

Human Rights

Human rights **leadership** in the twenty-first century is developing in the midst of worldwide debate about which institutions should predominate globally in the governance of human organizations. Innumerable actors are involved in these interrelationships—national, subnational, and transnational—representing widely varied views. These actors also have widely varied capacities and commitments regarding the exercise of personal example, peaceful persuasion, manipulation, coercion, or even overwhelming violence toward those people appearing to oppose them.

In significant ways, current conditions for human rights **leadership** are similar to those in which the human rights movement first greatly expanded at the end of World War II. Widespread horror at recent spectacles of mass human suffering and organized cruelty led many people then, as now, to determine that all humans deserve the rights of freedom, dignity, and safety because they are human and that these rights must be asserted around the world. Too many people had seen with their own eyes or learned in the media about events so terrible that they felt that no human being should ever again be treated like that. More world leaders were concluding also that if there is to be hope in this increasingly interdependent world for long-term humane conditions of life for people anywhere, there must be worldwide-agreed goals, standards, institutions, and enforcement for how all people must be treated. Influential people were beginning to believe that for there to be peace in the world, the world must build human rights.

After World War II, however, many leaders also were deciding that modern technology provides so much danger of extreme damage to whole populations and their protective governing structures, from sudden attacks by armed aggressors, that new structures and methods for national, regional, and worldwide security must be developed to prevent and defend against such attacks. National security structures developed during World War II were expanded, and even the United States and other democracies substantially increased secret government information and activity that ordinary citizens were not allowed to know. Within the new world security structure, the United Nations Security Council, measures were backed selectively by leaders of the five major powers and nonpermanent members according to the individual national security needs they perceived in differing situations as they lined up on the two major sides or attempted to stay neutral during the “Cold War,” which lasted until nearly the twentieth century's end.

Some of the most important security goals during the Cold War and since, such as the prevention of nuclear war, have coincided with the goals of human rights leaders. Some of the most important human rights goals, such as the prevention of genocide, in most specific cases have been assessed by national security leaders as not sufficiently important to their own nation's security to be worth spending the political, economic, military, and human assets to prevent. This was true for twentieth-century genocides in Cambodia, Iraq, Rwanda, and other countries.

By the twentieth century's end, however, political leaders had begun more publicly expressing regret after



A man tries to hold back the crowd in Tiananmen Square in 1989 as citizens demonstrate for increased individual rights and political reform.

Corbis; used by permission.

SIDEBARS:

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

failing to counter ongoing genocide. U.S. Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, in leading military interventions, in, respectively, Kosovo (1999) and Iraq (2003), justified those actions to some extent in regional security terms, citing the countering of genocide as a grave, related matter. Governmental and nongovernmental political and human rights leaders do not yet agree on what scale of human rights atrocities within a sovereign state justifies outside military intervention. Some observers at the time believed the United States to have less-principled reasons for the Kosovo and Iraq interventions. Other observers believed that less-principled reasons in other world capitals helped explain why U.S.-led military intervention in those cases received less than the clearest U.N. authorization. During the twenty-first century's first decade, to be sure, struggles for influence among national, subnational, and transnational structures are more complex than during the two-sided Cold War, although U.S. leaders are backed by more force than much of the rest of the world combined. Furthering the complexity, increasing technological capacity has enabled fewer individuals to cause more suffering and damage, creating more terror on behalf of whatever cause, with smaller weapons of "ordinary" and mass destruction. Transnational and small groups now more easily can cause massive damage to human rights and national security in the same blows.

Therefore, as when modern national security structures were developing after World War II, the most serious contemporary challenge for human rights **leadership** is to improve human rights in a worldwide context of intensely increased focus on national and international security. The present security context amplifies sovereign state responsibility to prevent small or transnational groups from instigating international violence from within their borders. As sovereign states perceive their own interests threatened also by such groups—or in some countries by legitimate opposition—they are motivated or further emboldened to control or eliminate them. One major result is considerably increased pressure on civil and political rights in many countries. Affected in varying degrees are rights to privacy, government information, free expression and association, and legal representation, the right to be charged or released, the right to open and fair trials before a jury, and rights against torture and inhumane treatment.

