

Summary of U.N. Agreements on Human Rights



<http://www.dfamil.com/philosophy/teach/hswtl/journal.html>

Summary of United Nations Agreements on Human Rights

- <http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html>

An interesting article. There is lots of stuff in this which we can discuss for hours. We just barely got into this during the 12th classroom day.

What we shall do next time is take a vote on each of these rights. If the vote is unanimous, then we shall go on to the next. If it not unanimous, we'll see what interesting ideas come out.

Remember, the teacher gets to vote too! 😊

A Summary of United Nations Agreements on Human Rights Table of Contents

- I Universal Declaration of Human Rights
<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#UDHR>
- I Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#CPR>
- I Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#CPR-Prot>
- I Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights
<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#ESCR>
- I Convention Against Torture
<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#CAT>
- I Convention Against Genocide
<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#CAG>
- I The Geneva Conventions
<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#Geneva>
- I Convention on the Rights of the Child
<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#Child>
- I Convention on Elimination of Discrimination Against Women
<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#CEDW>
- I Charter of the United Nations
<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#UNCharter>

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#UDHR>

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law....

- I Does the reasoning sound somewhat contrived to anyone?
- I Is this a valid reason to grant inalienable rights?
- I Is this a valid reason to grant man's rights?

Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms...

- I Have many nations lived up to their pledge?
- I Have many nations not lived up to their pledge?
- I Why in cooperation with the United Nations?

Article 17

Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

- I What is arbitrary?

Article 21

Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

- I Is "everyone" all people in the country or all citizens?
 - I If all citizens, would citizens who are out of the country be eligible for public services anyway?
 - I For example,
 - I ... would you receive your Social Security Check if you were out of the country?
 - I ... would medicare pay some of your medical bills even if you are out of the country?
- I Does Equal Access differentiate between races?
- I Does Equal Access differentiate between classes?
 - I What are some classes?
- I Does Equal Access differentiate between religions?
- I Alright, who is eligible for food stamps?

Article 23

- I Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.
 - I Many nations and cultures do not provide freedom of choice of employment and are not heading their either. Even in this country we have movements attempted to take that freedom away.
 - I Controlled Economies provide a master plan and then fill the slots.
 - I Socialized medicine tells the doctor what their specialty is going to be and where they need to set up practice.
 - I Prior to Industrial Revolution, children apprentices with their parents and there were many generations doing to same work.
- I Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.
 - I What about all these union shops and other organizations which base pay upon sonority?
 - I What about teachers whose pay is based upon their level of education and sonority?
- I Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.
 - I Does this right belong in an International body or is this a national discussion?
 - I Supposing their are other solutions on how to deal with an problem, is this not going beyond stating a right but also imposing their brand of a solution for the problem?
- I Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.
 - I Does anyone have the right not to join a trade union.

Article 24

Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Am I the only one who seems to think this is somewhat presumptions of an unelected International body to be imposing on all nations?

Article 25

Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

- | Vote ?
- | So why do anything?
 - | Missing Child care
 - | Why would anyone make food or food stamps if they had everything cared for them?
 - | Some want more than standard.
- | It seems all is covered?
- | Is this universally true in all cases for all people?
 - | Those who will not accept Charity.
 - | People in other countries.
- | What social services are necessary? Don't they presume if they thought of them, then they are essential? ~~Who works on a project and thinks they are wasting their time?~~ Scratch that.
- | Is the UN stating inalienable rights or doling out Man's rights?
- | Is the UN meddling?
- | Are nations, why all signed up in 1948, getting any closer to making this come true?
- | Are they wrong and evil if they haven't?
- | Something to think about.....

[(Teacher's NOTE: This proposition works out well if you work it out, point by point, and plug the students into it. That is, certain students are the family parents and children, mayor of city, neighbor, princess of nation, etc. This makes it personal where their answers are in reference of "those groups" for all but the one where they especially identify. In that case, it is "their" reaction and they are explaining or excusing their actions.)

(Purpose here is to sneak up on a conclusion if we cannot do all we should do. We DO use some logic or rules of conduct to determine which events we respond to, how much, and which ones we do not. What is it?)

An Arab Moslem family has fallen on hard times and is starving to death in a small town in an Arab country.

Most people in this small town are not starving to death, and some are doing very well.

