



PRACTICAL ETHICS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Dr. Dewan Nazrul Qadir

Associate Professor in History

B. B. Kishan College, Jalah, Assam

ABSTRACT

Basic liberties, legitimate, common, financial, social and social, shares the normal elements of being upheld by moral standards This postulation centers around an assessment and support of the subordinate moral bases of common liberties. The presentation clarifies the overall idea of common freedoms. Of the alternate points of view - - philosophical, legitimate, and political, from which rights are imagined, our anxiety is with the main, which primarily examines the establishments of common liberties, connecting rights with ideas like equity, improvement and government assistance. The verifiable powers, the strict and philosophical customs, that affected the advancement of the cutting edge arrangement of basic freedoms, here been reviewed in Paper examines the ways of thinking of Confucius, Aristotle, Immanuel Kant, John Rawls, and Alan Gewirth as designing moral establishments of common liberties. Relativists and multiculturalists disprove foundationalism contending that qualities are social explicit, henceforth plural and relative, and rights which shield these qualities are in like manner relative. The perspectives on anthropologist Ruth Benedict and savant Richard Rorty are demonstrative of the nearby elements between social variety and basic liberties, the primary topic of section In paper Martha C Nussbaum's abilities approach and Jack Donnelly's idea of 'relative all inclusiveness' are utilized to cut out a center ground among universalism and social relativism, permitting moderate social variety and translation without endangering fundamental rights and opportunities. The traditional radical suspicion of a brought together, normal, independent self supporting common freedoms talk, bars from the overlay of basic liberties the simple-minded, the unborn, babies, the matured, and ladies. In paper components have been gathered from Diana T Meyer's five originations of oneself, the morals of care, the Feminist angle Theory, and contextual investigations of moral situations in commonsense life, to set up the postulation that human instinct can't be decreased to its realist measurements. The Conclusion in growing human instinct to incorporate the parts of social connectedness and enbededness, frees common liberty from their pragmatist, and stretches out rights to the underestimated segments, making basic liberties a reality in the existences of individuals. More prominent regard and payment of basic freedoms can be accomplished if the ideal models of universalism and social relativism work pair as integral methodologies. Consistent discourse is recommended as an instrument for supporting basic liberties in existences of individuals at all levels.

Keywords: *Human Rights, Ethics*

Introduction

A basic freedom is a calculated gadget that focuses on, advances and secures for all people certain qualities, characters, and capacities fundamental for an ideal human life. Common liberties are grounded on the focal moral case that all people are conceived equivalent in respect, and consequently they have a place with an individual just due to his humanness. Basic liberties have a place with every single person independent of his ethnicity, race, rank, ideology, sexual orientation, or some other thought. They are neither made by nor can be annulled by any administration. Basic freedoms secure individuals against torment, unjustifiable imperatives on their opportunity, and assurance certain freedoms. The extent of basic freedoms being wide, constitutions of nations cherish those fundamental rights that are important for guaranteeing a sufficient human life. The arrangement of common liberties encapsulates the vision of a free, evenhanded, and tranquil world. It delineates least guidelines in the light of which people and establishments wherever should treat individuals. Common liberties are kept up with and clung to as 'Fundamental Rights' when they are ensured by a composed constitution, in light of the fact that a composed constitution typifies the key law of the state. Common freedoms are pre-requirements of an equitable, all around requested society.

The qualities of basic liberties can be listed as follows:

- (a) Human rights are natural. Basic liberties have a place with all people independent of their station, ideology, religion, sex, or identity. They are presented on an individual even post mortem. For instance, after an individual's passing, his assertions referenced in his will in regards to the appropriation of his mobile and undaunted property, are respected. Additionally, the diverse passing customs in various religions bear declaration to this.
- (b) Human rights address most pivotal parts of people groups' lives. The physical, material, social, social and moral advancement of an individual becomes conceivable with the help of basic liberties.
- (c) The idea of human poise is enmeshed in common liberties. The arrangement of common freedoms calls for individuals treating each other with poise. For instance, in 1993 India instituted a law disallowing the embarrassing act of conveying human excreta. This law is called Employment of Manual Scavengers and Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act.
- (d) Human rights are unavoidable. No individual can be denied of his privileges by any force or authority, since people are qualified for rights just due to their humanness.
- (e) Human rights are important for the satisfaction of the motivation behind life. Human existence has a purpose. Basic liberties give and secure ground level, satisfactory ways of life for individuals, permitting them to satisfy the motivation behind their lives. The public authority of any nation doesn't have the ability to remove or abridge rights that are sacred, sacred, and changeless.
- (f) Human rights are general—they are not the advantage of any exceptional individual or gatherings of people. Poise and equity are significant parts of human instinct on which common liberties are grounded.