Human rights leaders, therefore, first must continue to demonstrate to world leaders how decreases in human rights have initiated downward spirals in which reciprocal damage to security and human rights has led to armed conflict, chaos, and finally to major security threats from seriously dysfunctional and failing states. More challenging to human rights leaders, they must bring to bear an enormous range of knowledge, skills, and capacities of character to demonstrate in a great range of situations how legitimate, effective security can be realistically maintained and increased while maintaining and improving human rights.

In the best case, twenty-first-century human rights leaders can help lead the world to soundly based transformations in which national, regional, and international security mind-sets become increasingly congruent with human rights and human security standards set forth in the world's foremost human rights document, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the worst case, far more pessimistic, coercive, and ultimately unrealistic security views among world leaders might prevail. In such a scenario, even some human rights now seen as basic could be perceived as affordable only at unacceptable expense to national and international security. As technology continues to develop, such pessimistic security views could lead to widespread degradation in conditions of human existence.

In addition to this long-term, conceptually based security challenge to human rights **leadership**, the majority of worldwide human rights leaders have immediate security problems that the fewer who enjoy political freedom and relative safety do not have. This higher proportion of human rights leaders must struggle under severe political oppression and personal danger. For them especially, human rights **leadership** decisions can have major effects on their collective and personal security. At this writing, Burma's (Myanmar's) Nobel Peace Prize-winning heroine Aung San Suu Kyi is perhaps the most famous human rights leader who, along with the great majority of Burma's peoples quietly supporting her as they live together under military dictatorship, must make crucial decisions with momentous implications for human security and suffering.

The tremendous variety of conditions that human rights leaders in various situations must deal with leads to the proposition that such leaders, to achieve maximum human rights improvement with least suffering, must excel in the variety of approaches they understand, in their judgment about which methods to use in what situations, and in their ability to inspire in others clear thinking and long-term loyalty to the effort. Fortunately for potential human rights leaders, previous examples provide many cases to examine. Careful students can use these cases to identify which basic approaches and supporting methods might best produce specific human rights improvements, in what time frames they might do so, how much additional human damage and suffering various means might involve, and in which cultural, political, and technological circumstances particular strategies might function best.

For open-minded leaders many possibilities exist to further human rights. These possibilities suggest that all persons who want to improve human rights can find some way to lead in that direction, on however small a scale, whatever their circumstances. For those who might make human rights **leadership** a central commitment, the rich possibilities, along with the skills and character development their use implies, point to a deeply engaging and productive, if at times difficult, way to use one's life for the benefit of humankind.

HISTORICAL EXAMPLES

Looking back to major pre-World War II examples of human rights **leadership**, one remembers that political leaders of the U.S. and French revolutions asserted civil and political rights for ordinary persons not previously anywhere guaranteed. Leaders of both drew on common European visions of human nature and rights articulated by the English philosopher John Locke, the French philosopher and author Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and others, in the historic U.S. Declaration of Independence (1776) and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man (1789). However, the level of ferocity and human suffering associated with the French Revolution was markedly higher than with the U.S. revolution.

Students of human rights **leadership** can find significant differences between the U.S. and French examples to explain the different results. One important difference was that educated, landed leaders of the U.S. colonies had more than one hundred years of experience in relative self-governance at a meaningful distance from decisive English imperial force. Even ordinary U.S. colonists had more experience than did ordinary French persons in practical freedoms, on their relatively large farms and in their independent small businesses, less supervised by traditional aristocracy in the expanding U.S. colonies.

Due partly also to less-intense experience of abuse from those above them, U.S. revolutionists demonstrated less pent-up rage than did the French. Leaders of contemporary oppressed groups often have extracted the principle, from these and more recent examples, that participants in their causes may need considerable training to stay within agreed limits in their own approach toward violence so as to further their long-term human rights goals, regardless of strong feelings that particular situations might provoke.