The neighbors know of their situation and avoid them.

The town's government know of the situation but have no programs to deal with their plight?

The local mosque knows of their situation and avoid them.

(Eventually, you may need to return to the family and work in some reason which is no fault of the family such as polio. If the students get too hung up on "just consequences", your discussions won't be as wide ranging as hoped.)

The Arab country is rich with their oil exports.

Many Arab countries have huge oil exports which bring in billions of \$.

Developed nations purchase the oil which provides billions to the Arab countries.

International Health groups are helping many people with food and medicine, but cannot help this family because the rules of engagement require the problem to be wide spread, not isolated.

Christian Missions do not have the resources to reach all those who need help -- or do they?

Christians eat out several times a week.

- I Now, when the family dies of starvation, who is responsible?
- I Is anyone responsible?
- I If one group fails to uphold their responsibility, does the responsibility shift or does it stop right there?
- I Why do the International groups have rules of engagement?
 - I They cannot deal with all the starving people in the world. They have to use their resources judiciously.
- I Why add the final statement about Christians eating out?
 - I We didn't point out every groups possible excesses, so why present it this way?
 - I (Next time, include a sound byte from Mere Christianity about giving up on Self. Self wants to do God's will and hopefully have enough left over for self to do what it wants to do. 4th tape, side 2.)
 - I Tell an analogy where we are bought by Christ. We have been commanded to help those who are starving. So, in light of that, who is responsible.
 - I (Here was the teacher's opportunity to teach them about how we must deal with acts of Charity and to determine the rules by which we setup those rules of conduct. Didn't do quite so well this occasion.)
- I The [Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#) requires [all nations to cooperate to end world hunger](#).

[Article 11.2 - The States Parties to present Covenant, recognizing the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger, shall take, individually and through international cooperation, the measures, including specific programs, which are needed:

To improve methods of production, conservation and distribution of food by making full use of technical and scientific knowledge, by disseminating knowledge of the principles of nutrition and by developing or reforming agricultural systems in such a way as to achieve the most efficient development and utilization of natural resources;

Taking into account the problems of both food-importing and food-exporting countries, to ensure an equitable distribution of world food supplies in relation to need.]

- I The right within all this is "[fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger](#)"
- I Yes- No-
- I We seem to have strayed from rights, either inalienable or man's rights. Now we are into International programs.
- I Are some of these statements declarations or directives?
 - I If directives, are any of them obvious?
 - I Improve methods of production? Obvious?
 - I Do any of the directives close doors? That is, if you look over all your options, do some directives select certain options and take other options off the table, per say?
 - I Does "[Equitable distribution](#) of world food supplies in relation to

- need" take marketing solutions off the table?
- I Does "Agricultural systems" take laboratory, aquatic, factory, and any non agricultural food supply off the table?

Article 26

- I Everyone has the right to education
 - I so is education available in all nations everywhere?
- I Education shall be free
 - I Books normally cost the parents big time.
 - I Property taxes are almost exclusively used towards education which suggests only a certain segment of society pays for all education.
 - I Since the government only has money by taking it from someone, then essentially, the government is not able to give away anything for "FREE".
EI Robin Hood.,
- I at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory
 - I So in nations where many people do not have education available to them, are they, what, evil?.
- I Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.
 - I So the United Nations is on the School Board?
 - I Is this a right or a directive?
 - I Is the curriculum a subject for educational rights?
 - I If so, which subjects MUST be taught?
 - I reading?
 - I writing?
 - I arithmetic?
 - I computer programming?
 - I typing?
 - I music appreciation?
 - I alternative sexual practices?
 - I tolerance?
 - I rejection of values of our religion, culture, family, self.
 - I universal values based upon the UN's values?
 - I What happens if a nation disobeys the UN on this?

Article 29

These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

If I am reading this correctly, I would suspect the UN claims the UN trumps human rights. Not only presumptions, but prideful.

Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#CPR>

This covenant details the basic civil and political rights of individuals and nations. Among the rights of nations are:

- I [the right to self determination](#)
 - I Vote?
- I [the right to own, trade, and dispose of their property freely, and not be](#)

deprived of their means of subsistence

- I Vote?
 - I BUT: Can government restrict inalienable rights?
 - I Vote?
 - I What if John grew marijuana on his farm and it was his only means of making a living?
 - I Would we be infringing upon his inalienable rights to outlaw marijuana, thus making it impossible for John to earn a living?
 - I BUT: If your family has been producing Whiskey for 100 years and this is your only means of subsistence and suddenly you find yourself in a dry county....
 - I Well, you're out of business. You had a legal way of making a living, but you do not now.
 - I Does the government, which is the administrative articulation of what society at large wants, presumably, now owe you a living?
 - I Should the government pay you the same amount of \$ you got for making whiskey previously, now for nothing?
 - I Should the government help you get another job?
 - I If you don't want to get another job, where does this leave us?

Among the rights of individuals are:

- I the right to legal recourse when their rights have been violated, even if the violator was acting in an official capacity
 - I Vote?
- I the right to life
 - I Vote?
 - I Death Penalty legal?
 - I Vote?
 - I The No changed their mind because the Bible said so.
- I the right to liberty and freedom of movement
 - I Vote?
- I the right to equality before the law
 - I Vote?
 - I Bias is natural. Seeing people the same is unnatural. How can being equal be an inalienable right?
 - I If a right is taken away or oppressed so often we come to think naturally expect it to be so, does this mean there is no right?
 - I Inalienable Rights Test
 - I The reading of this question has been in error. The argument and answers read as if it reads "the right to equality before man". It does not. It refers to laws in the books. It does not refer to how one person may get better treatment before one jury and another worse treatment - because of bias.
- I the right to presumption of innocence till proven guilty
 - I Vote?
 - I Solomon judged 2 ladies with 2 babies. Guilt or Innocent presumed? Or perhaps it was a Child Custody case?
 - I Did Greek / Romans came up with Innocent until guilty?
 - I It is a good idea to be innocent, but isn't this a product of our legal system starting with the Magna Carta in England?
 - I In Old Testament, were the accused guilty or Innocent presumed?
 - I How about drinking alkaline material and hoping God intervenes to save you in order to prove your innocence?
 - I Presumed guilty because it required divine intervention to prove

innocence.

- I the right to appeal a conviction
 - I Is it unending?
 - I Vote?
 - I Moses only judge
 - I Jethro gave us first judiciary system?
 - I Safe cities in Old Testament.
 - I Is it inalienable if the first people didn't have a use for appeals?
 - I Is it inalienable or natural for people to want to exhaust all avenues available to them to prove themselves innocent.
 - I If one steals a \$50 train from another person. They are convicted. They appeal. It cost \$100,000 for 1st case. It cost \$1,000,000 next case. It cost \$2,000,000 next case. Is there a limit to how much money and time we should spend on an appeal process? 2.5M for a \$50 train set?
- I the right to be recognized as a person before the law

[Article 16 - Everyone shall have the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.]

 - I Vote?
 - I As opposed to what?
 - I We are all seen the same by God.
 - I The students still find problem with how the real world works compared to these Universal Rights.
- I the right to privacy and protection of that privacy by law

[Article 17 - No one shall be subjected to arbitrary or unlawful interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to unlawful attacks on his honor and reputation.]

[Article 17 - Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.]

 - I Vote?
 - I How much privacy?
 - I What do you think about a National ID?
 - I The students changed their minds as I tried to get them to say WHY it was inalienable because they were describing it like it was a "Want". They presumed because all they could think of was wants, it must be a want.
 - I What is Slander?
 - I Slander is a lie.
 - I What if you tell someone they are ugly? Is that slander?
 - I Are there any logical limits we might wish to put on our privacy?
 - I Presuming we do have our privacy, what sort of penalties make sense for violating our privacy?
- I freedom of thought, conscience, and religion

[Article 18 - Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching.]

 - I Vote?
 - I So what is it with the guilt and manipulation?
 - I Political Correctness which makes some thoughts, attitudes a NO NO!
 - I It is wrong to do so.
 - I If your subdivision has an ordinance against animals and your religion says you must offer up one live goat a week, who wins?

- I If your subdivision says you can't have a flag pole more than x' feet from the road and more than x' tall and you are so patriotic you feel compelled to express your sentiment with a US flag on flagpole in your yard, who wins?
- I There is one argument about buying a home in a subdivision or in a town which have ordinances you disagree with. However, if after you move in, a majority get together and pass an ordinance which you are a conscientious objector to. Who wins?

