Introduction

Human Rights belong to everyone, or they are guaranteed to no one.

—Amnesty International

The concept of human rights has occupied social workers, educators, philosophers, lawyers, and politicians for ages. The proposition that all individuals who inhabit planet Earth share inherent privileges and rights has great attraction. This commonality among all who reside on the planet, regardless of country or nationality, aims to bring individuals closer together than might otherwise be the case. After all, if someone who lives in the United States acknowledges that someone living in Russia or China has the same right to a safe, nonviolent environment, this link can lead to better cooperation in resolving key issues affecting human existence.

Of course, human rights cover domestic, as well as international, circumstances. Unless individuals, communities, corporations, governments, and other groups recognize human rights at home, promotion of human rights on a broader level appears meaningless or, at best, superficial. The most appropriate place to begin the study and application of human rights lies within a person’s own environment. Only after the individual, entity, or group thoroughly understands human rights in a local sense can human rights be expanded to a broader spectrum of circumstances.
THE DRED SCOTT CASE

The United States often leads the charge against violations of human rights. However, while the United States has some justification in presenting itself as a model for promoting human rights, history has not always been so kind to this beacon of liberty. Only after the Civil War in 1865 did the country definitively prohibit slavery and grant citizenship to all persons born within the United States by enacting amendments to the Constitution (U.S. Constitution, amend. 13 and 14).

Before those amendments, a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court had ruled that African-Americans were not citizens of the United States: slavery was legal unless banned by a particular state, and slaves were property protected by the Constitution (Scott v. Sandford, 1857). This decision is known as the Dred Scott case and can only be viewed as an abomination of political, social, and cultural thought. Dred Scott had been a slave in the state of Missouri, which allowed slavery. Scott’s owner then moved with Scott to the free state of Illinois and free territory of Wisconsin, areas that prohibited slavery. By residing in a free state and free territory, Scott gained his freedom. However, after having gained his freedom, Scott returned to Missouri. At the time Scott initially returned to Missouri, the prevailing law in Missouri stated that if a slave returned to Missouri after having resided in a free state or territory, that slave could then retain his or her freedom (Rachael v. Walker, 1837). To obtain his freedom, Scott began legal proceedings in Missouri. As Scott’s case wound its way to the Missouri Supreme Court, the debate over slavery became increasingly heated. Instead of following previous legal precedents, the Missouri Supreme Court overturned those principles and refused to grant Scott his freedom.

Scott’s plea for freedom then went to the U.S. Supreme Court, which rendered its decision that Scott, as an African Negro, could never be a citizen of the United States and, further, was considered to be a piece of property protected by the Constitution. Outrage followed this decision, but not until after the Civil War did Congress begin overturning the legal principles established by the Dred Scott case. In reality, decades passed before Congress removed all the legal residue of the Dred Scott decision. Segregation in many southern states legally allowed separation of races in schools, eating facilities, public transport, and other institutions until prohibited by court decisions in the 1950s and 1960s. Even today, though, ghosts from the Dred Scott case remain, a reminder that a society must always be diligent in the protection of basic human rights and freedoms.
WHAT ARE HUMAN RIGHTS?

To begin any study of human rights, the initial and obvious question arises: What are human rights? Without a coherent response to this question, no further study or understanding of human rights can occur. Unfortunately, many individuals (especially, it seems, politicians) blithely employ the words *human rights* as if automatic comprehension necessarily follows. Nothing could be further from reality. For instance, American politicians frequently criticize China for its human rights violations, with little explanation as to the nature of those violations. One may wonder: What violations? What specific acts perpetrated by China run afoul of human rights? Why are those acts violations of human rights? Who defines human rights? Do violations of human rights occur only in China and other countries outside the United States? General statements alleging that a country violates human rights creates confusion because such generalizations usually provide scant insight into the true concept of human rights. This does not mean that China or some other country is *not* violating human rights. However, before a politician, social worker, or other individual accuses another individual or entity of violating human rights, he or she needs to have at least a basic grounding in the concept of human rights. Unfortunately, this does not appear to be the case in many instances.