(g) Human rights are not outright. Individuals don't live separated presences. They live in urban culture. No man can appreciate limitless opportunity. Despite what is generally expected, the rights and opportunities of an individual are restricted by the delight in similar arrangement of rights and opportunities of his individual creatures. Basic freedoms are subsequently restricted powers or cases, which add to the benefit of all, and which are perceived and ensured by the State, through its arrangement of Law which is restricting on all people.

(h) Human rights are dynamic. They stay up with the social, monetary, political and social improvement inside the State, by extending to oblige the developing and changing necessities and requests of society, and furthermore to resolve new issues. In this way as society progresses and the degree of training and awareness of individuals improve, we find more current and more up to date rights like the privileges of the unborn, of the hatchling, of those having a place with the trans-sex, gay and lesbian rights, privileges of ladies, and so on Laws should be, and have been returned to and re-deciphered in the light of an increased consciousness of specific qualities like life, nobility, and so forth Accordingly today, the option to be really focused on in affliction calls with the expectation of complimentary clinical therapy in open medical clinics under the Public Health Scheme, free and necessary clinical assessments in schools, arrangement for schools with unique hardware to oblige the truly disabled.

(I) Rights are cutoff points to state power—common liberties limit the state's ability to guarantee that the state doesn't unduly infringe on specific opportunities of the person. The singular in this manner has certain cases on their general public. These cases appear as adverse limitations when they keep the state from abusing natural opportunities of the person. These cases force positive commitments on the state.

(j) Rights are resolute, interrelated and related. The infringement of one right has its repercussion on different rights. For instance, if an individual is denied his right to instruction, his entitlement to seek after an appropriate occupation might be placed in danger as a result. The assurance of one right anticipates different rights to be ensured. For instance, the option to cast a ballot is purposeless to individuals who live in social orders where wellbeing, instruction and social government assistance arrangements are not given. Since lack of education would be in a real sense equivalent to disappointment of a huge part of individuals of such social orders.

In current occasions we track down an extensive number of public and global law and deals that maintain and ensure common freedoms. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is the primary authority proclamation of a global arrangement of assurance for common liberties. The UDHR was proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 December, 1948. This day is praised every year across the world as the International Human Rights Day. The rights as defined in the UDHR are not restricting on any country; by the by there is an inescapable acknowledgment of the standards of basic freedoms depicted in the UDHR, which structure the foundations of numerous advanced public constitutions. Basic freedoms are delegated—common basic liberties, political basic freedoms, monetary basic liberties, social and social rights, and advancement situated basic freedoms.

(a) Civil and political normal freedoms: Civil and Political rights secure and give individual opportunity against crazy state control, and are with everything taken into account known as 'Liberty masterminded Rights'. Social freedoms consolidate the right to life, opportunity and individual security, the rights to adjust under the watchful eye of law, and the right of confirmation from being caught discretionarily, the right to the suitable techniques of law, the right to a sensible fundamental, the right to chance of religion and love. Political rights fuse the option to talk and explanation, the option to social affair and alliance, the choice to project a voting form and political participation. Political rights give on an individual the rights to partake in open issues and in endeavors of the state. All nation states have the commitment to safeguard normal and political rights that fundamentally include the essential opportunities. They are generally called Blue Rights, which are the First Generation of essential opportunities.

