

# Whip of human rights

Lt Col (R) M Zaman Malik

*The Muslim Human rights*

differ in each specific case.

**W**HAT was formally called as "fundamental rights" are now called the human rights. The human rights convention was adopted by the UN at Lake Success on December 10, 1948. The declaration of Human Rights, the convention on prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide and other similar measures for eliminating all sorts of discrimination based on race, sex, or religious belief, the upholding of the rights of the child, protection against torture, eradication of hunger and malnutrition and the use of scientific methods and technology progress in the interest of peace and benefit of mankind are all very noble and heart warming resolves and intentions expressed therein. But it is being used like another whip in the west's hand to beat others. In

Why does the West create, encourage and sustain the violation of human rights. in Chachenya, Palestine, Bosnia and Kashmir? Secretarian hatred in Muslim countries is the creation of the Jewish-led West. The Jews have always been spreading intrigue and chaos.

The West arrived on the scene only recently in human history. Many civilisations have been in existence, much before giving life, the foundations on which it stands today. We believe, with equal reverence in all the Prophets, mentioned in The Torah. The Bible and The Holy Quran. That is why we cannot stand anyone talking ROT like the infamous "Satanic Verses" of Salman Rushdie. What audacity! He is honoured by Austrian parliament, France, England and

**The West arrived on the scene only recently in human history. Many civilisations have been in existence, much before giving life, the foundations on which it stands today. We believe, with equal reverence in all the Prophets, mentioned in The Torah. The Bible and The Holy Quran. That is why we cannot stand anyone talking ROT like the infamous "Satanic Verses" of Salman Rushdie. What audacity! He is honoured by Austrian parliament, France, England and received by President Clinton, ignoring the Vatican wishes prohibiting Catholics from reading, as it is Blspheamous works. Austria has a sizeable Jewish population and the US is the most obedient servant of Zionism. What to talk of such an outrage against a great world religion, the West does not allow even the circulation of Mein Kampf and the protocols of the Elders of the Zion, as far as their own countries are concerned. Where then is the justification for the translation of Salman's book in various languages in the West, on name of the freedom of Literary expression? This constitutes a horrific violation of human rights.**

The irreconcilability of cultures does not mean a cultural war. The whole world, at this stage, seems interested in the development of good mutual relations. For the standardisation of human rights now in progress of formulaation by the community of nations to be promoted and established as prevailing international norms, a fundamental redefinition of human relationship is called for. If humanity is indeed coming of age, if all inhabitants of the planet constiute a single people, if justice is to be the ruling principle of social organisation then existing conceptions that were born out of ignorance of these emerging realities have to be recast.

MOVEMENT in this direction has already begun. It will lead, as it unfolds, to a new understanding of the nature of the family and of the rights and responsibilities of each of its members. It will entirely transform the role of women at every level of society. Its effect in reordering people's relation to the work they do and their understanding of the place of economic activity in their lives will be sweeping. It will bring about far-reaching changes in the governance of human affairs and in the institutions created to carry it out. Through its influence, the work of society's rapidly proliferating non-governmental organisations will be increasingly rationalised. It will ensure the creation of binding legislation that will protect both the environment and the development needs of all peoples. Ultimately, the restructuring or transformation of the United Nations system that this movement is already bringing about will no doubt lead to the establishment of a world federation of nations with its own legislative, judicial and executive bodies.

The standard of truth-seeking this process demands is far beyond the patterns of negotiation and compromise that tend to characterize the present-day discussion of human affairs. It cannot be achieved — indeed, its attainment is severely handicapped by the culture of protest that is another widely prevailing feature of contemporary society.

Debate, propaganda, the adversarial method, the entire apparatus of partisaship that have long

actual practice, these are abused by the West for destabilising a regime (As China and Iran etc) or utilised for influence in others internal affairs.

Muslim values are certainly different from those of the West. The Holy Quran, describes the humans as "Vicergerent" of God, on earth. The expression "Haqulabad" (Peoples rights) is exactly the same as human rights, but about 1400 years older! In an Islamic civilisation, accountability for injustices done to an individual does not end with earthly life but goes beyond, in the life to come. Like any ordinary citizen the Khalifa is bound to appear before the court to clarify his position. Prince Charles, heir to the British Crown, said the following in his October 27, 1993, lecture at Oxford: "Medieval Islam was a religion of a remarkable tolerance of its times, allowing Jews and Christians the right to practice their inherited beliefs, and setting an example which was not unfortunately, copied for many centuries by the West. The Holy Quran counted "Al-Riqab (liberating the slaves) as an act of piety and redemption in the hereafter. In the Muslim society slaves rose to be the Kings and mighty emperors, by merit, selection and by choice.