As this book will explain, human rights are not limited to political ideals, meaning democratic elections, freedom of speech and religion, and other rights typically associated with the American political system. Human rights encompass a wide variety of political, economic, and social areas. For example, a specific human right includes the right to adequate health care, which the United States does not legally recognize. Does this mean that in

---

Forty-two million U.S. citizens and residents have no medical coverage with which to help pay the costs of medical care (Krutsinger 2001). U.S. politicians talk about human rights violations in China—lack of freedom of speech and religion in particular. Which set of human rights is more important? Does an individual who refuses to seek medical attention because he or she cannot pay for it suffer a human rights violation? Under human rights principles, this would be the case.
this regard the United States violates the human rights of its citizens? This book will address this issue in later chapters. Clearly, though, a selective recognition of human rights by U.S. politicians and other individuals indicates a lack of understanding about the overall concept of human rights.

Human rights define needs but also present a set of rights for each individual, no matter where that individual resides. The concept of human rights can generally be defined as “those rights, which are inherent in our nature and without which we cannot live as human beings. Human rights and fundamental freedoms allow us to fully develop and use our human qualities, our intelligence, our talents and our conscience and to satisfy our spiritual and other needs” (United Nations 1987; emphasis added).

Of course, this definition immediately raises questions about whose “nature” is being defined. A U.S. citizen might feel that having access to running water, electricity, and other similar resources is inherent in her or his nature and therefore necessary to fully develop as a human being. On the other hand, a citizen of Afghanistan might feel that simply having enough to eat and possessing warm clothing is enough to live with dignity as a human being. Whose version of human rights should prevail? Are some people entitled to greater human rights than others because they possess the means with which to obtain or purchase valuable resources? From a purist’s viewpoint, certainly not. Every individual is entitled to the same human rights. The difficulty arises in allocating resources to achieve human rights. A fundamental issue concerning human rights lies in constructing policies by which human rights apply to all, not simply select individuals and groups.

Clearly human rights principles require cultural understanding and attention to existing resources. Certainly, a social work practice based on human rights is no panacea for discrimination, inequality, poverty, and other social problems. Yet knowledge of human rights can help the social work profession better understand its role as a helping profession. By integrating human rights into the profession, social workers will obtain unique insight into issues central to the profession.

**UNIVERSALITY AND INDIVISIBILITY**

When beginning to study human rights, a social worker needs to understand two basic concepts relating to those rights: universality and indivisibility. The concept of *universality* underpins human rights. Every individual has a claim to enjoyment of human rights, wherever the individual resides.
For example, human rights include adequate health care and nutrition for everyone. Perhaps a country’s resources are insufficient to provide universal health care and food and, therefore, not everyone receives adequate care and nutrition. However, because health care and food are integral to human rights, governments have an obligation to provide a framework for ensuring the delivery of these rights. Lack of resources may actually be a subterfuge for ignoring these human rights. By classifying certain rights and freedoms as human rights, all governments recognize a common goal of creating conditions to guarantee those rights and freedoms.

Not all human rights are so clear-cut as the above examples, which can result in reluctance to promote a particular human right. The notion of universality may clash with particular cultures, laws, policies, morals, and other regimes that fail to recognize the human right in question. In some countries, discrimination against gays and lesbians is allowed because cultural or religious norms permit this type of discrimination. Yet such discrimination appears to violate human rights principles even though human rights require sensitivity to culture and religion. Which should prevail, the cultural or religious norm or the human right? If human rights apply to everyone, then the human rights doctrine must prevail. Of course, the issue is not so simple. Who defines a human right? Who benefits from the definition? Who loses from the definition? Whose voices are being heard in enforcing human rights? Who defines culture? Does one government have the right to tell another government that its policies violate a human right? In the case of disagreement over interpretation of a human right, who decides? Obviously, the issue of universality can lead to bumps along the way in exercising human rights.

This principle of universality places a unique stamp upon the body of laws and other guidelines commonly known as human rights. “Human rights doctrine is now so powerful, but also so unthinkingly imperialist in its claim to universality, that it has exposed itself to serious intellectual attack. These challenges have raised important questions about whether human rights norms deserve the authority they have acquired: whether their claims to universality are justified, or whether they are just another cunning exercise in Western moral imperialism” (Ignatieff 2001:102). In later chapters, this book will address in more detail issues surrounding the universality principle.

