

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

6-1-1954

### The Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the Light of Lutheran Theology

Theodore Ernst

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_ernstt@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Ernst, Theodore, "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the Light of Lutheran Theology" (1954). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 412.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/412>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS  
IN THE LIGHT OF LUTHERAN THEOLOGY

---

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty  
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
Department of Philosophy  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Bachelor of Divinity

---

by

Theodore Ernst

June 1954

Approved by:

Paul W. Bretcher  
Advisor

A. G. Markus  
Reader



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS . . .	1
Introduction: Development and Adoption of the Declaration . . . . .	1
Subsequent Developments . . . . .	7
Objective of the Study . . . . .	10
II. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECLARATION . . . . .	12
Democracy, Humanism, and Utilitarianism . . . . .	12
The Apparent Unanimity of Purpose and Expression . . . . .	16
III. THE DECLARATION AND LUTHERAN THEOLOGY . . . . .	20
Critique . . . . .	20
Some Possible Implications . . . . .	33
APPENDIX . . . . .	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	41



## CHAPTER I

### THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

#### Introduction: Development and Adoption of the Declaration

Emphasis upon human rights in the Charter of the United Nations is not a vague, gossamer thread ephemerally appearing, disappearing, and reappearing. It rather constitutes one of the chief cornerstones upon which the Charter stands.

Already in its second paragraph the Preamble of the Charter states that the peoples of the United Nations determine "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women. . . ."

In Chapter I ("Purposes and Principles"), Article 1, Paragraph 3 of the Charter this primary purpose is further articulated in the following words:

To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

In Chapter IV ("The General Assembly"), Article 13 ("Functions and Powers"), Paragraph 1b it is specifically stated:



The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international co-operation in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, and assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Similarly in Chapter IX ("International Economic and Social Co-operation"), Article 55, Paragraph c it is set forth that

the United Nations shall promote: universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

And Article 56, immediately following, pledges all members themselves "to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55."

More specifically, in Chapter X ("The Economic and Social Council"), Article 62 ("Functions and Powers"), Paragraph 2 the following directive is laid down for the Economic and Social Council: "It may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all."

In particular Chapter X ("The Economic and Social Council"), Article 68 ("Procedure") states:

The Economic and Social Council shall set up commissions in economic and social fields and for the promotion of human rights and such other commissions as may be required for the performance of its functions.

The major importance of this article is underscored by the fact that it alone in the Charter creates and names



a specialized United Nations agency, as pointed out by Roger Baldwin.<sup>1</sup>

Finally we find the last specific mention of human rights in the Charter in Chapter XII ("International Trusteeship System"), Article 76, Paragraph c where it is stated that one of the basic objectives of the trusteeship system with regard to trust territories shall be:

to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world.

Thus it is quite evident that the Charter of the United Nations, unlike the old League of Nations,<sup>2</sup> is clearly committed to a policy of promulgating, protecting, and guaranteeing universal human rights. Justin Wroe Nixon credits the inclusion of this emphasis on human rights in the Charter by its framers to the pressure of public opinion, both American and world-wide, behind which, of course, lay the experience of the peoples of the world under, or in conflict with, Nazi and Fascist tyranny during the immediately preceding years.<sup>3</sup>

For the purposes of this present writing it is both

---

<sup>1</sup>Roger N. Baldwin, Human Rights--World Declaration and American Practice (New York: Public Affairs Committee, Incorporated, c.1950), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>3</sup>Justin Wroe Nixon, The United Nations and our Religious Heritage (New York: The Church Peace Union, c.1953), p. 44.



interesting and important to note here that O. Frederick Nolde reports that representatives of many churches actively lobbied for inclusion in the Charter of the obvious emphasis on human rights. He concludes his statement with these words: "As the Charter was finally drafted, it reflects to a considerable extent the position taken by the churches."<sup>4</sup>

At this point, perhaps, it would be well briefly to analyze this concept "right" with which we shall be dealing throughout this entire study.

Possibly the concept "duty" is more familiar than that of "right." "Duty" emphasizes the neighbor; it is built upon the element of obligation. We think here of Kant's "categorical imperative" or of the so-called "Golden Rule." "Right," on the other hand, emphasizes the "Thyself," and this will be true whether "rights" as we shall discuss them are natural and innate or whether they are merely conferred.