During the second quarter of the twentieth century, Russian revolutionary leaders presided over a longer and more massive reign of terror than had leaders of the French revolution. Before that time, Russian opposition leaders, peasants, and proletariat had experienced even less exposure to self-governance and more intense abuse than had their French counterparts. Many human rights advocates would now note that the Marxist vision of economic and social human rights, although producing the first **leadership** commitment by a large nation to economic, social, and cultural provisions in the later Universal Declaration of Human Rights, was fatally flawed, as led by the Soviet leaders Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin, in its practical rejection of civil and political freedoms for "dictatorship of the proletariat." By the twentieth century's end, while demands for economic, social, and cultural rights had greatly strengthened worldwide, Stalin's role regarding human rights was more widely viewed as monstrous than monumental.

The principle learned from Stalin's Soviet **leadership**, however, is suited not only for political leaders who might

emphasize economic, social, and cultural human rights at the expense of civil and political ones. Those political leaders, in contrast, who champion civil and political rights, with too little attention to economic, social, and cultural rights for all, are now widely recognized to risk mounting rage from young people growing up in deprivation while watching the privileged on television, however politically free those young people might be to gather and speak.

One illuminating example of human rights **leadership** was set by Eleanor Roosevelt in leading the new United Nations Human Rights Commission's effort, soon after the twentieth century's most devastating war, to forge an international bill of human rights. Mrs. Roosevelt had benefited greatly from close exposure to the thinking and executive action of her husband, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in response to the Great Depression of the 1930s and to the horrors of World War II. She understood well his legacy of "four freedoms" (freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear) and the influential human rights legacy of World War I President Woodrow Wilson. Mrs. Roosevelt recognized also that the world of that time was divided roughly among leaders and constituencies emphasizing civil and political rights; those emphasizing economic, social, and cultural rights; those emphasizing freedom from colonial rule; and those who felt threatened by human rights concepts in general. In presiding over the drafting committee Mrs. Roosevelt exercised **leadership** principles well gauged to deal with these and other complex constituent priorities.

First, Mrs. Roosevelt facilitated open, fair, inclusive, but well-disciplined process. The committee considered drafts from a broad base of ideas and proposals from sources around the world. Participants in the committee were free to express themselves on each issue fully but not so repetitively as to prevent the committee from proceeding to decision.

Second, Mrs. Roosevelt managed important accommodation in substance among philosophically divided committee members. She had to deal with the essential principle, if agreement were to be reached, of inclusion in this major world document of the most important human rights concepts from both sides of the Cold War. On the other hand was the equally essential principle, if the rights were to be enforceable, of binding agreements for the rights enumerated. Mrs. Roosevelt was painfully aware, however, that no member of the committee would accept binding provisions for all of the rights that were considered so essential, by one or more other committee members, as to prevent committee approval of a document without them.

Therefore, Mrs. Roosevelt encouraged the drafting committee toward reaching realistic compromise without sacrificing principle. One subcommittee would draft a world universal declaration. That document would assert for all humankind the fullest enumeration of human rights that the entire committee could be persuaded to accept in principle but that no country at the time would fully meet. To increase acceptance of a fuller range, the rights would be phrased in general terms rather than in binding language that might seriously endanger passage by the U.N. General Assembly. Another subcommittee would begin work on a binding covenant, especially important to small nations feeling comparatively defenseless among larger ones.

Work on the binding covenant went slowly because nations perceived many obstacles to signing legal commitments. However, with Mrs. Roosevelt's **leadership** the committee managed to keep up momentum to finish the nonbinding Universal Declaration, with a quite comprehensive human rights blueprint drawn from each side of the Cold War.

Third, Eleanor Roosevelt pinned her long-term strategy on encouraging worldwide creation of cultures of human rights. Personally, she focused much of her later work, after serving as drafting committee chair, on assisting African-American efforts to secure equal rights. Overall, her goal was to empower ordinary people everywhere to develop human rights cultures supporting both enactment and implementation of binding human rights documents. These cultures would continue to reflect the many differences among human traditions, but they also would support in common the spread of respect and voluntary observance of all the rights in the Universal Declaration. Mrs. Roosevelt's inspiring conceptualization has reached a wide audience: "Where, after all, do

universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home—so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any maps of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person; the neighborhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, farm, or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman, and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere. Without concerted citizen action to uphold them close to home, we shall look in vain for progress in the larger world” (Roosevelt 1958).