It is not the nature of societies to abandon what they have practiced for centuries and adopt something new. However, the ever evolving societies incorporate for permanence, if some change happens to be socially and economically useful. The Bangkok moot attended by 49 Asian countries, framed its own definition in fundamental rights conference. But in the human rights conference, the US led West differed with it. Huntington reflects the West maglomania by saying,.... Western concept differs fundamentally from those prevalent in other civilisations, Islamic Japanese, Hindu, Buddhist or orthodox cultures. Considering the level of the Third World, if the same material conditions had prevailed in the West, would it still be possible for it to have all the sophisticationism it boasts of?

**I**T IS entirely a colonial heritage of West which perpetuates itself enjoying unlimited economic benefits. The West would starve without the economic resources of Asia. Unfortunately, a vast majority of Muslim countries are ruled by autocracy, monarchy, authoriterianism and all sorts of hodgepodge. It is because of the long (over three centuries) colonial rule. The West, in actual fact, does not like democracy in the Muslim world. Like human rights, it wants to continue using its name as an intimidating device, to serve its own narrow interests.

received by President Clinton, ignoring the Vatican wishes prohibiting Catholics from reading, as it is Blspheinous works. Austria has a sizeable Jewish population and the US is the most obedient servant of Zionism. What to talk of such an outrage against a great world religion, the West does not allow even the circulation of Mein Kampf and the protocols of the Elders of the Zion, as far as their own countries are concerned. Where then is the justification for the translation of Salman's book in various languages in the West, on name of the freedom of Literary expression? This constitutes a horrific violation of human rights.

There is no need to remind that every freedom is subject to certain limitations. Unlimited freedom is not a democratic concept,

**There is no need to remind that every freedom is subject to certain limitations. Unlimited freedom is not a democratic concept, for it is circumscribed by Morality. If only a genuine democracy is allowed in Muslim countries, the Muslim world will become highly progressive much to the chagrin of the Petro-Dollar hungry US-led West. The process of trial and error too is not being allowed to succeed, to evolve itself in to useful permanence. They call themselves Judeo - Christian civilisation, forgetting that tagging it so will create problems for the West itself. For instance, in Judaism adultery is punishable by stoning to death, while the Christian West consider fornication a human right preserve. US model human rights should not be imposed forcibly. These have civilisational context, which may differ in each specific case.**

for it is circumscribed by Morality. If only a genuine democracy is allowed in Muslim countries, the Muslim world will become highly progressive much to the chagrin of the Petro-Dollar hungry US-led West. The process of trial and error too is not being allowed to succeed, to evolve itself in to useful permanence. They call themselves Judeo - Christian civilisation, forgetting that tagging it so will create problems for the West itself. For instance, in Judaism adultery is punishable by stoning to death, while the Christian West consider fornication a human right preserve. US model human rights should not be imposed forcibly. These have civilisational context, which may

of partisanship that have long been such familiar features of collective action are all fundamentally harmful to its purpose: that is arriving at a consensus about the truth of a given situation and the wisest choice of action among the options open at any given moment.

What the need is calling for is a consultative process in which individual participants strive to transcend their respective points of view, in order to function as members of a body with its own interests and goals. In such an atmosphere, characterised by benevolence and courtesy, ideas long not to the individual to whom they occur during the discussion but to the group as a whole, to take up, discard, or revise seems to best serve the goal pursued. Consultation succeeds to the extent that all participants support the decisions arrived at

regardless of the individual opinions with which they entered the discussion. Under such circumstances an earlier decision can be readily reconsidered if experience exposes any shortcomings.

Viewed in such a light, consultation is the operating expression of justice in human affairs. So vital is it to the success of collective endeavour that it must constitute a basic feature of a viable strategy of social and economic development. Indeed the participation of the people on whose commitment and efforts the success of such a strategy depends becomes effective only as consultation is made the organising principle of every project.