The Christian who lives by the Gospel and is determined by agape must especially bear in mind that the sinful world does not, to any large extent respect "rights." This means, therefore, that the Christian must be ready to suffer in his respect for "rights," whether these arise as ordinances of men (conferred) or spring from conscience

---

<sup>4</sup>O. Frederick Nolde, Power for Peace (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, c.1946), p. 65.



(innate) as 1 Peter 2 so clearly teaches.

Regardless of how altruistically the motivation may be, "duty" always involves an interplay or bond between persons. "Right," on the other hand, emphasizes the individual and individual freedom, the "Thyself," in relation to others, to be true, but not in the obligatory nature of "duty." "Right" denotes, we think, those aspects of individual freedom which operate in accord with either natural law or some standard of "rightness" laying emphasis not upon the "neighbor" relationship but upon the "Thyself."

The Charter, then, alludes to what it calls "human rights" and "fundamental freedoms" in emphatic, but general terms. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights specifically spells out these rights and freedoms.

The Commission on Human Rights, appointed by the Economic and Social Council, with eighteen members representing eighteen different countries, began its work at Lake Success, New York, on January 27, 1947, with Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as chairman.<sup>5</sup> Among other prominent members of the Commission at its first meeting we find Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon<sup>6</sup> (its present chairman)<sup>7</sup> and

---

<sup>5</sup>United Nations. Economic and Social Council. Commission on Human Rights. Report of the First Session (Lake Success: n.p., 1947), p. 3.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>United Nations. Economic and Social Council. Commission on Human Rights. Report of the Ninth Session (New York: n.p., 1953), p. 1.



General Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines.<sup>8</sup> At present the representative on the Commission of the United States of America is Mrs. Oswald B. Lord.<sup>9</sup>

As soon as the Commission had formally begun its work, organizations and individuals from all over the world were solicited for ideas and suggestions for a statement by the Commission as to what the rights to be maintained by the United Nations actually were.<sup>10</sup> It was as a result of these suggestions, sifted, revised, and simplified by the Commission in many sessions, that it brought to the General Assembly meeting in Paris in the fall of 1948 its "Draft Universal Declaration of Human Rights." For three months more the draft declaration was worked over by one of the main committees of the Assembly.<sup>11</sup> Finally on December 10, 1948, came the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,<sup>12</sup> the text of which is given in the Appendix. The vote in the Assembly, then consisting of fifty-eight member nations, was forty-eight for, none against, eight abstentions, and two absences.<sup>13</sup> Regarding the voting at

---

<sup>8</sup>United Nations, Report of the First Session, p. 3.

<sup>9</sup>United Nations, Report of the Ninth Session, p. 1.

<sup>10</sup>Nixon, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

<sup>11</sup>United Nations. Third Committee. Official Records of the Third Session of the General Assembly, Part I: Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural Questions (Lake Success: n.p., 1949), pp. 1-901.

<sup>12</sup>Nixon, op. cit., p. 46.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.



that time, Roger Baldwin writes:

The Soviet bloc abstained on the ground that, after three years, the document needed "more study." Saudi Arabia, a Moslem country, abstained because of the inclusion of the right to change one's religion. South Africa abstained because of the guarantees of racial equality under law.<sup>14</sup>

#### Subsequent Developments

Subsequent to the adoption of the Declaration, by 1953 it had been translated into thirty-six different languages.<sup>15</sup> The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has made its circulation and presentation a special program, and various aspects of this program have won co-operation from over forty countries.<sup>16</sup> In addition, various resolutions of the General Assembly and of subsidiary United Nations organizations have either appealed to the Declaration or been seriously affected by it.<sup>17</sup>

However, concerning its permanent influence little can be said. The Human Rights Commission continues its work. This has consisted mainly of drawing up draft Covenants which as treaties would implement the Declaration and become the law of ratifying nations regarding human rights. Needless to say, attempts at formulating such a covenant

---

<sup>14</sup>Baldwin, op. cit., pp. 1-2.

