

In this country, we discuss the economy, unemployment, health care, education, even the deficit and environmental crises as individual challenges, neglecting not only a unified approach to solving these problems, but forgetting in the process that these same issues present not just differing economic and political choices, but “rights” recognized decades ago by our own country, and much of the rest of the developed world, as fundamental to providing “justice” and “human dignity” to all citizens.

Sixty-Two years ago (on December 10th, 1948), the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, calling upon all member nations to publicize and expound the text of the Declaration, “principally in schools and other educational institutions.”

It was a basic tenet of the Declaration that a denial of the human rights proclaimed therein was fundamentally a denial

of justice and a denial of basic human dignity. But this idea remains unknown to most Americans, who have not heard much of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in their schools or “other educational institutions.”

Rather, our ideas of justice seem to narrowly focus on the workings and perceived shortcomings of the civil and criminal justice system; and as a people we seem to forget that after the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, it was former first lady Eleanor Roosevelt who is largely credited with having “drafted” the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which our allies, and much of Western Europe adopted after World War II.

At the time of their adoption, the U.S. Ambassador to the Vatican said our country’s involvement in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would result in a “world made new.”

With the United States as one of the leaders in adopting “The Declaration,” it is not surprising that the general political freedoms associated with our Constitution—such as free speech, the right to life, liberty, and security of person and private property,

privacy, equal protection of the law, free and public hearing by an impartial tribunal in criminal cases, and freedom for being subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile, play a prominent role in The Declaration.

What we don’t hear much of are the “economic” rights proclaimed in The Declaration, such as the right to “work,” (not to be confused with our idea of “right to work” as keeping unions out of the workplace), protection against unemployment, and the right to “just and valuable remuneration for work...” “ensuring for [working persons and their families] an existence worthy of human dignity... [Article 23].

The Declaration also recognized as a basic human right “a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being” of working people everywhere, “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

[their] control,” [article 25];

It also recognized a 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.” [Article 26].

Finally, the Declaration may be said to have anticipated environmental degradation caused by the actions of others, proclaiming that in the exercise of their own individual rights and freedoms, persons have “duties to the community” and may not impinge on the general welfare or living standards of others in the community [Articles 29, 30].

The Universal Declaration recognized these “economic” rights, as well as these “political rights,” as “equal and inalienable right[s] of all members of the human family,” as the

of Justice

“foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,” and that the “disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind...’ and that it is essential to protect these human rights “by the rule of law,” “if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression..”

Finally, The Declaration recognized” freedom from “fear and want” as the “highest aspiration” of people everywhere.

One cannot help but think of Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s words in his first inaugural address in 1933, at the height of the Great Depression, that “We have nothing to fear, but fear itself.” Yet in this time of the Great Recession, our political discourse seems stuck solely on a note of fear —fear of terrorism, fear of Islam, fear of the deficit, Obamafear—— while any “plan” (whether for the private or public sector) to provide decent paying “jobs” for all Americans as a matter of “justice” (which would go a long way to paying for things like the deficit, health care and a decent

standard of living) gets relegated to clichés about the misguided “welfare states of Europe,” or worse, “socialists among us.”

The recent book “Postwar” by Tony Judt contains an excellent discussion on the rapid acceptance by most European countries in the aftermath of World War II, (and as a result of the war and depression) of the idea that governments must ensure the provision of social services such as education, housing and medical care, subsidized public transportation, and social security from illness, unemployment, accident and old age, as a matter of fairness and justice; and Raj Patel, in “the Value of Nothing,” has explained that “while the language of individual rights was strident” [in the Declaration] the signatories compromised by deciding that “enforcement mechanisms would be left to individual countries to decide.” In the end, some countries did better than others with their promise of



“economic” human rights, with some countries of Western Europe coming closest to having enforced the “economic” tenets of The Declaration.

As one example, despite the popular (and “misleading”) criticism of the British health care system as one in which its citizens have to “wait in line” for health care, it is generally not mentioned by those same critics that the citizens of the U.K. have treated their health care system (as we do our social security system) as sacrosanct ever since the National Health Service (NHS) was enacted into law way back in July of 1948!

Perhaps in retrospect the country who learned the lesson best of all is Germany, who was every bit as much a victim of Nazism and Nazi “fear” mongering [then, the rallying cry was “fear of Jews;” today, “fear of Muslims”] abetted by much of the elite business interests of the country, which culminated in Germany’s arrogant

imperialistic aggression, the Holocaust, destruction of millions of its’ own citizens, and an economy and infrastructure in ruins, not to mention the loss of life and destruction in the rest of the world.

But modern Germany, with its work councils, co-determined boards, and wage-setting multi-bargaining institutions that give workers a real say in the factories and businesses in which they work, is now maligned as one of those European “welfare states,” lacking the “labor flexibility” of the United States.


Yet it is Germany (where “living wages,” including six weeks of vacation every year, are the norm), that is running neck and neck with China in world export trade; Germany, that does not suffer from any trade deficit; and Germany, that has not, like the United States, dismantled much of its manufacturing sector and shipped it off to China.

Critics may call the German experiment “socialism,” but more perceptive analysts have described it as capitalism at its best, albeit with a more democratic face.

The State of Justice- con't. from p.5

“Consider the Germans,”
Thomas Geoghegan,
Harpers Magazine, March,
2010).

In this time of lingering recession, it may be in our own national interest to unlearn the paralysis of “fear,” and instead, start a debate on how to get Americans back to work again, not at “minimum

wage” jobs, but at “living wage” jobs, that will ensure decent living standards not as a matter of partisan politics, nor as an agenda of the “left” or the “right,” but as a requirement of basic justice and human dignity; before we too have to learn the lesson the hard way. 



Brest State University today

In fact, as we would not learn until later, Schmidt was still alive. He had not died on November 9, 1989, but had suffered a massive stroke that paralyzed his entire left side. He could no longer talk, except usually to affirm “Yes” or “No,” yet he seemed to understand everything said to him. His “yeses” were always straight-forward, but his “noes,” the instinctual expression of his autonomy, were

delivered with a dramatic intonation of voice, demonstrating that the passion for his “negative” expressions was not lost to disability.

Then too, he would on occasion amplify on his negative or affirmative responses, with a phrase in Latin, like “that’s terrible,” or a few favorite words in German, like “Eleganz,” the latter to show his approval or appreciation of the words or actions of Frederica

Humway-Warmuth - con't. from P. 1

Bake-Off. I have been blessed and extremely lucky to have been a two time competitor at that event once in 2002 and again in 2010. My first recipe was called Chuck wagon Cheeseburger Skillet and this year my recipe was called Grand! Good Morning Orange Walnut Biscuit. I really thought I had a shot at the \$1 Million prize, but hope springs eternal, there’s always next year.

Married to Brian Warmuth for nearly 15 years. Brian is the Human Resources

Director for West Liberty University. Rose and Brian reside in the Edgewood Section of Wheeling. Rose’s mother is State of West Virginia Magistrate Rose M. Humway. Rose has one brother, Richard, who resides in the Wheeling area and one sister, Christine, who resides in Washington D.C. and is an attorney for the DOJ.

Rose serves as City Solicitor for the City of Wheeling and also legal counsel for the City of Cameron.

La Cerca - Chapter 15

Illyich, who Belarusian officials hired in 1989 as a care-taker to Schmidt in his University apartment, and who had become for all intents and purposes the invalid’s adopted mother.

Although Schmidt could still eat most foods, Fredericka first had to cut up his food into small morsels, so that he was able to eat it with a fork utilizing his still serviceable right hand. He could still walk, but only with difficulty and with someone at his side at all

times, to prevent against a loss of balance, or hold his cane when he sat or rose from a chair. He had to be helped even in his dress and bath, even for such simple things as getting into the shower, and washing parts of his body not reachable with his right hand.

The saddest part of the transformation in Schmidt was his inability to read or engage in intellectual discussion, which was the mainstay of his life for