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I want to offer my appreciation to St. Mary’s Metchosin Church for offering this Lenten series to mark the 70th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). This has given me the opportunity to think about the UDHR and what has happened in the field of international human rights since 1948. If we read the news, we know about alarming and deeply disturbing realities in the world today. I have been pondering what this means for us here in Canada, and I would like to share some of my thoughts with you. Now that our winter has officially drawn to a close, it also seems to be a fitting time to pause for spiritual reflection as we enter the spring season, particularly as we near the end of our forty day period of Lenten reflection before Easter, when nearly a third of the world’s 7.5 billion people will commemorate the death and resurrection of Jesus.

The UDHR emerged in the aftermath of World War II out of resolve that “never again” would the world allow the atrocities of war or genocide. A draft of the UDHR was presented to the first meeting of the United Nations (UN) General Assembly in 1946. While the UDHR is associated with the advocacy of Eleanor Roosevelt in the United States (US), a Canadian legal scholar, John Humphrey, prepared the initial blueprint for the UDHR in his capacity as Director of the UN Human Rights Division. The drafting process involved representatives from different legal and cultural traditions from all regions of the world plus consultation with all the UN member States, who were then divided into Western and Eastern blocs – the Western countries favoured civil and political rights while the Eastern socialist countries emphasized economic and social development. These ideological divisions made it a significant achievement that the UDHR was finalized within two years. On 10 December 1948, the UDHR was adopted by 50 members of the UN General Assembly; the other eight member States abstained. No State voted against it.
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commemoration of the UDHR, December 10th is celebrated annually as International Human Rights Day.

Over the past seven decades, the UDHR has achieved more authority around the world that the drafters might have expected. Its adoption launched a process of rapid development of a number of human rights treaties, many of which have now been ratified by the vast majority of countries. The UDHR has been translated into 508 languages, more than any other document in the world. (The bible is the most translated book; as of October 2017 it has been translated into 670 languages.)

Canada has ratified a number of international human rights treaties. One of them – the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has been partially implemented in the 1982 Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. These treaties guarantee important rights and freedoms that are to be enjoyed equally by everyone, without distinction, including every child. Here are a few of them:

- freedom from racial discrimination;
- the responsibility to prevent and prosecute genocide where it may occur;
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8 Treaties acceded to or ratified by Canada include:
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/ccpr.aspx, the ICCPR that guarantees: the right to life (Article 6), right not to be tortured (Article 7); the right not to be enslaved (Article 8); the right to liberty (Article 9 including freedom from unfair prosecution or imprisonment; the right to equality before the courts and the presumption of innocence (Article 14); the right to privacy of one self and ones family (Article 17); the right to freedom of religion or belief, including the right to manifest religion or belief individually or in groups; this right may be subjected only to strict limitations defined by law and necessary to protect public safety or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others (Article 18); freedoms of thought, conscience, expression (article 19) and peaceful assembly (article 21); the right to participate in the cultural life of the community (Article 7) including language rights.
the right to life and liberty, including freedom from unfair prosecution or imprisonment or torture;
freedom from sexual assault, abuse or exploitation;
freedom from slavery;
the opportunity earn a living;
fair working conditions;
a standard of living adequate for health and well-being of individuals and their families, including food and housing;
adequate rest and leisure;
education and health care;
equal rights of women;
rights of children in recognition of their evolving capacities and their special needs for provision, protection and participation in culture and society;
rights of persons with disabilities;
freedoms of thought, conscience, opinion, expression, and peaceful assembly;
the right to freedom of religion or belief, including the right to manifest religion or belief individually or in groups; this right may be subjected only to narrow limitations defined by law and necessary to protect public safety or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

One justifiable limitation on the freedoms of religion, expression or assembly is the prohibition of incitement or promotion of hatred toward any identifiable group.10 But short of such incitement there is no such thing as a right not to be offended or upset by other people’s expression of beliefs. As one UN Special Rapporteur has pointed out, the “crucial elements of freedom of religion or belief… [include] the freedom to search, choose, change, reach out, communicate, convert, and peacefully provoke in the field of religion or belief.”11 I emphasise that the right to peaceful provocation does not extend to discriminatory or other harassment or violence, which are legitimately prohibited by law or regulation.