<sup>15</sup>Nixon, op. cit., p. 46.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., pp. 46-47.



have met with severe difficulties. Part of the difficulties lie in the apparent cleavage between East and West. The so-called "free" world, i.e., the West, usually takes the position that human rights, as the Declaration spells them out, are inherent in man as man, and are not something bestowed on man by governments. The Communist world takes the latter view. Mr. Vishinsky stated their position quite explicitly at the 1948 General Assembly in Paris when he said: "The rights of human beings cannot be considered outside the prerogatives of governments, and the very understanding of human rights is a governmental concept."<sup>18</sup>

This cleavage between the East and the West involves other issues as well. Justin Wroe Nixon, pointing out some of these differences, writes:

For instance, the role of government in giving effect to these rights has been an issue. The communists would load the whole responsibility on governments. The free peoples want non-governmental agencies and individuals to share the responsibility. Then there has been the issue as to which is the more important, civil and political rights or social and economic rights. The free peoples of the Atlantic world have emphasized the former group of rights; the communists, joined on this issue by representatives from underdeveloped countries, have emphasized the latter.

The general issue of how an international organization can go to work to secure observance of these rights without interfering with national sovereignty has also come up. South Africa with its grave dissensions over the rights of natives and Indians is a case in point. Then there has been the issue of self-determination. What principles should be invoked when an area demands full independence? Should it be encouraged to sacrifice opportunities for the improvement of health,

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 47.



education and economic well-being for the enjoyment of a single right?<sup>19</sup>

Other severe difficulties have been encountered by the Commission in its attempts to draft a Covenant of Rights. Roger Baldwin, writing on the subject of the attempts at drafting a Covenant, describes these basic difficulties as follows:

The Commission has first had to determine what rights would be accepted by enough countries to make a covenant mean anything in practice. And then it was faced with the difficult problem of working out ways of enforcing the covenant without undermining the sovereignty of the various nations. No nation appears ready yet to yield jurisdiction over its citizens to any international court or commission. The Charter specifically bars any interference in domestic matters. But covenants on particular issues may yield sovereignty to an agreed authority.

Unless some international authority is provided, the guarantee of human rights on an international scale would appear to be an empty gesture. Similarly, it would be without force unless persons could appeal to an international authority after they had, as the lawyers say, exhausted their remedies in their own countries.

A long debate therefore took place in the Commission as to whether individuals or private organizations or both should have the right to appeal or whether the right should be limited to governments. The United States, along with Great Britain and France, opposed extending the right to individuals or private groups. Practically all the interested non-governmental organizations recognized as consultants by the Economic and Social Council (ninety in July, 1950, of which about thirty are directly concerned with human rights) urged the right to private petition as indispensable to enforcement. But the majority of the Commission favored restricting the right to governments. They were fearful that few nations would ratify a covenant departing from conventional principles. So far, no enforcement has been provided except for a permanent commission to receive government complaints, inquire into them, and attempt conciliation.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., pp. 47-48.

<sup>20</sup>Baldwin, op. cit., pp. 4-5.



These, then, have been the developments regarding the Commission and its work subsequent to the adoption of the Declaration. As mentioned previously,<sup>21</sup> the Commission is continuing its work, and the major portion of its agenda is almost always devoted to further attempts at drafting a suitable and acceptable Covenant of Rights and discussion regarding the content of such a Covenant.<sup>22</sup>

#### Objective of the Study

Having thus briefly described the inclusion of a high degree of emphasis upon human rights in the Charter, the formulation and work of the Commission on Human Rights culminating in the adoption of the Declaration by the General Assembly, and the subsequent activity of the Commission, centering mainly in its attempts to formulate a draft Covenant of Rights for possible ratification by the respective members of the United Nations, we should like at this point to set forth the objectives we have in mind for the remainder of this present study.

In Chapter II we shall first of all briefly examine some of what we consider to be the basic ideas underlying the human rights "movement," which arbitrarily we have termed "democracy, humanism, and utilitarianism." The second half of Chapter II will be devoted to an appreciation of the Declaration as a statement of apparent unanimity

---

<sup>21</sup>Supra, p. 7.

<sup>22</sup>United Nations, Report of the Ninth Session, pp. 1-88.



of thought and expression on the part of widely, indeed, violently differing individuals, parties, powers, and nations.

Chapter III will be devoted largely to a critique of the Declaration in the light of Lutheran theology, particularly in view of Article XVI of the Augustana and the corresponding article in the Apology. Other sources will, of course, be compared and utilized. But, on the whole, we shall confine ourselves largely to additional material to be found in the Book of Concord, which for the purposes of this present study we shall utilize as a plain and clear, comprehensive and coherent statement of Lutheran theology.

The concluding portion of Chapter III will be devoted to a brief consideration of some of the possible implications of the Declaration and of the human rights "movement" for Christian people, in particular, implications for Lutheran believers.