(b) Social, money related and social rights: The 20th century saw the new development and supporting of monetary, social and social rights. The advantages of minorities moreover got uncommon thought. Social and money related rights fuse the right to daily existence, the right to guidance, the right to prosperity and 6 thriving, the alternative to work and sensible pay, the choice to outline laborer's associations and free affiliations, the right to unwinding, and the right to government upheld retirement. These rights work with the new development and flourishing of individuals all over, and they further develop certainty. Money related rights by ensuring fundamentally the base monetary government help of the greater part, guarantees an acculturated living. Social rights consolidate the benefits of culture, the right to local land, functions and social practices, the alternative to impart in one's neighborhood language and the choice to first language guidance. Social rights are highlighted guaranteeing the social characters of the minorities, and getting them against regular assimilationist gadgets and frameworks of nations. The money related, social and social rights target ensuring the crucial security in the solitary's life and are aggregately known as 'Security Oriented Human Rights'. They are moreover suggested as Red Rights or Second Generation rights, and were therefore perceived by (I) the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and (ii) the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in December 1966.

What are Human Rights?

To characterize basic freedoms it is first important to dissect the idea of a right. Following Hohfeld (1919), a right is a case for explicit human products (e.g., food, training, or clinical benefits) made against someone else or the State who accordingly has an obligation to give the great asserted. A right might be separated into various key ideas: a rights-holder (i.e., the individual who makes the case), the declaration of a case, the reason or objective of the case (e.g., free discourse or freedom), a beneficiary called upon to give the article being referred to (i.e., the obligation conveyor), and the grounds or avocation for the case being referred to. Rights in this sense are seen as privileges to neutrality from others in the specialist's issues as well as to the arrangement of products to which an individual is entitled. Rights include obligations or commitments; the beneficiary of the case in this way has an obligation to furnish the petitioner with the chance or condition being referred to. Unmistakably a right is basically an ethical idea and is thought to take point of reference over other moral contemplations. On account of their superseding moral status, rights are viewed as supported by incredible moral ideas

like the poise of people and their critical advantages (Gewirth, 1981; Orend, 2002; Talbott, 2005). Rights scholars ordinarily make a differentiation among negative and positive rights (Churchill, 2006; Rasmussen and Den Uyl, 2005; Freedden, 1991; Orend, 2002).

A negative right is a right that forces an obligation of inaction by others. A genuine model is the obligation to regard a singular's on the whole correct to free discourse; the case is for others to halt from meddling with the outflow of the rights-holder's perspectives. A positive right is a right that forces a commitment on others to act in certain manners to furnish the rights-holder with a particular need or condition. A model is a case or assumption for the State to give jobless people monetary help or detainees with sporting exercises. People hold common liberties just in light of the fact that they are individuals from mankind and as such are viewed as moral specialists. Moral specialists are people equipped for detailing their very own ventures and looking for methods of acknowledging them in their everyday lives. That is, specialists purposeful with regards to what results are in their own wellbeing and act as needs be to get them. The connection among qualities and common liberties is very much portrayed by Michael Freedden (1991) who contends that basic freedoms are expected to work as defensive cases that present a cautious zone around people so they can continue ahead with the matter of driving great and significant lives. Such a life is one openly picked and includes the quest for individual objectives that mirror an individual's specific responsibilities (Lomasky, 1987).

Basic freedoms ensure what are viewed as fundamental credits of individuals: necessities, limits, and interests that, whenever ensured, regard the individual's pride and whenever disregarded outcome in existences of urgency and diminishment. The infringement of basic liberties happens when people are treated as items, essentially as intends to other people groups' finishes instead of as independent people. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) comprises of a preface stating the nobility of people and 30 articles addressing explicit rights like independence from torment, security of the individual, a reasonable preliminary and fair treatment, right to possess property, opportunity to and from separation, opportunity to wed, the option to work, strict opportunity (United Nations, 1948).

The UDHR was trailed by two worldwide contracts in 1966 (the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights) that gave more detail on the different articles laid out in the first United Nations presentation (Freeman, 2002). According to a mental point of view the UDHR forces significant general moral limitations on training and urges clinicians to consider cautiously about the connection between common liberties and measurable/clinical mediations. Crafted by Orend (2002) has additionally explained the guiding principle basic the UDHR and in our view is especially valuable for remedial specialists. Following Orend (2002) it is feasible to bunch the different rights contained in the UDHR into five groups, each bunch related with specific common liberties, the worth or condition ensured: Personal opportunity, material resource, individual security, natural fairness, and social acknowledgment. The basic liberty of individual flexibility alludes to a subset of rights like ability to speak freely, get together, development, affiliation, heart, religion, and is related with some of the particular rights contained in the UDHR. Besides, it is straightforwardly connected to people's more right than wrong to depend on their own judgment when concluding how to carry on with their lives. The common liberty to material

means alludes to a subset of articles including rights to essential degrees of actual wellbeing, food, water, and training.

