

## HUMAN RIGHTS ARTICLES ON PEACE

**Prof. Roger S. Colisao**

Faculty

School of Education, Arts and Science

Universidad de Zamboanga

Zamboanga City, Philippines

While some dictionaries define the word right as “a privilege, “when used in the context of “human rights,” we are talking about something more basic. Every person is entitled to certain fundamental rights, simply by the fact of being human. These are called “human rights”, rather than a privilege, which can be taken away at someone’s whim. Every person is entitled to certain right—simply by the fact that they are a human being.

I have sensed that the very first aspiring preamble of the Universal declaration on Human rights is recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family which is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world. What is this alienable rights? It means that the “rights” of an individual cannot be taken away from hi/her and its inborn.

Same is true with the first two, Article 1 which states that “All human beings are born and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards on one another in a spirit of brotherhood”; and Article 2 which reveals that “Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. “ Precisely, each of us is due with freedom. Hence, we must be respected equally for what we are and what we ought to be. Our being rational (ability to think and reason out) sets our free will go justice. Therefore, we must act according to the principles of truth and humanity regardless of status, nationality, race, color, religion and practices.

This means that dignity is a term used in moral, ethical, and political discussions to signify that a being has an “innate right” to respect and endowed with ethical treatment. It is an expression of beliefs that individuals have inherent, inviolable rights, and thus is closely related to concepts like virtue, respect, self-respect, autonomy, human rights, and enlightened reason. In short, everyone has the right to have his honor respected and his dignity recognized inherent in as essence of “human being.”

Moreover, Article 3, of the Universal declaration of human rights states that “ Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.” This is also a clear manifestation under the BILL OF RIGHTS of our Constitution. This suggests that even the fetus in the mother’s womb has the right to life and no one could take it away from him. Right to liberty means the fundamental basis of morality. The right to liberty is simply the right to do whatever does not violate the rights of others, I supposed. To deny the validity of the right to liberty is to deny your own right to do anything whatsoever—including any right to have an opinion or present an argument. Therefore, the right to liberty is based on the optimistic assumption that whatever you want to do is morally correct, provided there is no compelling argument against it.

Pessimistically assuming the inverse-which you have no right to do anything until you can prove that you do from which there is no escape: You wouldn't have the right to even think about how to prove you have any rights, let alone the right to present any proofs. "That government can scarcely be deemed to be free where the rights of property are left solely dependent upon the will of a legislative body without any restraint."

The discussion place the concept of the right to property in a right perspective. They definitely rejected the Russian theory of socialism but accepted the doctrine of individual right to property subject to the laws of social control. The right to property was conditioned by the social responsibility .The interests. The social order visualized by the constitution to be brought about smoothly by a process of a gradual judicial adjustment. The fundamental assumption of the constitution was that every party that was elected to power should be bound by the provisions of the constitution and should strive to bring about the new social and economic structure of the country, in the manner prescribed therein. Under the constitution, both the means and the end were equally important in the evolution of the new society.

Sad to note that many people know something about their rights. Generally they know they have the right to food and safe place to stay. They know they a right to be paid for the work they do. This is also expressed in the Philippine Constitution. However, there are many other rights. When human rights are not well known by Filipinos, for example, or people, abuses such as discrimination, intolerance, injustice, oppression and slavery can arise. We have to accept that human rights form the basis for a world built on freedom, justice and peace.

However, between individuals and groups, peace is a state of harmonious co-existence which goes with that "innate human rights." On a personal level, peace connotes the absence of anxiety or stress. A person with peace of mind experiences serenity, tranquility, and inner contentment. If one is at peace, then the pursuit of that "right" is preserved and respected and therefore is indispensable and has been in existence since humanity began.

I believe that to experience peace, we must take responsibility for our thoughts. With god's help we can quit reacting with anger or self-pity. It's our circumstances or other people that determined our mood; it is our attitude about them.

While over the last few years, human rights activists have been able to expose abuses almost anywhere in the world the attacks on human rights defenders, organization, and institutions. On the contrary, what's interesting is that many governments have been able to adapt themselves into new "silencing" techniques that have instead "grown in subtlety and sophistication."

So why then after all the progress the human rights movement has made, we always posed a lot of question: "Are abuses like these are still happening? And why do people who work towards peace continue to become the objects of such attacks? ; why is it that report itself offers no clear answer other than to state that we need a more sensitive government defense system and to stand up more firmly against those government that are violating human rights."

Apparently, no one is to be blamed about all these scenario because we made it. We are part of the situation that comes out from our decision, so let's take the consequence of such decision... that human right. Accordingly, politics plays an important role in developing or recognized the above rights, and the discussion about which behaviors are included as "rights" is an ongoing political topic of importance. The concept of rights varies with political orientation. Positive rights such as a "rights to medical care" are emphasized more often by left-leaning thinkers, while right-leaning thinkers place more emphasis on negative rights such as the "right to fair trial".

In the Philippines setting, the term *equality* which is often bound up with the meaning of "rights" often depends on one's political orientation. Conservatives and libertarians and advocates of free markets often identify equality with equality of opportunity, and want equal need fair rules in the process of making things, while agreeing that sometimes these fair rules lead to unequal outcomes. In contrast, socialist often identify equality with equality of outcome and see fairness when people have equal amounts of goods and services, and therefore think that people have a right to equal portions of necessities such as health care or economic assistance or even housing. But the question is: are these rights really manifested in the real thing? Many contemporary states have a constitution, a bill of rights, or similar constitutional documents that enumerate and seek to guarantee civil liberties. Other states have enacted similar laws through a variety of legal means, including signing and ratifying or otherwise giving effect to key conventions such as the so called European convention on human rights and the international covenant on civil and political rights.

Finally, it might be said that the protection of civil liberties is a key responsibility of all citizens of Free states, as distinct from authoritarian states. Well, like in the Philippines, sometimes it happens. The existence of some claimed civil liberties is a matter of dispute, as are the extent of most civil rights, controversial, examples includes property rights, reproductive rights, civil marriage, and the right to keep and bear arms. Whether the existence of victimless crimes infringes upon civil liberties is a matter of dispute. Another matter of debate is the suspension or alteration of certain civil liberties in times of war or state of emergency, including whether and to what extent this should occur. In ending my right to believe that "Man by nature is not free but is meant to be free "is somewhat respected. That's the real sense of my human right.