, проф. Каліфорнійського інституту інтегральних досліджень С. Грофом / записала Я. Винницька // Український тиждень. – 2013. – № 25 (293). – [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <http://www.tyzhden.ua/Society/83066>.

10. Мережко А. Психологическая теория международного права (публичного и частного) : [монография] / А. Мережко. – Одесса : Феникс, 2012. – 244 с.

11. Почепцов Г. Контроль над разумом / Г. Почепцов. – К. : КМА, 2012. – 350 с.

12. Рабінович П. Основні права людства / П. Рабінович // Мала енциклопедія етнодержавознавства / НАН України, Ін-т держави і права ім. В.М. Корецького ; редкол.: Ю.І. Римаренко (відп. ред.), В.П. Андрущенко, В.Д. Бабкін та ін. – К. : Довіра, Генеза, 1996. – С. 571–572.

13. Рабінович П. Основи загальної теорії права та держави : [навчальний посібник] / П. Рабінович. – 5-те вид., зі змінами. – К. : Атіка, 2001. – 176 с.

14. Тищенко Ю. Шляхи гармонізації колективних та індивідуальних прав у процесі реалізації етнонаціональної політики / Ю. Тищенко [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <http://old.niss.gov.ua/monitor/june2009/10.htm>.

15. Хамітов Н. Людина і народ: етноантропология / Н. Хамітов // Філософія: Світ людини. – К. : Либідь, 2003. – 432 с.

16. Modood T. The Politic Multiculturalism in the New Europe / T. Modood. – London : Zed Books, 1997. – 281 p.

17. Van Hoof G.J.H. Theory and Practice of the European Convention on Human Rights / G.J.H. van Hoof, P. van Dijk. – 2-nd ed. – Deventer : Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers, 1990. – 657 p.