The final document agreed to by the United Nations on 10 December 1948 as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a magnificent accomplishment of human rights **leadership**, not only by Mrs. Roosevelt and the small number of drafting committee framers, but also by all the governmental and nongovernmental organizations; world leaders; representatives of world religious, philosophical, and political traditions; and ordinary people who pressed for and contributed to its content. The declaration is simply and clearly expressed. It is written for and completely accessible to the ordinary person, thereby helping to emphasize that human rights are basic to the organized human condition and can be accomplished largely through **leadership** and practical selfdetermination by all of the ordinary people to whom the rights belong.

Since passage of the Universal Declaration, governments, international organizations, and people in difficult circumstances everywhere have exerted human rights **leadership** by asserting Universal Declaration provisions where there have not yet been legally binding agreements. In that way, the declaration has become recognized as the preeminent world human rights document and has achieved some meaningful legal force in itself. Therefore, a simple, important act of human rights **leadership**, available to everyone who can read and who has access to a copy of the Universal Declaration, is to memorize its relatively short text of thirty crucial universal human rights. Those people who cannot read can be helped orally to learn it. A second simple, important act that can be repeated often is to share the declaration's contents with others and engage in respectful dialogue about their meaning. A third simple, important act, easily a lifetime practice, is to act in whatever spheres one can to increase respect, voluntary observance, and enforcement when necessary of each Universal Declaration right.

MANY POSSIBILITIES

Since the U.N. agreed to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, individuals and groups all over the world have demonstrated an astounding number of ways to increase respect, voluntary observance, and enforcement of human rights. For example, when adopting the goals of the Universal Declaration, the United Nations also achieved agreement on one major binding agreement. Responding to the Nazi campaign to exterminate all Jews and others they deemed “inferior,” and greatly spurred on by the tireless human rights **leadership** of Polish Jewish Holocaust survivor Raphael Lemkin, the U.N. General Assembly passed the Convention on Prevention and Punishment of Genocide one day before it agreed to the declaration. Since then, the continuing strong **leadership** of dedicated individuals and groups, working with many governmental and nongovernmental constituencies, has secured U.N. enactment of additional binding international agreements. Primary have been the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (1966). Human rights and political leaders working together have succeeded also in passing the International Convention on Elimination of Racial Discrimination (1965); the International Convention on Elimination of Discrimination against Women (1979); the International Convention on Rights of the Child (1989); the International Convention against Torture (1984); and others.

At the national level, U.S. President Jimmy Carter led the U.S. executive branch in early explicit efforts to fit foreign policy measures to human rights standards. Persons organizing legislative human rights groups, such as U.S. Congressman Tom Lantos and his wife Annette (both Hungarian-American Jewish Holocaust survivors saved by Swedish hero Raoul Wallenberg) have fostered legislative environments increasingly conducive to enacting laws supporting human rights. Most human rights advocates would agree on the importance of continued **leadership** in legislatures worldwide, not only to adopt binding documents reflecting the rights in the

Universal Declaration, but also to monitor executive branch implementation.

Since the declaration was signed, citizens' organizations to support human rights have arisen in large numbers. The founders of Amnesty International led the world in organizing global citizen capacity to end torture and free prisoners of conscience. World War II resistance heroine Ginetta Sagan, rescued from torture herself, exercised dynamic **leadership** in expanding Amnesty International's activity. Amnesty International members flood the offices of dictators with polite letters, citing accurate documentation of a prisoner's nonviolence and the human rights violations alleged toward him or her. They keep writing until the prisoner is freed. Amnesty International has carefully expanded its scope; its membership has grown exponentially; and many organizations now emulate the Amnesty International model. Human Rights Watch, another prominent nongovernmental organization, has led in conducting research on nations with serious human rights violations and in publicizing U.S. and other influential policies toward those nations. Their model also has been widely followed.