The basic liberty of individual security concerns the actual wellbeing and government assistance of people and incorporates more explicit rights like independence from torment, brutality, fair treatment rights in law, and rights to look for haven. This is the place where the singular privileges of criminal wrongdoers and casualty's privileges for public security regularly seem to clash. Natural correspondence means conditions like equity under the steady gaze of the law, and independence from separation on the grounds of religion, sexual orientation, handicap, or some other element viewed as unimportant for the attribution of people's ethical status. At last, social acknowledgment is basically worried about recognizing people's privileges to coordinate the course of their own lives and to be treated in a stately and aware way as per their status as independent specialists. Sense of pride and confidence are incorporated under this class and highlight the significance of people having inspirational perspectives toward themselves and their own lives. In this manner as per the UDHR and the two contracts, common freedoms are general privileges to specific merchandise that, whenever acquired, will result in to some extent insignificantly fair and noble living souls.

The APA Code of Ethics and Forensic Guidelines

One of the most incredible accessible instances of a moral code is the American Psychological Association's Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (2002), which gives five general moral standards and ten gatherings of explicit moral norms. The points of the APA Ethical Code are to "give explicit norms to cover most circumstances experienced by therapists. It has as its objectives the government assistance and assurance of the people and gatherings with whom therapists work and the training of individuals, understudies, and the general population in regards to moral principles of the discipline" (APA, 2002, p3). The trial of what comprises sensible adherence to the standards depends on the overarching proficient judgment practiced by different clinicians occupied with comparative exercises in comparative circumstances dependent on the information they have or ought to sensibly be relied upon to have. The APA Ethical Code is seen as one of a few assets that clinicians might depend on while assessing the moral idea of their training and exploration exercises. In circumstances where there is struggle between the APA Ethical Code and the law or different kinds of guidelines, therapists ought to consistently endeavor to determine the conflict in a capable way. In the event that the contention can't be agreeably settled clinicians are allowed to cling to the necessities of the law and some other pertinent definitive assemblage of guidelines insofar as such activities are predictable with essential standards of basic liberties. Along these lines common freedoms seem, by all accounts, to be seen as setting a basic limit underneath which no expert activities ought to be allowed to fall. In the prelude of the APA Ethical Code it is expressed that "Analysts regard and secure common and basic liberties and the focal significance of opportunity of request and articulation in examination, educating, and distribution" (p3).

- The five APA general standards are expected to guide and capacity as administrative beliefs (i.e., to rouse) and in this way don't address explicit commitments in the severe feeling of that term (but we contend later that they perform force general responsibilities). The five APA general standards are as per the following:

- Principle A: Beneficence and Nonmaleficence. This rule urges clinicians to try to help their customers and patients and to guarantee that they don't hurt them.
- Principle B: Fidelity and Responsibility. This rule reminds clinicians that they ought to make sharing associations with individuals they work with and subsequently endeavor to maintain proficient guidelines of lead, be clear with regards to the nature and cutoff points of their expert jobs, adequately oversee potential irreconcilable situations, and to act in a mindful way.
- Principle C: Integrity. This guideline urges clinicians to propel genuineness, honesty, and exactness in their act of mental science, educating, and clinical work.
- Principle D: Justice. This guideline prescribes that clinicians hold fast to the requests of equity and decency when assigning administrations and do all that could be within reach to advance balance while taking part in mental errands.
- Principle E: Respect for People's Rights and Dignity. This guideline focuses on that clinicians ought to perceive the intrinsic nobility of every single person and their essential rights to protection, privacy, and self-assurance.