Social workers may find the notion of universality difficult to fit within other social work principles, especially those of cultural diversity and self-determination. However, universality does not mean that everyone is alike or should develop in the same manner. Universality allows all types of di-
versity and differences among individuals and groups. The key to understanding universality is to accept that the goal is not to create sameness among different cultures. Universality aims to ensure that individuals and peoples everywhere have basic rights in their existence, but makes no pretense that everyone will exist in the same manner.

In addition to universality, the other concept important to human rights is that of *indivisibility*. The concept of indivisibility refers to the necessity that governments and individuals recognize each human right and not to selectively promote some rights over others. The fact that U.S. policy does not guarantee health care to all its citizens highlights the importance of indivisibility among human rights. Without adequate health care, an individual may fail to attend to an illness that becomes life-threatening or debilitating. Impaired health reduces an individual’s enjoyment of other human rights, such as the promotion of family or employment. Impaired health could even affect the will or ability of an individual to participate in an election or other activities viewed as human rights. Consequently, the denial of one human right can easily impact the enjoyment of other human rights and directly or indirectly deny other human rights. For this reason, the notion of indivisibility plays a key role in the exercise of human rights.

Indivisibility does not come without a certain degree of controversy. Admittedly, not every country can afford to provide all the economic rights defined as human rights. Should not this excuse the provision of that right? And what if a country views a particular human right as unsuitable for its citizens? Can that country refuse to acknowledge that human right? While indivisibility occupies a key position within human rights, no simple answers apply to issues surrounding this basic concept.

Many of the concepts about human rights may appear impractical, strange, or merely utopian. Yet by analyzing specific human rights and the justification for a particular human right, social workers can better understand how human rights naturally connect to their profession. This book aims to fill in perceived gaps about the nature of human rights and what they really mean for the social work profession.

**RELUCTANCE TO INTEGRATE HUMAN RIGHTS INTO U.S. SOCIAL WORK**

On an international level, social workers have embraced the concept of human rights as a key component in their profession (Staub-Bernasconi
1998; Ife 2001; IFSW 2000). However, social workers in the United States have lagged behind their counterparts from other countries in connecting human rights to social work policies and practices (Reichert 2001). The U.S.-based National Association of Social Workers does not even mention the term human rights in its Code of Ethics (NASW 1996). Yet the concept of human rights has equal importance to U.S. social workers. Social workers in the United States follow many of the concepts contained within the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (see appendix A) and other human rights instruments.

Why has there been so little discussion by the social work profession in the United States concerning human rights? The current reluctance of U.S. social workers to join their international counterparts in promoting human rights appears to be the result of three primary factors:

1. **A focus in the United States on social justice instead of human rights.** U.S. social workers continue to adhere to the concept of social justice as the dominant theme in their profession, with little mention of human rights (Pelton 2001). The promotion of social justice as the central theme in the profession originates from historical and philosophical theories that frequently appear confusing and outdated. For example, no clear definition of social justice even exists. Social work academics describe various types of social justice with little explanation as to what kind of social justice applies to the circumstances at hand (Hartman 1990; Tyson 1995). By focusing on social justice, U.S. social workers might believe they are also addressing human rights. However, human rights encompass a more comprehensive set of guidelines for the social work profession.

2. **The inclination of U.S. social workers to view human rights as only political rights.** Aside from using as its ideal an amorphous concept of social justice, the social work profession in the United States often equates human rights with constitutional and legal issues. An equating of human rights with purely legalistic notions sidesteps any apparent importance of human rights for the nonlawyer. The liberal U.S. political tradition, as reflected in early documents like the Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights in the Constitution, emphasizes individual political and civil rights (Roche and Dewees 2001). However, these documents reflect relative indifference to economic and social rights (Charlesworth 1994). Civil and political rights such as freedom of
speech, press, and religion are officially protected cornerstones of U.S. public policy. But economic, social, and cultural components of human well-being, such as food, shelter, health care, and cultural identity, tend to be relegated to individual initiative and personal achievement (Flowers 1998). Social workers may discount the importance of human rights by viewing the Constitution and other basic documents as encompassing the entire gamut of human rights, thus assuming that it is unnecessary to explore the topic further. Therefore, when U.S. social workers encounter the term human rights, they may view those rights as only indirectly related to the social work profession.