I freedom of opinion and expression

[Article 19.2 - Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.]

- I Vote?
- I Is Civil Disobedience possible?
 - I One way of reading this is to suggest if you object to a law, you may express you objection any way you choose. Civil Disobedience is to object with a law, break it, get tried and accept the conviction so as to make your point.
 - I Well, if the former translation were right, you would be exercising a constitutional right, not breaking a law?

I freedom of assembly and association

[Article 21 - The right of peaceful assembly shall be recognized. No restrictions may be placed on the exercise of this right other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, public order (*order public*), the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others]

[Article 22 - Everyone shall have the right to freedom of association with others, including the right to form and join trade unions for the protection of his interests. No restrictions may be placed on the exercise of this right other than those which are prescribed by law and which are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, public order (*order public*), the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. This article shall not prevent the imposition of lawful restrictions on members of the armed forces and of the police in their exercise of this right. Nothing in this article shall authorize States Parties to the International Labor Organization Convention of 1948 concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize to take legislative measures which would prejudice, or to apply the law in such a manner as to prejudice, the guarantees provided for in that Convention.]

- I Vote ?
- I Cults, Militia, KKK, Nazi, Pro and Anti various groups?
 - I Can there be certain groups which should not be allowed to Associate?
 - I Natural to wish to be with like minded people.
 - I We have a history of assemblies of people gathering for a purpose who have done things.
 - I What is the smallest assembly?
 - I Self.
 - I What is the next smallest assembly?
 - I Family.
 - I What is the next smallest assembly?

- I Tribe.
 - I Is man meant to live alone? No? He is meant to live "assembled".
 - I The covenant forbids
 - I torture and inhuman or degrading treatment

[Article 7 - No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation.]
 - I slavery or involuntary servitude

[Article 8 - No one shall be held in slavery; slavery and the slave-trade in all their forms shall be prohibited. No one shall be held in servitude. No one shall be required to perform forced or compulsory labor; Paragraph 3(a) shall not be held to preclude, in countries where imprisonment with hard labor may be imposed as a punishment for a crime, the performance of hard labor in pursuance of a sentence to such punishment by a competent court; For the purpose of this paragraph the term "forced or compulsory labor" shall not include: Any work or service, not referred to in subparagraph (b), normally required of a person who is under detention in consequence of a lawful order of a court, or of a person during conditional release from such detention; Any service of a military character and, in countries where conscientious objection is recognized, any national service required by law of conscientious objectors; Any service exacted in cases of emergency or calamity threatening the life or well-being of the community; Any work or service which forms part of normal civil obligations.]

 - I Vote ?
 - I If freedom from slavery is an inalienable right, then God would have taken people out of Slavery sooner rather than later?
 - I Did God allow things to happen in this world rather than get off message?
 - I Did Jesus know about germs and causes of diseases?
 - I Did Jesus let sickness be described in terms of demons rather than point out the errors in their thinking?
 - I Would that not be - staying on message?
 - I arbitrary arrest and detention

[Article 9.1 - Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention. No one shall be deprived of his liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedure as are established by law.]

 - I Vote ?
 - I Would your rights be abused against arbitrary arrest if you are stopped at the air port and checked out thoroughly, very thoroughly?
 - I Only if everyone was stopped so as not to be arbitrary?
 - I Is pure random checks permissible?
 - I Is profiling (*that is, comparing you against a list of characteristics a suspect has*) permissible?
 - I How about racial profiling (*the same as above, but now recognizing color is a recognizable characteristic*)?
 - I debtor's prisons

[Article 11 - No one shall be imprisoned merely on the ground of inability to fulfill a contractual obligation.]
 - I It forbids
 - I propaganda advocating either war

[Article 20.1 - Any propaganda for war shall be prohibited by

law.]