In past lectures in this Lenten series you have discussed issues covered in several human rights treaties including the right to water, language rights, rights of women, the right to education, and children’s right to play (which you may have heard is connected to several rights including the right of everyone to adequate rest and leisure as well as the right to education). Another important instrument is the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which is not a binding treaty, but the federal government is currently in the process of passing a law to implement it in Canada12 as part of the plan of reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples.

The past 70 years have seen a rapid pace of adoption of human rights norms around the world, but there is a very long way to go in terms of implementation. Despite Canada’s relatively good reputation for human rights globally, our country (and citizens), have a lot of work to do to

address human rights violations, particularly against Indigenous Peoples in Canada who continue to be harshly affected by inequalities in areas of economic wellbeing, housing, water quality, education, health, over-representation in prisons, and impunity for crimes against them. Indigenous women and girls are overrepresented among murdered and missing women, and they face far greater risks of violence than do other women in Canada. A 2014 RCMP report found that 1,017 indigenous women and girls were killed between 1980 and 2012 and 164 remain missing, but these numbers have not been updated because Canada does not collect statistics on how many indigenous women and girls go missing every year. Many of these murders and disappearances remain unsolved, and there are credible allegations of discrimination in investigations of violence against indigenous women and girls. The recent acquittal of the white farmer charged with the murder of Colten Boushie, a young Cree man in Saskatchewan, has caused deep sorrow among my indigenous colleagues and friends. Human rights advocates are concerned that the investigation being launched by the RCMP may not meet international human rights standards of independence. Indigenous Peoples’ land rights and environmental concerns are among the serious and long standing problems complicated by business demands for development, resource extraction and transportation. I will return to Canada later.

In recent years, several countries have been dramatically backsliding on human rights as authoritarian leaders flagrantly defy the UDHR and human rights treaties they have ratified. Some commentators have even predicted that we are in the “end times” of human rights as States underfund the UN, resist or ignore its recommendations, undermine international criminal law, and suppress independent journalism and human rights advocacy. Countless violations and atrocities are ongoing in numerous countries where authoritarian leaders or powerful elites and business people are defaming or criminalizing journalists and human rights defenders. Whether the apocalyptic doomsayers are right or not, I am not planning to give up advocating for the protection of people who working for fundamental human rights. In the span of history, 70 years is not all that long, and it seems to me that we are just getting started.

The list of backsliding countries is too long, so I will mention just a few. Turkey has been charging and imprisoning large numbers of journalists, academics, lawyers, and human rights
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workers and has fired at least 4,000 independent judges. Honduran organized crime and large businesses have been getting away with masterminding attacks and even murders of lawyers and indigenous human rights defenders. Thailand and Cambodia have been prosecuting human rights journalists, lawyers and community land rights defenders. Those are just the countries I have personally visited for research or advocacy in cases of lawyers or human rights defenders at risk.

To that very partial list I will add China, Russia, and the US, three permanent members of the UN Security Council that have consistently blocked interventions to stop serious human rights violations by their allies. Saudi Arabia is also on the list of notorious rights abusers that enjoy international support from Western countries including the US. And I note that Canada persists in claiming that it is fine to sell armoured vehicles to Saudi Arabia despite evidence that the equipment will be used against their own citizens to suppress dissent.

The list goes on and on. I would be remiss in the context of this evening if I did not mention that our upcoming Easter celebrations should be tinged with sorrow that one in twelve Christians in the world are living in countries where their faith is “illegal, forbidden, or punished.” Christians are not the only group persecuted for their faith. Jew and Muslims are also persecuted or oppressed in many places as are adherents to the Bahá’í faith in Iran or the Falun Gong in China.

I want to single out Myanmar (or Burma), which I have visited several times, although not since its historic election in 2015 which ousted the military’s majority in government and elected the party led by the famous former human rights champion Aung San Suu Kyi. There was so much hope that her leadership would help bring Myanmar out of its years of military dictatorship and repression. But these hopes have not been fulfilled, particularly in light of last year’s horrifying escalation of persecution against Rohingya Muslim people who live along the North western border with Bangladesh. Myanmar’s military have for decades been involved in persecution of Rohingya Muslims as well as Christianized ethnic minorities, but the latest round of ethnic cleansing of Rohingya that began last August increasingly shows hallmarks of genocide. There has been far too little international intervention, and the atrocities continue.