3. **A more local view of the world by U.S. social workers.** Another factor inhibiting U.S. social workers from embracing human rights lies in the international nature of human rights. Social workers in the United States have shown themselves to be rather myopic in their worldview of social work (Sanders and Pedersen 1984). This narrow view of social work possibly contributes to the reluctance of social workers in the United States to embrace human rights to the extent of their international counterparts (Reichert 1998). Human rights embrace cross-cultural concepts, which transcend national boundaries. Therefore, unless U.S. social workers adopt a more worldly outlook, they most likely will continue to view human rights as foreign to the profession.

This reluctance to promote human rights does not mean U.S. social workers are less competent than their international counterparts. However, because human rights occupy a central role in the social work profession, both in the United States and elsewhere, social workers could benefit from a better understanding of human rights and the relationship of those rights to the profession.

In a recent policy statement, the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) supported efforts to link human rights with the social work profession: “*Human rights and social work are natural allies. Social workers need to be aware of this conceptual link and the power of working in concert with human rights organizations and activists throughout the world*” (NASW 2000:181; emphasis added). Yet even with this NASW policy statement, current attention to human rights and their application to the profession seems inadequate to help social workers understand this important link.

Certainly, as indicated by the NASW policy statement, not all U.S. social
workers ignore the strong connection between human rights and their profession. Social workers have expressed the need to establish social work as a human rights profession and integrate human rights into social work teaching, research, and practice (Witkin 1993, 1998; Mayadas and Elliot 1997). Social work educators have developed a teaching model for human rights (Roche, Dewees, Trailweaver et al. 1999; Roche and Dewees 2001). Social work literature exists on connecting women’s rights to human rights (Wetzel 1993; Reichert 1996, 1998; Roche 1996). The literature also impugns the federal U.S. welfare act enacted in 1996 as a violation of immigrants’ human rights (Reichert and McCormick 1998). However, these voices in the social work profession are few. Usually, human rights simply become merged into a vague but ubiquitous classification of social and economic justice.

**SOCIAL JUSTICE—AN OUTDATED CONCEPT?**

Social workers in the United States generally have encountered a guiding principle in their training known as social justice, which tends to concentrate on the needs of a client, rather than on the rights of the client. In the education of social workers, the National Association of Social Workers’ Code of Ethics (NASW 1996) and the handbook of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE 1994) reflect this strong commitment to social justice.

While the social work profession couches all types of goals beneath the umbrella of social justice, close scrutiny of this concept reveals shortcomings, primarily in the precise contours of social justice itself. The satisfying sound of this term clearly lends support to the continued use of the term in the profession. However, the use of a term simply because it evokes a desirable resonance defies logic if the term itself lacks a clear definition and ready application to social work practice. An attempt to define social justice indicates that three main theories of social justice exist: libertarian, utilitarian, and egalitarian. Each theory has its followers and adherents, though the egalitarian theory is apparently the most relevant to social work practice.

**Libertarian Theory** The libertarian theory of social justice proposes that each individual is entitled to any material possession he or she has legally acquired (Nozik 1974). Under this theory, the individual has autonomy and has no obligation to share resources with others. This autonomy militates
against any forced redistribution of resources from the haves to the have-nots. Charity, or service to others, occurs from the largess of the benefactor, rather than through any right of the recipient to obtain what the benefactor possesses.

As an entitlement-based form of social justice, the libertarian theory rejects distributive justice. For this reason, social workers may not readily subscribe to this theory of social justice. Yet in reality, many of the basic principles in the organization and sentiment of government structures within the United States follow a libertarian theory, with frequently only limited attention to the redistribution of resources.

**Utilitarian Theory** A second theory of social justice evaluates actions on the basis of whether they provide the greatest happiness for the individual or the greatest number. This utilitarian theory holds that, although an individual has the right to be free from coercion, at times a redistribution of scarce resources meets the interest of the common good and should occur (van Soest 1994). For example, under this theory, conditions should be promoted that encourage the greatest production of food for all, regardless of an individual’s circumstances.

Essentially, providing the greatest good for the greatest number forms the primary principle under utilitarian theory. In contrast to the libertarian theory, a utilitarian will not hesitate to infringe upon an individual’s right to resources if the sharing or redistributing of those resources would benefit the greatest number within a defined region. Obviously, the inherent conflict with this theory of social justice lies in determining what benefits the greatest number.