Beginning in 1920, before the Universal Declaration, Indian anti-colonialist and Hindu pacifist leader Mohandas Gandhi set the world's most famous example of mass nonviolent civil disobedience, leading the people of India toward human rights and freedom from British colonial rule. Several times Gandhi stopped violence, by his own supporters or between Indian Hindus and Muslims, only by refusing to eat, on occasion for weeks, until respect for his action ended the violence. In the United States, Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. followed Gandhi's example, leading a mass nonviolent movement during the 1950s and 1960s to gain civil rights for African-Americans. Tragically, his personal example ended in assassination, as did Gandhi's, but like Gandhi's moral influence, Dr. King's lives on.

U.S. labor leader César Chávez, leading a mass nonviolent movement to gain farm worker labor rights, is thought to have shortened his life through hunger strikes that influenced employers and the public. Like Gandhi, King, and others since, Chavez used economic pressure to further his human rights cause. From his prison cell in South Africa, before he was president (1994–1999), Nelson Mandela inspired continued national and international resistance to end apartheid, combining nonviolent actions and economic boycott to reduce perceived need for violent resistance while increasing pressure against the violent regime. In the end, leading the African National Congress, he oversaw peaceful regime change, adoption of a democratic South African constitution, successful nuclear nonproliferation, and a Truth and Reconciliation Commission process that helped South Africa's peoples begin to heal from apartheid.

Mass nonviolent movements, often with strong student **leadership**, have helped tame oppressive regimes also in Asia, central and eastern Europe, and elsewhere. The peaceful, principled human rights **leadership** of Czech author Vaclav Havel is one of the late twentieth century's most admired examples. Nonviolent movements are currently the widest accepted method to achieve human rights and selfdetermination, partly because many people believe that they add up to less total suffering and more effective action against authoritarian regimes than do dynamics of armed resistance.

Some people who reject violent resistance in every case are criticized by others who note that successful nonviolent resistance movements often have coexisted in their political environment with movements using some degree of violence. Although the nonviolent movement may honestly denounce all armed action, some people who have supported armed groups have believed those groups assisted a nonviolent movement, in the "good cop, bad cop" tradition, in gaining leverage against an oppressive regime. This uneasy question is not yet entirely resolved within some early twenty-first-century groups seeking to escape oppression through efforts toward self-determination.

However, because increasing technology and expanded munitions trafficking during the twentieth century added greatly to devastation wreaked by armed conflicts on civilians, and because more people now believe war to be irrational in the context of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, more European and U.S. citizens are concluding that armed conflict is almost never justified. They see war in itself as causing massive deprivations

of human rights and in the modern context as unacceptably multiplying risks of mass injury and annihilation.

Many persons, whether or not they would ever justify armed action, exercise human rights **leadership** by learning and teaching conflict prevention and resolution. Others lead by helping dissipate psychological trauma caused by torture and other abuse, so that abused persons can regain some inner peace and better avoid passing trauma on to others. Yet others educate the public about how relationships among humans and other living beings, international trade arrangements, capital markets, energy sources, defense alliances, labor rights, toxic waste management, environmental conditions, equal empowerment of women, media ownership, corporate shareholder activism, human diet, and other factors can affect development of armed conflicts or development of peace.

So many members of so many groups have devised ways to exercise human rights **leadership** that it truly seems that everyone can do so. Doctors, lawyers, psychologists, journalists, and many more have organized to document human rights conditions and support human rights improvements in their areas of specialty. Professors and teachers engage in research and develop curricula at all levels. Some business leaders develop practices to support human rights in other countries where they invest. Clergy preach and help victims and activists toward spiritual comfort. Essayists, fiction writers, and poets write movingly about human rights conditions, and cartoonists pierce public denial while making the public laugh. Truck drivers played a key role in the largely peaceful overthrow of Serbian ruler Slobodan Milosevic in 2000.