## CHAPTER II

### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECLARATION

#### Democracy, Humanism, and Utilitarianism

It is not our purpose here to produce a major treatise on what might well be described as a new religion of our times, namely, that democratic philosophy or faith, built upon humanism with a strongly utilitarian ethic, which is the foundation not only of the entire human rights movement, but also is implicit in the wording, thought, and intention of the Declaration. Indeed, this humanistic spirit is per se part of the fiber that can be found in any manifestation of democracy no matter where or how it may appear. Democracy as we see and experience it in the world today implies a faith in man qua man. The spokesmen for this new faith proclaim the inherent dignity and worth of every individual, the right to security (however that may be defined), the right to freedom in its widest connotations, and above all the right to self-determination in all spheres, especially in the individual's realization of his potential for happiness and life at its fullest (according to their definitions.)<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Excellent representative selections from the writings of many different spokesmen for various aspects of this humanistic spirit can be found in Main Currents of Western Thought, Franklin Le Van Baumer, editor (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, c.1952), which contains readings in western European intellectual history from the middle ages to the present and will also guide the reader to other primary and secondary sources.



Manifestly, such a faith in man, regardless of its political, social, or economic implications, implies an underlying philosophy which is most commonly termed "humanism." And by this latter term we refer to that latter-day "faith" which rejects all forms, manifestations, or revelation concerning the supernatural, the hereafter, or any outside influences upon man whatsoever except environment and heredity. Concepts such as the supernatural, divine revelation, a hereafter, or any sort of divine intervention humanism most often prefers to satirize with such catch phrases as "pie in the sky, by and by, when we die, it's a lie." They will, of course, tolerate religion, and attempt to utilize it where they can in support of their position and motives, and they usually try to avoid antagonizing organized religion. But more generally humanism almost Pollyanna-like sees man's greatest, indeed, his only hope, now in this present life. It places supreme faith in the advancements of science and human knowledge in general, and it optimistically views the future as a time when these advancements will work for the good of all men everywhere, in a time when by his own knowledge man will advance higher and higher towards the summit of his ideals. It does not subscribe to much of the pessimism that so many others see so prevalent in the world today, but remains optimistic, whether or not it advocates a gradual development of man's potentialities or a radical, revolutionary march of progress.



Above all, democracy and its proponents who subscribe to the views set forth above are thoroughly pragmatic in their outlook, and in their ethics utilitarian, because that which serves the good of the greatest number now manifestly in their eyes is of the greatest value to mankind not only for now but for the future.

There are conflicting philosophies current in the world today, but this spirit and faith of democracy and humanism remains a major element in contemporary human thinking. It is of fairly recent origin, and though some Protestant thinkers and spokesmen would have us believe that it is a by-product of Christianity, this would not seem to be the case. Most likely, it seems to us, the general notion of democracy was given its first significant modern impetus by the Renaissance revolt against all forms of authoritarianism such as church, state, and tradition. From its inception the democratic spirit has been in essence a revolt against all forms of absolutism.<sup>2</sup>

This revolt found its first great spokesmen in such men as Rousseau and John Locke,<sup>3</sup> and has its classic formulation in such documents as the French Declaration of the

---

<sup>2</sup>For a lengthy and detailed exposition of the view that closely relates democracy and religion see Democracy and the Churches by James Hastings Nichols (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1951).

<sup>3</sup>Characteristic selections from the writings of both Rousseau and Locke as well as from the writings of other spokesmen for various aspects of democratic philosophy also are given in Main Currents of Western Thought, Franklin Le Van Baumer, editor.



Rights of Man, this country's Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and Bill of Rights, the Atlantic Charter, and most recently in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration of Human Rights which we are considering in this present study.

While they did not produce it, this democratic faith in man did receive support and certain of its concepts from Protestant and Puritan religious thinking, and today finds its strongest advocates within the field of social work,<sup>4</sup> among the Quakers with their heavy emphasis on service,<sup>5</sup> and with reference only to its political and not its social or cultural implications among Protestants generally.

The group which perhaps most consistently advocates this sort of humanism in its broadest form is the American Ethical Union, consisting of a number of individual Ethical Culture Societies, the first of which was founded by Felix Adler in 1876 in New York City. Some of the most forthright and vociferous statements setting forth and supporting this humanistic spirit may be found in the American Ethical

---

<sup>4</sup>Gordon Hamilton, Theory and Practice of Social Casework (second revised edition; New York: Columbia University Press, c.1951), pp. 3-26.