THE ETHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The historical backdrop of basic liberties that we have momentarily investigated in paper shows that their moral substance is gotten from various strict and philosophical customs that firmly propose equivalent poise, everything being equal. Basic freedoms are hence considered in a general and populist style. With regards to basic freedoms there has been a long-standing discussion among Universalism and Cultural Relativism. Defenders of Universalism attest that all men by temperance of being human are qualified for some fundamental rights, and these rights apply to all individuals regardless. Then again, Cultural Relativism holds that rights are culture-explicit, circumstance explicit, and consequently denies cover rights. In this section we will explore whether basic liberties have certain establishments, that is, unmistakable regulating grounds that render them generally material. For this we need to show that a few interests and contemplations are major to all individuals, and that hence we need rights that defend and further these interests. This Chapter will be separated into two Sections. By method of tracking down an ethical establishment for common liberties we will talk about the perspectives on Immanuel Kant and Alan Gewirth in Section I, and the perspective on Confucius and Aristotle in Section II. The terms 'foundational' and 'universal' are not actually similar, but rather a section from the one to the next can be shown. With regards to human rights, 'universality' has two detects. To begin with, it implies the extent of use, applying to all people on the planet. The subsequent sense alludes to the ethical establishment of basic liberties. In this sense, the establishment of common liberties demonstrates the standards which legitimize why people have key rights; in addition, on the off chance that we can show that those principles pertain to every single person preceding his substantial circumstances, then, at that point the rights supporting those standards acquire comprehensiveness of utilization.

In this section we are worried about the quest for such upright rules that contain the establishment of the design of rights. There are two boss ways to deal with the ID of the regularizing bedrock of basic freedoms - (i) The strict methodology and (ii) The Natural Rights approach. Those (i) who are focused on a strict establishing of common freedoms keep up with that an exceptional connection

holds among God and people, and that God presents man with certain natural rights. Each religion has its own images, ceremonies, its own accounts, and its own local area of adherents who share a similar confidence, and are in some cases distrustful of different religions. History informs us concerning the multitudinous strict conflicts that have been battled, coming about because of strict narrow mindedness and profound socio-strict divisions. Subsequently religion neglects to give a comprehensive establishing to common liberties. Another justification for why religion neglects to give the genuine, useful establishing of basic freedoms on the planet is that religion is of importance just to the adherents. While an extensive piece of the number of inhabitants on the planet, non-devotees to be exact, are distrustful with regards to the supernatural suspicions of religion, (2)and truth be told conceive religion as a danger to basic liberties.

In any case, if keeping to the side the particularities and doctrinal divergences of religions, we focus on the message of consideration and fellowship that is normal to most world-religions, then, at that point the positive job of religion in establishing common freedoms can be confirmed; for basic liberties, to acquire comprehensiveness should be established on rules that are all around recognized. Endeavors at the strict establishing of common freedoms don't appear to have yielded positive outcomes. The other unmistakable way to deal with tracking down the regulating bedrock of common freedoms is the Natural Rights approach. Regular Rights are not made by man, they are not legitimate rights; their normativity is gotten from nature itself. Upholders of regular rights keep up with that nature invests each human (without qualification old enough, sex, identity or race), with certain unavoidable rights (like right to life, freedom and the quest for satisfaction), which no administration can drop or meddle with. The most popular definition of normal rights is found in the works of John Locke who underscored life, freedom and property as essential.

David Hume protested the endeavor to get standards from realities. (3) Universalists, that is, the people who accept that a few rights are outright, can be characterized into three categories. The first classification of universalists accept that specific qualities are respected generally, and common liberties that maintain those qualities are along these lines all around material or practical. This position might be known as the De facto Universalism of common freedoms. True Universalists contend that similarly as bank theft is all around denounced, so likewise, some common freedoms have been acknowledged as addressing a general worth. By the by bank theft proceeds to happen and the looters are censured. Essentially, some basic liberties notwithstanding being outright are abused by certain individuals. Like the burglars, the people who abuse these rights are off base. A second sort of universalism confirms that some common liberties ensure a general regular property that each individual from the human species has normally. Yet, similarly as certain individuals don't know that the earth is round fit, and trust it to be level, so likewise certain individuals are ignorant of the truth of general common freedoms. One of the objectives of the worldwide arrangement of basic liberties is to advance familiarity with the presence of basic freedoms. This position is known as the Universal Realism of Human Rights. A third class of Universalists recommend that the qualities hidden some common freedoms should be all around acknowledged. This gathering might be known as the De jure Universalists. Each of the three sorts of universalism debate the relativist position on basic liberties.

