自由中国运动 · Free China Movement

T033｜Are Human Rights Mainly a Domestic Matter, and Therefore Beyond Outside Evaluation?

Myths T033 · v1.0 ｜ 2026-11-22

© 2026 Free China Movement

https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/en-myths-t033-are-human-rights-mainly-a-domestic-matter-and-therefore-beyond-outside-evaluation/

contact@freechina.live

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

The claim, stated fairly

The argument runs like this. Human rights are, by and large, a matter for each sovereign state. A country's human rights situation grows out of its own history and national conditions, so outsiders have no standing to judge it. External criticism is not neutral observation; it is interference in internal affairs, and interference is forbidden by international law. Therefore, the rest of the world should leave each country's human rights record alone.

This is the official position of China's first human rights white paper, and it draws on sovereign equality and non-interference — a principle almost every state claims to accept. It deserves a serious answer. But it is wrong as stated, because it collapses four different things into one: the sovereignty principle, treaty commitments, evaluation, and armed intervention. Once separated, the conclusion no longer follows.

1. What the white paper actually says

The 1991 white paper is worth quoting at length, because its own words are more careful than the slogan built from them. Its preface says:

> *"Despite its international aspect, the issue of human rights falls by and large within the sovereignty of each country. Therefore, a country's human rights situation should not be judged in total disregard of its history and national conditions, nor can it be evaluated according to a preconceived model or the conditions of another country or region."*

Note the opening words: "Despite its international aspect." The paper does not claim human rights are purely domestic; it says they are *mainly* within sovereignty, and then immediately concedes they have an international aspect.

> *"The Chinese government has also highly appraised the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, considering it the first international*

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

> *human rights document that has laid the foundation for the practice of human rights in the world arena."*

The white paper's own position is already a balance, not a wall: it also praises the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1948, in the highest terms:

Chapter X of the same paper, "Active Participation in International Human Rights Activities," states the non-interference position in its strongest form:

> *"China is opposed to interfering in other countries' internal affairs on the pretext of human rights and has made unremitting efforts to eliminate various abnormal phenomena and strengthen international cooperation in the field of human rights."*

And:

> *"China has always maintained that human rights are essentially matters within the domestic jurisdiction of a country. Respect for each country's sovereignty and noninterference in internal affairs are universally recognized principles of international law, which are applicable to all fields of international relations, and of course applicable to the field of human rights as well."*

So the claim has real textual support. But it does not support the further step — that no outside evaluation is legitimate at all. It fails for four reasons.

2. The sovereignty principle is real — and limited

The sovereignty principle is genuine law, not rhetoric. Article 2(7) of the Charter of the United Nations provides:

> *"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state...."*

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

The white paper quotes this provision itself. Two features of the provision matter. First, it binds the *United Nations* — it does not forbid states, journalists, scholars, or international bodies from forming and expressing a judgment. Second, it ends with an exception the white paper's quotation marks with an ellipsis: "but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII." Sovereignty is a strong default, not an absolute shield — and the Charter says so in the very article cited to defend the shield.

3. Treaty commitments: sovereignty exercised, not surrendered

The strongest answer comes from the states themselves: sovereignty includes the power to make binding promises, and once made, those promises are a matter of international law, not domestic discretion alone.

The white paper records that "[s]ince 1980 the Chinese government has successively signed, ratified and acceded to seven UN human rights conventions," including the conventions against genocide, racial discrimination, discrimination against women, and torture, and the Refugee Convention and its Protocol — and that it "has always submitted reports on the implementation of the related conventions, and seriously and earnestly performed the obligations it has undertaken." Reporting to treaty bodies on its own compliance already accepts outside examination of its record. That is sovereignty exercised through consent, not lost.

The record since 1991 points the same way. China ratified the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights on 27 March 2001, and it signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on 5 October 1998. The second signature has not been followed by ratification, so China is not bound by that Covenant's specific provisions and does not undergo its periodic review — a gap noted here rather than glossed over. But the pattern is clear: the Chinese state has repeatedly chosen to bind itself internationally on human rights, and a

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

government that has done so cannot coherently claim that outside evaluation of those commitments is, by definition, interference.

4. Evaluation is not intervention

"Evaluation" covers fact-finding, reporting, criticism, debate, and review under procedures a state has accepted — such as the UN's Universal Periodic Review, in which every member state is examined by its peers. "Intervention" in the legal sense means coercive action: sanctions imposed to compel, and above all the use or threat of armed force.

These are different in kind, and international law treats them differently. The 1993 Vienna Declaration, adopted by consensus, affirms that all human rights are universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated, and that states must promote and protect them regardless of their political, economic and cultural systems. The white paper itself makes a demand about *how* to evaluate, not a denial that evaluation can happen: judge a country with its history and national conditions in view. That is a reasonable standard — and an invitation to evaluate carefully, not a ban on evaluating at all.

There is a related confusion worth naming: the credibility of the critic is not the same as the truth of the criticism. That a critic has its own human rights problems weakens its standing; it does not make the facts it cites disappear. (See CCE-071, "What Do Human Rights Problems in the United States Mean?")

5. What is genuinely forbidden: coercive interference

None of this means all outside pressure is legitimate. The white paper is right to object when human rights language is used to impose one country's ideology or model on another:

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

> *"It is neither proper nor feasible for any country to judge other countries by the yardstick of its own mode or to impose its own mode on others."*

Armed intervention, the threat of force, and coercive measures imposed without Security Council authorization are indeed barred by the Charter, and the white paper is right that "using the human rights issue for the political purpose of imposing the ideology of one country on another is no longer a question of human rights, but a manifestation of power politics." But this proves too little for the claim under examination. That some forms of pressure are illegitimate does not make all evaluation illegitimate. The line is drawn by the *means* used, not by the *subject* discussed: discussion, reporting, and peer review are permitted; force and coercion are not.

Conclusion: four questions for the reader

Human rights are mainly, but not only, a domestic matter — the white paper says so itself: "despite its international aspect." Sovereignty protects a state against coercive interference, not against examination of its record, including against standards it accepted itself: the Declaration it praised, the seven conventions joined by 1991, and the Covenant ratified in 2001.

When you next hear "human rights are an internal affair, so no one may judge us," ask four questions:

1. **Which act is being objected to?** A report, a criticism, a treaty review — or sanctions, threats, or force? Only the last group is "interference" in the legal sense.

2. **What has this state itself accepted?** Ratifying treaties and reporting to treaty bodies is consent to outside evaluation of those commitments.

3. **Is the evaluation fair?** The white paper's own test: does it consider the country's history and conditions, or apply "a preconceived model"? An

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

unfair evaluation should be answered with evidence, not with a ban on evaluation.

4. **Who is being silenced?** If "no outside evaluation" also bars the country's own people from raising the same questions, sovereignty is shielding the state from its own people.

Related reading in this series (CCE-100)

- CCE-072, "How Does Colonial History Shape Today's Human Rights Discourse?" — on how the 1991 white paper uses colonial history, and why history can explain a rule's origins without justifying its retention today. https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/en/cce-072-colonial-history-human-rights-discourse/
- CCE-071, "What Do Human Rights Problems in the United States Mean?" — on separating the truth of an allegation from the credibility of the critic, and why a flawed critic can still state a true fact. https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/en/cce-071-what-us-human-rights-problems-mean/

References

1. Information Office of the State Council. *Human Rights in China*, November 1991, Beijing. Preface; Chapter X, "Active Participation in International Human Rights Activities." Full English text: https://en.humanrights.cn/r/hren/files/cms/attach/2024/04/Human%20Rights%20in%20China.pdf (also reproduced from the Xinhua full text of 2 November 1991 at http://www.tibetjustice.org/materials/china/china8.html).

2. Charter of the United Nations, Article 2(7). https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

3. Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, A/CONF.157/23 (1993), Part I, paras. 5, 8. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/183139/files/A_CONF.157_23EN.pdf

4. United Nations Human Rights Council, Universal Periodic Review — Compilation on China, A/HRC/WG.6/17/CHN/2 (7 August 2013): ICCPR, "China (signature only, 1998)"; ICESCR, "China (2001)"; and University of Minnesota Human Rights Library, "Ratification of International Human Rights Treaties — China" (ICESCR ratified 27 March 2001; ICCPR signed 5 October 1998, not ratified). http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/research/ratification-china.html

5. CCE-072, "How Does Colonial History Shape Today's Human Rights Discourse?" (Free China Movement, published 2026-11-09). https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/en/cce-072-colonial-history-human-rights-discourse/

6. CCE-071, "What Do Human Rights Problems in the United States Mean?" (Free China Movement, published 2026-11-09). https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/en/cce-071-what-us-human-rights-problems-mean/

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live