- I As a right, may we turn this around and say, "You shall not be threatened by war".
- I Vote ?
- I If we have a right to not expect war, then what do we not need?
 - I A standing army.
- I What if the entire world accepts this "right" except one country?
- I If no one can propoganda war, can the option be debated?
 - I If not, then how does this reconcile with our right to freedom of expression and of opinion?
- I If the country does not officially speak out for war but the people, perhaps led by the press, are calling for war, is that permissible?
- I Can a powerful military be interpreted as "propaganda for war"?
- I What function does war have in national and international relations and dialog?
- I Is there something which can be called a "just" war?
- I Presume we are guilty of promoting "propaganda for war"?
 - I What's the consequence? What is the enforcement?
 - I Either stop talking about war or we are going to declare war on you?
 - I Economic embargo?
 - I How to enforce an embargo?
- I hatred based on race, religion, national origin, or language
[Article 20.2 - Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law.]
- I To turn this around to speak of it as a right, it might be "Thou shalt not say or do anything which causes bias to be formed against any nationality, race, or religious groups."
- I Vote ?
- I How does this reconcile with our right to freedom of expression and of opinion?
 - I What if everything we say is "true" (*not slander*), but the effect is it attributes to hatred of a people group?
- I How does this reconcile with all our redneck, Polish, and other Catholic jokes?
- I How does this reconcile with our right to associate with whomever we wish, say, the KKK or Nazi groups?

It provides for the right of people to

- I choose freely whom they will marry and to found a family
[Article 23.2 - The right of men and women of marriageable age to marry and to found a family shall be recognized.]
 - I Vote ?
 - I so India and other cultures which arrange marriages now have to change?
 - I Tell story of Pal who returned to India to marry a girl he met when he was 5 years old and had not seen since. An arranged marriage.
 - I Does this right not conflict with freedom of conscience, religion, and others?,
- I and requires that the duties and obligations of marriage and family be shared equally between partners
[Article 23.4 - States Parties to the present Covenant shall take appropriate steps to ensure equality of rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution. In the case of dissolution, provision shall

be made for the necessary protection of any children.]

I Vote ?

I Partners. Doesn't that mean 2 people?

I What about all these single parent families?

I What about current lawsuits concerning Mom, Dad, and Mommy's lover as a three parent family?

I

I Also, what is with this shared equally business?

I Who judges what is equal?

I Where does a universal declaration of rights end and meddling begin?

I Are there laws which can be put into effect to make it so?

I What would be the penalty for only doing 30% or for over achieving?

I Is this one of those nice sounding platitudes which have no practical value?

I Teach us if you know better..

I It guarantees the rights of [children](#) and [prohibits discrimination based on race, sex, color, national origin, or language](#).

[Article 24 - Every child shall have, without any discrimination as to race, color, sex, language, religion, national or social origin, property or birth, the right to such measures of protection as are required by his status as a minor, on the part of his family, society and the State. Every child shall be registered immediately after birth and shall have a name.

Every child has the right to acquire a nationality.]

[Article 26 - All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law. In this respect, the law shall prohibit any discrimination and guarantee to all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.]

I Vote ?

I Seems like short, balding guys are on their own. Fatties too. Animal lovers and tree huggers are not covered either.

I It also [restricts the death penalty to the most serious of crimes](#)

[Article 6.2 - In countries which have not abolished the death penalty, sentence of death may be imposed only for the most serious crimes in accordance with the law in force at the time of the commission of the crime and not contrary to the provisions of the present Covenant and to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. This penalty can only be carried out pursuant to a final judgment rendered by a competent court.]

I Vote ?

I Restricts? How is a right something which is metered out?

I Serious crime? Who decides? On what grounds?

I Will the United Nations play god and determine what is worthy of a death sentence and impose their will on all nations and in all cultures?

I What is the definition of a competent court?

I guarantees condemned people the right to appeal for [commutation to a lesser penalty](#)

[Article 6.4 - Anyone sentenced to death shall have the right to seek pardon or commutation of the sentence. Amnesty, pardon or commutation of the sentence of death may be granted in all cases.]