**Egalitarian Theory** The egalitarian theory of social justice corresponds most closely to what the social work profession appears to mean when it portrays social justice (Reisch and Taylor 1983). Under this theory, the needs of all must be considered (Rawls 1971). Redistribution of scarce resources becomes a moral imperative, and any redistribution should benefit, or at least not harm, the most vulnerable in society. This distributive theory of social justice holds that the disadvantaged have a right to basic resources for living.

Clearly, the egalitarian theory of social justice rebuts the libertarian and utilitarian theories when equality becomes a defining value (Rawls 1971). In
an egalitarian society, citizens must have equal rights, equality of opportunity, and equal access to social resources. Inequalities in resources should be allowed only when those within the lowest margin of society benefit (van Soest 1992). Social resources generally refer to economic benefits, but the egalitarian theory can also be applied to noneconomic goods. Alleviating noneconomic “deprivations” can be a form of social justice (Rawls 1971; Wakefield 1998).

**Summary of the Three Theories** Even based on the above three theories, the term *social justice* remains elusive for it defies a single, relatively concrete definition. Under the libertarian theory, social justice protects the rights of the individual. The utilitarian theory tempers the libertarian theory to provide for the greatest good of the people, while the egalitarian theory forms the basis for redistributing resources to the less endowed in society. In other words, depending on the theory, social justice means different things to different people.

In a social work context, social justice appears to be used to reflect the egalitarian theory more than the other theories. The social work profession uses social justice to encompass fairness in the distribution of resources, rights, opportunities, and duties (Rose-Miller 1994). Social policy concerns the allocation of resources, while social justice is about ensuring that all people have the same access to those resources. Social work is about addressing the way injustices are structured into the allocation of resources and the disadvantages that accrue from such injustices (Benn 1991).

In attempting to illuminate social justice for the profession, a debate over whether justice should be focused on individuals, as opposed to groups, has emerged (Longres and Scanlon 2001; Pelton 2001). The notion that needs of individuals are often subordinate to those of the community or group forms the basis for this debate. For example, “Advocates of recent welfare reform claimed that, *in general*, denying welfare benefits to women in need and children would contribute to the growth of the economy and reduce child poverty by motivating impoverished mothers to find jobs” (Pelton 2001: 433). The greater good here is the “growth of the economy” with its alleged spill-over effect of “motivating impoverished mothers to find jobs.” While social workers may question this sacrificing of individuals to the much larger community in the name of social justice, at times attention to group associations can promote access to resources. “Without studying group in-
equalities and generating appropriate policies and practice models, we would be inadvertently fostering the relative exclusion of some groups from social and human services (e.g., education, health, and mental health) and their overall inclusion in others (e.g., public welfare, criminal justice, and employment)” (Longres and Scanlon 2001:443). By focusing on the group, rather than individuals, social workers may discover dynamics that impact on the group.

In summary, though, while academics may debate concepts of social justice, even they must admit that a social work definition of social justice “remains an open question” (Longres and Scanlon 2001:444). “Our case study of researchers and research instructors in a School of Social Work indicated that social workers appear to lack a coherent sense of what constitutes social justice, sometimes equating it with Rawls’s fairness model of individual rights, at other times sounding a call for equality between social groups” (444).

The *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (Edwards 1995) lists three components of social justice: (1) legal justice, which is concerned with what a person owes to society; 2) commutative justice, which is concerned with what people owe each other; and (3) distributive justice, which is “what society owes a person” (van Soest 1995:1811). This three-pronged definition seems of little help in ferreting out specific details relating to social justice. Minds will inevitably differ on what society owes a person or what a person owes society. For instance, does society owe a person a job? Health care? Depending on the definition of social justice, answers to those questions could be either “yes” or “no.”

Curiously, while the NASW has numerous policy statements on all types of social issues, the only policy statement that specifically mentions social justice is within the context of peace. This policy statement, entitled “Peace and Social Justice,” focuses on peace and reduction in military spending, which emphasizes that people have a need to live without violence (NASW 2000:238–43). No definition of social justice appears within that six-page statement, although reference to the promotion of “social and economic development and protection of the environment” seems to fall within the vague contours of social justice (242).