<sup>5</sup>Justin Wroe Nixon, The United Nations and Our Religious Heritage (New York: The Church Peace Union, c.1953), p. 42.

<sup>6</sup>Frank S. Mead, Handbook of Denominations in the United States (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c.1951), p. 21.



Union's bi-monthly publication The Standard, published in New York City and edited by Dr. Henry Neumann. Similarly, the American Humanist Association with offices at 117½ Glen Street, Yellow Springs, Ohio, publishes a journal, The Humanist, which is also an excellent source of material concerning the history of this philosophy we have briefly described and contains many articles defining, describing, elaborating, and defending this movement.

This briefly is the underlying spirit and philosophy upon which the human rights movement rests. It is an optimistic faith in man and a confidence in his inherent worth and potentialities. It is an obvious product of the past two hundred years with their heavy emphasis upon the ascent of man and the realization of his abilities, and it trusts in men to serve mankind individually and collectively as the highest aim and good.

#### The Apparent Unanimity of Purpose and Expression

Roger Baldwin, a long-time leader in the civil rights movement in our country, has said of the Declaration of Human Rights, "Never before has an international body engaged in such searching tasks to find agreement among the nations on the complex problems of human rights."<sup>7</sup>

Similarly Justin Wroe Nixon writes:

---

<sup>7</sup>Roger N. Baldwin, Human Rights--World Declaration and American Practice (New York: Public Affairs Committee, Incorporated, c.1950), p. 2.



. . . there are values also--great values that have accrued from the wrestling of the United Nations with these issues of human rights. Think of the fact which Dr. Charles Malik points out, that here, "for the first time in history," the nations "have really come together seriously" to brood upon the nature of man and upon what that nature requires for its fulfillment. Think of the fact that always before in history, when it came to the enjoyment of rights, people have been classified as superior or inferior according to race, class, sex, color, religion, or other distinctions. Think of how sensitive some of us have become because in the mirror of this Declaration we have seen some of our own shortcomings. And think of what it can mean educationally that the human race, through the Assembly of the United Nations, has set up this international standard to challenge the consciences of men throughout the earth.<sup>8</sup>

Both of these statements point up an amazing fact, that in spite of the divergence of philosophies and political views among individuals and nations of the world today, in this instance, if in no other, a degree of apparent unanimity of purpose and expression has been reached that for the most part poses questions, we think, rather than offers any easy solutions.

Obviously, the Declaration, as also indeed the Charter, expresses agreement concerning a particular view of man and his nature which we have attempted to describe briefly above.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, though different groups have stressed differing aspects of human rights and have stressed one area rather than another, by its rather all-inclusive nature the Declaration has managed to satisfy a surprisingly large number of widely differing ideologies.

---

<sup>8</sup>Nixon, op. cit., p. 48.

<sup>9</sup>Supra, pp. 12-16.



How can this apparent unanimity of thought and expression be accounted for? We think that this manifestation of what in former years we spoke of as the "one world" idea has a two-fold explanation.

First of all, there is the prevalence among many peoples of the world today of what we have earlier in this present study termed "democracy, humanism, and utilitarianism."<sup>10</sup> By its very nature, its view of man, and its implicit faith and trust in his abilities and potentialities, it necessarily must call for the guarantee of as many rights for man as possible and in as great a measure as possible.

Secondly, we see in the Declaration a manifestation of the natural knowledge of the Law of God at work in men or what others who would deny any divine intervention would term "natural law." At this point we need only indicate the possible influence of the possibility of such an innate knowledge in man. Whether or not this is a genuinely inherent quality in man or not will be dealt with in the following chapter as part of the critique proper.

Suffice it to say at this point, for one or more reasons, this apparently high degree of unanimity of purpose and language to be found in the Declaration is extremely heartening in a world split by conflicting powers, philosophies, and ideologies, and all these possible threats to

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.



peace. It is especially heartening in view of the very nature of the world situation today. Now, as during the time of the Declaration's adoption, nations of vastly differing political persuasions, from the far "Left" to the extreme "Right," are working together, as they have previously, in this common task. Even with the many obvious limitations and drawbacks, such events have not happened quite similarly before. All this, much of the world continues to hope, is in the nature of a prelude, as it were.