Theater workers have developed subspecialties to promote political and economic rights, amusing while educating literate and illiterate alike. Musical performers initiate human rights fundraising concerts. Celebrities travel the world raising consciousness toward prevention of land mines and treatment for AIDS. Foundations and philanthropists fund relevant projects. Children learn human rights principles and defend them in their neighborhoods. Internet, computer, and media specialists help the world understand human rights more thoroughly through TV, radio, film, and the Internet and organize electronically in large numbers to support their improvement.

Altogether these efforts and many more have greatly increased worldwide understanding of the importance of human rights for groups formerly despised, ignored, or forgotten. Human rights leaders have supported the rights of women, children, racial and ethnic groups, and everyone else to civil, political, and religious freedoms. They also have organized to support the rights of—and directly to assist—the elderly and dying; the homeless and hungry; the disabled; indigenous peoples; lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered persons; persons in slavery; convicted inmates; refugees and the internally displaced; and those who lack decent housing, health care, work, and education. Rights for all of these persons are not universally accepted, and some are asserted in situations where they appear to conflict with others.

Therefore, there will continue to be crucial roles for human rights leaders who engage in careful research and facilitate respectful dialogue to reconcile differing views about human rights among people of different nationalities, political philosophies, races, religions, and many other characteristics. Many such leaders contribute incalculably in every role in society. Some globally influential examples are South African Christian Archbishop Desmond Tutu, Vietnamese Buddhists Thich Nhat Hanh and Sister Chan Khong, Romanian-American Jewish Holocaust survivor and author Elie Wiesel, Sudanese Muslim human rights scholar Abdullahi Ahmed AnNa'im, and U.S. Sioux native religionist and legal scholar Vine Deloria, Jr. Perhaps best known is Tibet's fourteenth Dalai Lama, Tenzin Gyatso, who continues to frame Tibet's long, peaceful struggle for productive dialogue with China regarding his Five-Point Peace Plan, in the areas of politics, the environment, security, and human rights, to help bridge gaps in understanding around the globe.

Human rights **leadership** from World War II until the present has achieved far wider acceptance of all of the goals in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights than was the case in 1948. Nevertheless, the goals' universal fulfillment appears far removed in a modern world plagued with unconscionable human rights

violations and vicious armed conflicts. Most human rights advocates would agree on the great need for dedicated human rights leaders of all ages in every human environment.

Some human rights advocates are encouraged, however, that the number of people worldwide who deeply desire to adapt human institutions to serve human rights cultures continues in rapid growth. They believe there is reason to hope that careful and cooperative **leadership** by everyone who understands the importance of human rights to the future of humanity gradually will adapt security and other crucial human institutions such that increasingly they will interrelate to support realistic, worldwide fulfillment of all of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

—Margery Gibbons Farrar

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Article 1.

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2.

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3.

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4.

No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5.

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6.

Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7.

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8.

Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9.

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 10.

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11.

(1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.

(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

Article 12.

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13.

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14.

(1) Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

(2) This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15.

(1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16.

(1) Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

(3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17.

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

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18.

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Human Rights

Article 19.

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20.

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

(2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21.

(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

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

(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22.

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23.

(1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24.

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

Article 25.

(1) 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.

(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26.

(1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

(2) 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.

(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

Article 27.

(1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

(2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28.

Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29.

(1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

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

Article 30.

Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

Further Reading

- Aikman, D. (2003). *Great souls: Six who changed a century*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Amnesty International USA, Group 19. (1994). *The casework manual: A toolbox*. Palo Alto, CA: Amnesty International.
- An-Na'im, A. A. (2003). Home page. Retrieved July 16, 2003, from <http://people.law.emory.edu/~aanaim/>
- Barkan, E. (2000). *The guilt of nations: Restitution and negotiating historical injustices*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bouchet-Saulnier, F. (2002). *The practical guide to humanitarian law: First English language edition (L. Brav, Ed. & Trans.)*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Chartock, R. K., ed. , & Spencer, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Can it happen again? Chronicles of the Holocaust*. New York: Black Dog and Leventhal.
- Chee, S. J. (1998). *To be free: Stories from Asia's struggle against oppression*. Clayton, Australia: Monash Asia Institute, Monash University.
- Cleary, T. (2000). *Classics of strategy and counsel: The collected translations of Thomas Cleary, 1–3*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Cole, D. C., & Dempsey, J. X. (2002). *Terrorism and the Constitution: Sacrificing civil liberties in the name of national security*. New York: New Press.
- Datan, M., & Ware, A. (1999). *Security and survival: The case for a nuclear weapons convention*. Cambridge, MA: International Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War, International Association of Lawyers against Nuclear War, and International Network of Engineers and Scientists against Proliferation.
- Deller, N., ed. , Makhijani, A., ed. , & Burroughs, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Rule of power or rule of law? An assessment of U.S. policies and actions regarding security-related treaties*. Takoma Park, MD: Institute for Energy and Environmental Research and New York: Lawyer's Committee on Nuclear Policy.
- Deloria, V., Jr. (1994). *God is red: A native view of religion (2nd ed.)*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum.
- Diamond, L. (2001). *The peace book: 108 simple ways to create a more peaceful world*. Berkeley, CA: Conari Press.
- Frost, M. (1996). *Ethics in international relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Garber, L. (1984). *Guidelines for international election observing*. Washington, DC: International Human Rights Law Group.
- Gilbert, M. (2003). *The righteous: The unsung heroes of the Holocaust*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Glendon, M. A. (2001). *A world made new: Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: Random House.
- Grounds, R. D., ed. , & Sawyer, R. L. (Eds.). (2003). *Native voices: American Indian identity and resistance*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Hannum, H. (1996). *Autonomy, sovereignty, and self-determination (Rev. ed.)*. Philadelphia: University of

Pennsylvania Press.

Harding, T. (2001). *The video activist's handbook (2d ed.)*. Sterling, VA: Pluto Press.

Howard, R. D., ed. , & Sawyer, R. L. (Eds.). (2003). *Terrorism and counterterrorism: Understanding the new security environment: Readings and interpretations*. Guilford, CT: McGrawHill/Dushkin.

Ingram, C. (1990). *In the footsteps of Gandhi: Conversations with spiritual social activists*. Berkeley, CA: Parallax Press.

Irons, P. (1988). *The courage of their convictions: Sixteen Americans who fought their way to the Supreme Court*. New York: Macmillan.

Ishay, M. (Ed.). (1997). *The human rights reader: Major political essays, speeches, and documents from the Bible to the present*. New York: Routledge.

Janes, R. W., & Tromble, K. R. (1995). *Scholar's guide to Washington, DC for peace and international security studies*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Josselin, D., ed. , & Wallace, W. (Eds.). (2001). *Non-state actors in world politics*. New York: Palgrave.

Kenyon, T. L., & Blau, J. (1991). *What you can do to help the homeless*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Klare, M. T. (1994). *Peace and world security studies: A curriculum guide (6th ed.)*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Krippner, S., ed. , & McIntyre, T. M. (Eds.). (2003). *The psychological impact of war trauma on civilians: An international perspective*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Levy, P. B. (1998). *The civil rights movement*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Minow, M. (1998). *Between vengeance and forgiveness: Facing history after genocide and mass violence*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Power, S. (2002). *A problem from hell: America and the age of genocide*. New York: Basic Books.

Power, S., ed. , & Allison, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Realizing human rights: Moving from inspiration to impact*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Roosevelt, E. (1958). In your hands. Retrieved July 16, 2003, from <http://www.udhr.org/history/inyour.htm>

Saunders, H. H. (2001). *A public peace process: Sustained dialogue to transform racial and ethnic conflicts*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Smith, R. K. M. (2003). *Textbook on international human rights*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Steiner, H. J., & Alston, P. (2000). *International human rights in context: Law, politics, morals (2d ed.)*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weiss, T. G., & Gordenker, L. (1996). *NGO's, the UN, and global governance*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Entry Citation:

Farrar, Margery Gibbons. "Human Rights." *Encyclopedia of Leadership*. Ed. . Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2004. 680-90. *SAGE Reference Online*. Web. 30 Jan. 2012.