CONCLUSION

A common freedom is a proper gadget that focuses on and secures certain human or social credits, interests, and qualities viewed as fundamental for the ideal working of an individual. Common liberties are esteem claims with huge social, political and monetary ramifications. In the Introduction of the theory, we have clarified the overall idea of common liberties, which are basic structure squares of our general public. We have likewise examined the three points of view from which basic liberties have commonly been imagined—(a) the philosophical, (b) the legitimate, and (c) the political. The searing plan has been shown in the Introduction, giving exceptionally short diagrams of every part. In the cutting edge time frame the Universal Declaration of Human Rights(UDHR) is the reference point of the worldwide arrangement of common liberties. There are layers of history and theory behind the rights pronounced in the UDHR. In Chapter I of our theory, we have talked about the chronicled and philosophical impacts that finished in the UDHR. The ideas of equity and human pride have been common in human culture since days of yore, and have assumed their parts in the development of the possibility of basic freedoms. In Medieval occasions rights were straightforwardly identified with societal position. 152 Rights were not presented on people, yet on classes or classifications of people. Rights and obligations were comparable with social jobs. Rights were frequently likewise grounded in strict perspectives that conceived the current social request as supernaturally appointed. That is, the rights and obligations of gatherings of individuals, and accordingly their economic wellbeing mirrored a heavenly arrangement.

Reference

1. Adcock, R. and Collier, D. (2001). Measurement validity: A shared standard for qualitative and quantitative research. *American Political Science Review*, 95/3,529-546.
2. Agamben, G. (2005). *State of Exception*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Akhtar, Saud, and Kumar, Pramod, (Eds). (2012). *Human Rights in the World*.
3. Sarup Book Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi. Alderson, A.S. (2004). Explaining the upswing in direct investment: A test of mainstream and heterodox theories of globalization. *Social Forces*, 83/1, 81- 122.
4. Alfred, Taiaiake. (2008). *Peace, Power, and Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Oxford University Press.
5. Alfredsson, G. (2005). Minorities, Indigenous and tribal peoples: Definition of terms as a matter of international law. *Minorities, people and Self-determination—Essays in Honour of Patrick Thornberry* (eds N. Ghanea and A. Xanthaki). Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.
6. Beiner, R. (1983). *Political Judgement*. London: Routledge. Beitz, C. (2009). *The Idea of Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Belknap, M. (1987). *Federal Law and Southern Order: Racial Violence and Constitutional Conflict in the post-Brown South*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
8. Bell, E. (1910). *Fighting the Traffic in Young Girls or the War on the White Slave Trade*. Chicago, IL: G.S. Ball.
9. Cardenas, S. (2007). *Conflict and Compliance: State Responses to International Human Rights Pressure*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

10. Carey, C. and Poe, S. (Eds) (2004). *Understanding Human Rights Violations: New Systematic Studies*. Aldershot:
11. Ashgate. Carothers, T. (2002). The ends of transition paradigm. *Journal of Democracy*, 13/1, 5-21. Carr, E.H. (1946). *The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939; An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (revised edn). London: Macmillan. Chandler, D, (2001). The road of military humanitarianism: How the human rights NGOs shaped a new humanitarian agenda. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 23/3,678-700.
12. ---- (2003) New rights for old? Cosmopolitan citizenship and the critique of state sovereignty. *Political Studies*, 51/2,339-356.
13. Hollis, M. (1994). *The Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Humphrey, M. (2007). *Ecological Politics and Democratic Theory: The Challenge of the Deliberative Ideal*. London: Routledge. Huntington, S. (1968). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University press.
14. Hyland, K.E. (2001). Protecting human victims of trafficking: An American framework. *Berkeley Women's Law Journal*. 16, 29-71.
15. Ishay, M.R. (2004). *The History of Human Rights: From Ancient Times to the Globalization Era*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. (2007). *The Human Rights Reader: Major political essays, speeches, and documents from Ancient times to the Present*. New York: