

I develop a philosophical argument to support the claim that the universality principle of international human rights is unrealistic, as it does not account for the unequal distribution of the physical existence and expression of human rights by humans in different situations. I begin by outlining the philosophical background of John Locke, John Rawls, naturalism, and positivism. Subsequently, to more accurately understand the expression, existence, and value of international human rights, I have created, out of the naturalist and positivist perspectives of legal validity, a physical hierarchy revolving around the *de facto* and *de jure* existence of human rights and a metaphysical hierarchy revolving around a teleological structure of intrinsic and instrumental value. Together, these hierarchies can better analyze which rights are more freely recognized, protected, expressed, and valued relative to others. I develop my argument through case studies of the right to freedom from torture, the right to clean water and sanitation, and the right to internet access, justifying them in their respective places on the hierarchy of human rights.