- I Yes- No-
- I Is there any limit to the appeals?
- I Do we not hear of people being on death row for 20 years as they go through all their appeals?
- I What lesser penalty? Why is that relevant? My daughter got a speeding ticket reduced to a parking ticket. It's a lesser penalty but does it not also cast a huge shadow over the judicial system of justice?),
- I and forbids the death penalty entirely for people under 18 years of age.
 [Article 6.5 - Sentence of death shall not be imposed for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age and shall not be carried out on pregnant women.]
 - I Yes- No-
 - I On what possible grounds?
 - I In all cultures?
 - I Why not on pregnant women? She only has a cancerous growth.
 - I Why can a pregnant woman not be given a death sentence and abortion (*death* sentence) for the unborn is a "private matter"?
- I The covenant permits governments to temporarily suspend (*suspend*?) some of these rights in cases of
 - I civil emergency only,
 [Article 4.1 - In time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation and the existence of which is officially proclaimed, the States Parties to the present Covenant may take measures derogating from their obligations under the present Covenant to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, provided that such measures are not inconsistent with their other obligations under international law and do not involve discrimination solely on the ground of race, color, sex, language, religion or social origin.]
 - I Is this a valid reason for suspension of an inalienable right?
 - I Yes- No-
 - I Why would a nations security rate higher than individual security?
 - I Why is the right to suspend not allowed if your civil emergency is in conflict with the International body?
 - I Is this not an admission the International Community is of higher value than the Nation?
 - I Is this not an admission the Nation is of higher value than the individual?
 - I Is there a hierarchy of values?
 - I If so, what is the pecking order?
 - I and lists those rights which cannot be suspended for any reason.
 [Article 4.2 - No derogation from articles 6, 7, 8 (paragraphs 1 and 2), 11, 15, 16 and 18 may be made under this provision.]
 - I Some rights are suspendable and some are not?
 - I Is there a distinction being between inalienable rights and man's rights?
 - I The **rights not suspended** for any reason are no cruel or inhumane or degrading treatment or punishment, no subjection to scientific experimentation, no slavery, no servitude, no debtors prison, the right to life, the right to presumption of innocence till proven guilty, freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, the right to equality before the law .

This particular "Covenant" was signed in 1966

I [equal opportunity for advancement](#)

[Article 7.3 - The States to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of just and favorable conditions of work which ensure, in particular:
Equal opportunity for everyone to be promoted in his employment to an appropriate higher level, subject to no considerations other than those of seniority and competence;]

- I Yes- No-
- I In a controlled economy, how would this work?
- I What was housed in Iraq Information building?
 - I Records of most people. Jobs, promotions, where they could live, were determined in this building.
- I How about tipping the scales against one group because of injustice done to another group in generations past?
- I How can you measure intangibles?
 - I What are some intangibles?
 - I Charisma?
 - I Attitude (*good or bad*)?
- I Why is seniority an allowed consideration?
 - I Is allowance for seniority innate within us?
 - I If yes, please explain.
 - I If no, then isn't this document making a value judgement?
 - I What makes the UN so special that they can deduce a value judgement which would override all values in every government, in every culture, for all people?
 - I Doesn't the exceptions in some of the basic rights tell us a lot about their values?

I [strike](#)

[Article 8.1.1 - The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to ensure:
The right to strike, provided that it is exercised in conformity with the laws of the particular country.]

- I Yes- No-
- I What if the laws of the country allow a strike if you get a 90% approval from government bodies and the business is in 100% agreement that it is alright?
- I Do these words say anything of value, or are they just pretty words so we may think "Ah, they care."?
 - I If our words just sound good but have no practical meaning, is there a reason for doing so?
 - I Is there a type of person who cares for the good sounding terminology than the practical application?

I [paid or otherwise compensated maternity leave](#)

[Article 10.2 - The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize that:
Special protection should be accorded to mothers during a reasonable period before and after childbirth. During such period working mothers should be accorded paid leave or leave with adequate social security benefits.]

- I Yes- No-
- I Paid by whom?
- I Can this benefit, if paid by the small employer, be struck from memory when the employer is hiring so there is no bias involved?
- I How long have we had paid maternity leave in our corporations?

- I What were the new maternity rights doled out several years ago?
 - I Wasn't it uncompensated leave for either parent for nearly any family issue?
- I copyright, patent, and trademark protection for intellectual property

[Article 15.1.3 - The States Parties to the present covenant recognize the right of everyone:
To benefit from the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.]

 - I Yes- No-
 - I So if your employer pays for all the material and provides you with a wage, do you still get the patent?
- I forbids exploitation of children,

[Article 10.3 - The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize that:
Special measures of protection and assistance should be taken on behalf of all children and young persons without any discrimination for reasons of parentage or other conditions. Children and young persons should be protected from economic and social exploitation. Their employment in work harmful to their morals or health or dangerous to life or likely to hamper their normal development should be punishable by law. States should also set age limits below which the paid employment of child labor should be prohibited and punishable by law.]