The crime of genocide has been perpetrated over and over since 1948 despite the international cries of “never again” – repeated again and again – since the genocide of European Jewish and Roma people during World War II. Since that time, the word “genocide” has been heard in shouts or whispers in far too many places. We may immediately think of Cambodia in the 1970s, the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s, and Rwanda in 1994. In too many places, embers of longstanding discrimination are fanned into hate speech by those in power who incite, organize

---
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or turn a blind eye to escalating violence and atrocities. Small brush fires of discrimination can and do escalate into crimes against humanity or genocide.

Not all genocides are marked by grisly massacres. The hallmark of genocide is not death but actions committed with the intention to eliminate a group in whole or in part. Here in Canada, the concerted attempt to assimilate Indigenous Peoples, including through the government-sponsored and church-run Residential School system, has been termed “cultural genocide” by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and by former Supreme Court of Canada Chief Justice Beverley McLachlan. Others want the UN recognize it as a “genocide” that fits the criteria of the 1948 *Genocide Convention* which Canada ratified in 1952. I believe we need to take these arguments seriously.

Since the report of Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission, which exposed Canada’s genocidal atrocities against indigenous children, “reconciliation” has become a watchword. My research shows a confusing array of meanings attached to the term “reconciliation.” Ideas range from “thin” conceptions of coexistence and toleration, to “thicker” conceptions of forgiveness, mercy, shared vision, mutual healing, or harmony. Those who have experienced
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24 This typology (thin to thick) draws on David A. Crocker, "Reckoning with Past Wrongs," in *Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts*, ed. Carol A.L. Prager and Trudy Govier (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2003), 54., citing an excellent discussion by Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson, "The Moral
atrocities reject versions of reconciliation that promote the idea that the survivors should “forgive and forget and let’s move on and get along.”

People who have been subjected to atrocities or genocide are often asked to look to the future instead of the past. People may querulously ask: “why not just get over it?” But those who have experienced atrocities know that any meaningful reconciliation requires truthful acknowledgement as well as reparations for past injustices.

People don’t “get over” atrocities by burying them. The “subterranean histories” keep surfacing as unhealed memories are triggered by new reminders of unacknowledged wrongs and unrestored. Unhealed memories of past traumas are triggered by contemporary wrongs. Trauma from atrocities and genocide becomes intergenerational, and traumatic memories become part of survivors’ identity. Old and new memories become conflated. Contemporary acts of anti-Semitism trigger the traumas of the holocaust. One commentator records that during the wars in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s, journalists sometimes couldn’t tell whether the stories they were hearing “had occurred yesterday or in 1941 or 1841 or 1441. For tellers of the tale, yesterday and today were the same,” he writes. Just last month, Armenia welcomed the Netherlands’ official parliamentary recognition that the attempt to annihilate Armenian Christians by the Ottoman Empire from 1915-1917 was a “genocide” despite continuous denials by Turkey’s governments. As the American author William Faulkner famously wrote: “The past is never dead. It's not even past.”

The blood and bones of victims continue to cry out from the ground until justice is done. Sometimes this is more than a metaphor. All over the world there are violently displaced peoples, and the unidentified remains of men, women and children deprived of their lives. Many have been “disappeared.” These atrocities sometimes implicate state officials and elite members of society – or their descendants – who remain powerful in successor governments and institutions and societies. Europe’s, Cambodia’s and Rwanda’s mass or unmarked graves, and the unmarked graves of indigenous children who died in Canada’s Residential Schools have not yet yielded the identities of all the victims or what happened to them. Their surviving loved ones and descendants continue to suffer the anguish of not knowing what happened to their loved ones. Descendants deeply feel the sadness and sense of unresolved injustice experienced by
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parents and grandparents and great-grandparents and more. People in countries where massive atrocities have been perpetrated have a basic need to understand what happened – beyond rumours, speculations, denials and lies that circulate and become solidified. Survivors and their descendants struggle to have their stories heard and believed. Future generations need to know the truth if for no other reason than to avoid the resurgence and spread of new lies or justifications for historic atrocities.

What hope can I offer as we draw near to Holy Week and Easter?

What does the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* say about this? It says that the recognition of human rights is the foundation of freedom, peace and justice in the world. But who is responsible to do what? Here is what part of its preamble says:

Now, Therefore the General Assembly proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction (emphasis added).

All countries’ governments are responsible to take measures to progress towards implement the Declaration. But the preamble also specifies that “every individual” and “every organ of society” – meaning each of us – is responsible to promote human rights through teaching and education throughout all member States of the United Nations. I believe this is a good start.