While NASW policy statements do little to define or explain social justice, their statement on human rights presents a view that could be interpreted as ranking social justice below the importance of human rights:
Social work can be proud of its heritage. It is the only profession imbued with social justice as its fundamental value and concern. But social justice is a fairness doctrine that provides civil and political leeway in deciding what is just and unjust. Human rights, on the other hand, encompasses social justice, but transcends civil and political customs, in consideration of the basic life-sustaining needs of all human beings, without distinction. (NASW 2000:180)

Even with the above attempts to explain the term social justice, the current use of the concept is elusive and misleading (Rose-Miller 1994). No theory fully explains the concept of social justice, and definitions simply beg more questions about the meaning. In light of these difficulties, social workers should view current usage of the term critically (Rose-Miller 1994). The dilemma with regard to social justice is that social workers are somehow supposed to know what social justice actually means, even though no satisfactory definition exists.

Like social justice, definitions of human rights can also present open-ended responses. However, human rights encompass a more comprehensive and defined set of guidelines for social work practice than social justice. Human rights focus on what must be given to a client, which elevates the discussion into one not simply of recognizing the needs of a client but also of effectively satisfying those needs. While social workers may perceive human rights as being overly legalistic and a topic more appropriate for lawyers, this belief should not prevent the study of human rights. By learning more about human rights, social workers can then understand why this idea should play an important role in the profession.

Human rights do not replace principles of social justice, no matter how amorphous the definition of those principles may seem. The study of human rights complements and broadens the perspective of social workers when carrying out policies and practices. By recognizing the importance of human rights, social workers can only enhance the profession. A foundation in human rights can provide a much clearer framework and structure with which to connect the social work profession to economic, political, and social aims.

OUTLINE AND PURPOSE OF THIS BOOK

This book dissects various aspects of human rights as they relate to the social work profession and presents each of those parts in an understand-
able form. The purpose of this book is to present the groundwork for understanding human rights. By no means does this book pretend to be anything more than an elementary or beginning text on linking the social work profession to human rights. For those persons who wish to deepen their knowledge about human rights, further study will be required.

Chapter 1 traces the development and history of human rights to the present. Much of what we now call human rights has evolved since 1945. However, the underlying themes within human rights draw upon historical traditions existing well before then. This chapter also explains the specialized language commonly encountered within human rights documents, such as declaration, covenant, ratification, and other key terms.

Chapter 2 focuses on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, first presented in 1948. The Universal Declaration forms the basis for contemporary human rights principles. This chapter lists and analyzes each human right contained in the declaration. Issues related to concepts of universality and indivisibility receive additional attention.

The third chapter introduces instruments drafted by the United Nations to supplement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These combined documents are known as the International Bill of Human Rights. To begin the discussion of UN articles drafted after the Universal Declaration, this chapter provides a detailed explanation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This covenant addresses numerous political rights that countries must provide their citizens.

Chapter 4 details the United Nations document known as the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, which addresses numerous economic, social, and cultural rights that countries should provide their citizens. Chapter 5 looks at human rights issues relating to vulnerable populations, with a focus on women. This chapter draws upon various declarations and conventions that specifically concern the human rights of women. The sixth chapter continues the discussion of human rights issues relating to vulnerable populations and draws upon various declarations and conventions that specifically address the human rights of those groups.

Chapter 7 examines human rights in an international framework and centers on international perspectives as they relate to human rights and social work. Chapter 8 addresses social work policy and practice in the context of human rights. To integrate human rights into policy and practice, the so-
cial worker must develop a connection between human rights and ethics. This last chapter also provides case studies that illustrate the application of human rights to social work practice. Finally, the appendices include the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other major documents relating to human rights.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

1. Distinguish the concepts of social justice and human rights.
2. How would you define human rights at this time?
3. Do you believe that it is possible for everyone in every country to enjoy the same basic rights?
4. How would you respond to the following statements?
   (a) Social justice has served the social work profession well for many years.
   (b) The profession has no need to introduce human rights into the social work curriculum.
5. What human rights issues do you believe you have encountered personally, academically, or professionally?
6. What do you see as the greatest hurdle to universal human rights?
7. How large a role should culture play in determining the validity of a human right?
8. Should some human rights be more important than others?
9. Which theory of social justice do you feel is most compatible with human rights?
10. Why has there been reluctance on the part of the social work profession to embrace human rights specifically?
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