

UNALIENABLE RIGHTS VERSUS HUMAN RIGHTS

The most dynamic political idea in the world today is that of "unalienable" individual rights derived from God who is sovereign. It is important not to confuse unalienable rights with the secular notion of "human rights." The trouble with that notion is its vagueness about the source of those rights. To the followers of Ayn Rand, for example, human rights are "inherent," that is, they are a natural concomitant of being human. In that formulation, "sovereignty" resides in the individual who in turn delegates to freely elected and appointed representatives a portion of that sovereignty to carry out the "legitimate" functions of government. The Constitution of the United States delineates the "legitimate" functions of government and thereby is considered the supreme law. The fact that the Constitution can be amended for good or evil by a two-thirds vote of the Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the states means that ultimately man's law is the supreme law, and that the state is mandated to enforce that law. What is lawful today may be unlawful tomorrow. Thus, man is sovereign, man is king, man is God. And thus, "human rights" become subject to human whim.

However, the concept of "unalienable" rights derived from God rests on the immutable foundation of God's law as articulated in the Bible. It is a concept peculiar to that worldview, for no other religion has ever given birth to the notion of "unalienable" individual rights. It is therefore no accident that the Founding Fathers who wrote the Declaration of Independence, conceived this republic and

wrote its Constitution were Christians with an intimate knowledge of the Bible. In the context of what the Founding Fathers believed, sovereignty resides in God, not man, and man may amend his laws only within the parameters of Biblical law.

Nor should human rights be confused with the notion of natural rights. The latter are a derivative of the notion of natural law, best summed up in the words of English jurist, William Blackstone, who wrote:

"The Law of Nature dictated by God himself is Superior to any other. It is binding over all the Globe, in all Countries and at all times. No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this, and such of them as are valid derive all of their force and all their authority mediately and immediately from this Original. Upon these two foundations, the Law of Nature and the Law of Revelation depend all human laws. Human laws are only declaratory of and act in subordination to Divine Law."

It should be noted that the concept of "unalienable" individual rights as spelled out in the Declaration of Independence preceded the development and invocation of secularized "human rights," and that therefore the latter concept is, in reality, a perversion of the earlier concept. The Declaration states that: "All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

Clearly, human life begins at its creation, and therefore these unalienable rights apply to the human being from the moment of conception until death in old age. Yet the secular believers in "human rights"

disregard the unalienable right to life of the unborn infant, and murder him or her on the basis of the mother's sovereignty which is acknowledged and upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. This is the kind of lethal behavior that sovereignty based on individual whim can lead to. The whim of the sovereign mother is law, and she need not consider the unalienable right to life of the infant, for in a world of human rights unalienable rights do not exist.

When the child is born, it then acquires "human rights" and thereby a sovereignty of its own which confronts the sovereignty of its mother. But even here, the infant's sovereignty is only tentative, for there is presently under discussion among physicians the notion that the mother's sovereignty should be extended to cover the first month of the child's life, so that if the child is born with a defect that was undetected in utero, he or she can be legally destroyed.

Thus, when sovereignty ultimately resides in the human being, "human rights" are determined by those physically capable of enforcing them. And so the concept of "human rights" based on individual sovereignty eventually reduces itself to the crude, barbaric formula that "might makes right."

As we celebrate the 200th anniversary of our Constitution, we can see that the American people are in a deplorable state of confusion concerning rights. Feminists clamor for "women's rights," lovers of animals agitate for "animal rights," the American Civil Liberties Union fights for "civil rights," and Amnesty International agonizes over "human rights." The right to freedom of religion has become perverted by the ACLU into a right to freedom from religion. The sovereignty of God is neither recognized by the public schools nor

the judiciary, and the media pontificates over this philosophical anarchy and calls it "our American heritage."

Recently, when Barbara Walters was in China, she interviewed a group of Chinese students from Peking University who spoke some English. The interview took place in the confines of the American embassy where the students were encouraged to speak freely before the TV cameras. Miss Walters asked the students about their recent demonstrations. What did the students want, she asked. "We want more freedom," they replied. Then, one of the students, a girl, said that the demonstrations had been about rights. "We have rights," she said. "They do not come from government." Rather than pick up on this remarkable comment, Miss Walters then went on to inquire about the students' sex lives, as is her wont. But what that young girl had revealed is that the notion of inherent rights and this direct challenge to the communist government's sovereignty are ideas now in the heads of Chinese students. Now if only someone had been there to open up a discussion on unalienable rights derived from God! One got the impression that the students would have listened very carefully.

-- Samuel L. Blumenfeld