Lent seems to be a good time to be willing to be challenged to consider what hope for human rights is offered by the historic teachings of the Christian church. First, we can consider the foundation of historic Christian teaching, who is Jesus. We can copy the example of Jesus, by aligning ourselves with those who are suffering injustice and with those advocating social justice.

And there are other familiar principles that I have been reminding myself about. One is the principle non-discriminatory equality found in the Golden Rule: Treat others as you would like to be treated. Those of us who are part of the church will know that Jesus teaches that God loves the world – including all of humankind – and that accordingly, God’s overall message to people is to return love to God, and to love our neighbours as ourselves. Jesus even said “love your enemy.” In my understanding of Christian teaching, the Christian stance towards others – even those who try to harm us – is radical; it is not “eye for an eye” hostility, but kindness. What I take from this is that I am called to consider all other people to be as worthy of respect as I am. No matter what, your entitlements are as important as mine. This teaching is difficult, because it requires profound and continual transformation of my mindset to give as much importance to your entitlements, your wellbeing, and your families and friends, as I give to mine.

Another is the bible’s clear teaching against racialized or economic discrimination or injustice. Contemporary interpretations of the bible have made it clear (to me at least) that Jesus fully accepts and includes women on the same footing as men. But anyone who reads the news knows
that not all those who call themselves Christians think alike, and that a small but vocal minority in North America, who self-identify as Christians, have been actively promoting or inciting hatred against identifiable groups based on religious, racialized or gender identity. I have no hesitation in categorically rejecting any promotion or incitement of discriminatory hatred. We also know that many religious groups and churches are struggling with intense internal, and in some cases external, controversies over historic teachings about roles of women, reproductive choice, and same-sex expression of sexuality. These controversies have pitted people – including church people – against one another. Whatever we believe about these matters, it is important to emphasise that the internationally protected right to manifest religion or belief includes the right to peaceful expression of dissent, including in the public square. It is important to realize that all rights are important and must be fulfilled. When one set of rights seems to conflict with another, we need to find ways to negotiate solutions that ensure that everyone’s rights are respected so that profound disagreement does not escalate into hatred, discrimination or worse.

Another ethical principle that I believe can help us with difficult controversy is the biblical principle of non-condemning lovingkindness, usually referred to as non-judgemental love. According to historic church teaching, the purpose of Jesus ministry, death and resurrection is not to condemn, but to overcome condemnation and to reconcile all of creation – including all people – to the God of love. Non-condemnation, lovingkindness and hospitality\(^\text{33}\) are integral to the concept of God’s grace (or graciousness) which Christians are meant to imitate. The principle of lovingkindness precludes discourteous forms of social criticism that we see so often on social media in the form of trolling, name-calling, sneering or other incivility. A healthy society includes those with diverse opinions where people do not exclude one another or build polarization. Rather, a healthy society fosters respect and inclusion while at the same time respecting everybody’s right to the freedom of sincere manifestation of religion or belief, including the right to dissent. The right to dissent is fundamental to a democratic society, and welcomes peaceful – but kindly – provocation of one another about our beliefs and practices.

A third principle relates to power. Jesus teaches believers not to dominate others but to be servants to everyone. Alas, as many rightly point out, churches have historically participated actively in cultures of domination and persecution instead of renouncing and challenging them. This has led to catastrophic results for Indigenous Peoples and other colonized peoples as well as to anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and other persecutions, including even genocide.

Finally, we can consider the ancient prophets recorded in the bible who model ways to confront those in power with disagreeable truths of social injustice. Prophets are often associated with doom-saying criticism. While informed critique sometimes leads to transformation, at other times it leads nowhere except to guilt, paralysis or even angry denials of the prophet’s message. I have been pondering how we reconcile social critique with Jesus’ admonition, “do not judge lest you be judged.” It seems to me that this admonition refers to condemnation rather than to wise discernment of truth and caring approaches to truth-telling.

According to Walter Brueggmann, the task of prophetic ministry is to use truth-telling not merely to criticize but to energize people towards an alternative vision for the community.

Energization of the community may well include telling truths that pierce our “numbness” about injustice to the point that we can deeply grieve and lament\(^{34}\) oppression and injustice and decide instead to embrace lovingkindness and justice. For Christians, this involves embracing the source of love and justice in the person of Jesus.\(^{35}\)