 - I Yes- No-
 - I So what if the state passes a law where the minimum age for child labor is 6 years old?
 - I Why does a declaration of "what we believe" have things like "States should also set age limits.... punishable by law"?
 - I Should not a document of declarations of "what we believe" contain only declarations and leave the application to others?
 - I Does the Bill of Rights contain a mixture of application and declarations or just declarations?
 - I Can you think of other solutions which do not embrace the methods stated within this declaration?
 - I What about outlawing buying anything made with child labor? Would that not only cover your own country, but also what was made elsewhere and imported?

Each nation which has ratified this covenant is required to submit annual reports on its progress in providing for these rights to the Secretary General, who is to transmit them to the Economic and Social Council.

Well, these rights were starting to sound more like we were being dictated to.

Now, this clinches it, as we are now filing reports to a, what, higher power?

Did anyone notice the Nation just became subservient to the International body?

Convention Against Genocide

<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#CAG>

- I Bans acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group.
 - I Have we not heard of ethnic cleansing going on just about every year, somewhere? Germany has revitalized Nazi. Church burnings. Cults?
- I It declares genocide a crime under international law whether committed during war or peacetime, and binds all signatories of the convention to take measures to prevent and punish any acts of genocide committed within their jurisdiction.
 - I So, is genocide in Africa or southern Asia outside anyone's jurisdiction? Why

did the Serbs get to practice Ethnic cleansing for a half dozen years before it was put to a stop?

- I Bans killing of members of any racial, ethnic, national or religious group because of their membership in that group, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group, inflicting on members of the group conditions of life intended to destroy them, imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group, and taking group members' children away from them and giving them to members of another group.
 - I You mean like they do in Sudan? What is the bigger issue? That genocide should not happen or that nothing is done about it? Where does the guilt lie? Is jurisdiction the key word? Is being safe from genocide a right? Is genocide another form of war?

Convention Against Torture

<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#CAT>

- I It forbids countries to return a refugee to his country if there is reason to believe he/she will be tortured.
- I requires states to make torture illegal.
- I individuals who allege that someone has committed torture against them are permitted to make an official complaint
- I receive compensation, including full medical treatment and payments to survivors if the victim dies as a result of torture.
- I Any confession or statement made during or as a result of torture is to be ignored.
- I forbids that which constitute cruel or degrading treatment.
 - I What would be degrading? Is imprisonment degrading or torture? Is not being able to watch Monday Night Football degrading or torture? How can diverse people come to some agreement on where punishment and discipline stop and cruelty or degrading behavior begins?

Convention on the Rights of the Child

<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#Child>

Article 2

2. States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that the child is protected against all forms of discrimination or punishment on the basis of the status, activities, expressed opinions, or beliefs of the child's parents, legal guardians, or family members.

Article 7

- I The child shall be registered immediately after birth and shall have the right from birth to a name,
 - I Does the necessity of including this seem foreign to you?
- I the right to acquire a nationality and,
 - I As opposed to what?
- I as far as possible, the right to know and
- I be cared for by his or her parents.
 - I What about all these movements toward state sponsored schools and institutions? Children get moved into boarding type schools in many nations even now. Why would you suppose this would be so?

Article 27

1. Right of every child to a standard of living adequate for the child's physical,

mental, spiritual, moral and social development.

Now what might that be? Living adequate for

Slippery slope?

2. The parent(s) or others responsible for the child have the primary responsibility to secure, within their abilities and financial capacities, the conditions of living necessary for the child's development.

What if said financial capacities are insufficient to provide for the child's physical, mental, spiritual, moral, and social development?

Article 31

1. Right of the child to rest and leisure, to engage in play and recreational activities appropriate to the age of the child and to participate freely in cultural life and the arts.

Article 32

1. Right of the child to be protected from economic exploitation and from performing any work that is likely to be hazardous or to interfere with the child's education, or to be harmful to the child's health or physical, mental, spiritual, moral or social development.

Day 12 - Chapter 5 - The Reformation - Continued

<http://www.dfamily.com/philosophy/teach/hswtl/journals/journal-day-12.pdf>



<http://www.dfamily.com/philosophy/teach/hswtl/journal.html>