## CHAPTER III

### THE DECLARATION AND LUTHERAN THEOLOGY

#### Critique

Our critique of the Declaration will center around two main questions and their implications. These are: (1) Are human rights as the Declaration describes them naturally inherent in man, or are they merely conferred rights? In seeking an answer to this question in the light of Lutheran theology we will need to consider a number of concepts, among them the image of God; the doctrine of original sin and the fall of man and its results; the concept of government; and the Christian's relationship to his government. (2) The second major question stems from the first and concerns the practical aspects of the Declaration and the principles it espouses. It will deal with such concepts as natural law and natural knowledge of the Law of God, conscience, and the entire area of civil righteousness. Finally we shall offer some additional critical commentary on some particular articles of the Declaration.

First of all, then, there is the question of whether human rights are naturally inherent in man or not; and if not, from whence they derive their origin and their validity, if any.

The Book of Concord teaches that man was created by God in His own image and that even before the fall man was



not without a knowledge of the Law of God. Thus Article VI of the Epitome of the Formula states:

For even our first parents before the Fall did not live without Law, who had the Law of God written also into their hearts, because they were created in the image of God, Gen. 1,26 f.; 2,16 ff.; 3,3.<sup>1</sup>

"Image of God" the Symbols define quite plainly in the words of the Apology, Article II, Paragraphs 18-21:

. . . man was fashioned in the image and likeness of God. What else is this than that there were embodied in man such wisdom and righteousness as apprehended God, and in which God was reflected, i.e., to man there was given the gifts of the knowledge of God, and the like? For thus Irenaeus and Ambrose interpret the likeness to God, the latter of whom not only says many things to this effect, but especially declares: That soul is not, therefore, in the image of God, in which God is not at all times. And Paul shows in the Epistles to the Ephesians, 5,9, and Colossians, 3,10, that the image of God is the knowledge of God, righteousness, and truth. Nor does Longobard fear to say that original righteousness is the very likeness to God which God implanted in man.<sup>2</sup>

And the Thorough Declaration of the Formula teaches that of this original knowledge there is in man even now a small remnant:

. . . as regards natural, external things which are subject to reason, man still has to a certain degree understanding, power, and ability. . . .<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>"The Formula of Concord," Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), Epitome, Article VI, Paragraph 1, p. 805.

<sup>2</sup>Philip Melancthon, "The Apology of the Confession," Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), Article II, Paragraphs 18-21, pp. 109-111.

<sup>3</sup>"The Formula of Concord," op. cit., Thorough Declaration, Article I, Paragraph 1, p. 863.



In addition, Article XVIII of the Augustana also clearly attributes this same innate ability to men, when in support of its position it quotes Augustine:

We grant that all men have a free will, free, inasmuch as it has the judgement of reason; not that it is thereby capable, without God, either to begin, or, at least, to complete aught in things pertaining to God, but only in works of this life, whether good or evil. "Good" I call those works which spring from the good in nature, such as, willing to labor in the field, to eat and drink, to have a friend, to clothe oneself, to build a house, to marry a wife, to raise cattle, to learn divers useful arts, or whatsoever good pertains to this life. For all of these things are not without dependence on the providence of God; yea, of Him and through Him they are and have their beginning. "Evil" I call such works as willing to worship an idol, to commit murder, etc.<sup>4</sup>

Finally, in one instance the Apology unequivocally teaches the existence of certain natural rights. Concerning marriage the Apology, Article XXIII, Paragraphs 9 and 12, states:

And because this creation or divine ordinance in man is a natural right, jurists have accordingly said wisely and correctly that the union of male and female belongs to natural right. But since natural right is immutable, the right to contract marriage must always remain. . . . Moreover, a natural right is truly a divine right, because it is an ordinance divinely impressed upon nature.<sup>5</sup>

Now, it is obvious that the Apology here directly refers only to marriage and posits the existence of natural rights upon the immutability of nature and the physical laws governing the observable universe. But we are of the opinion

---

<sup>4</sup>The Augsburg Confession," Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), Article XVIII, Paragraphs 4-7, pp. 51-53.

<sup>5</sup>Melanchthon, op. cit., Article XXIII, Paragraphs 9-12, p. 367.



here that by its rather general language at this point this section implies the possible existence of other natural rights as well, under which might possibly also come human rights as the term is used by the Declaration.

We come now to the alternate (or possibly the "complementary") view regarding human rights, and that is that human rights, rather than being inherent in man, are conferred rights, conferred upon men by governments.

As we have pointed out previously,<sup>6</sup> this is in substance the contemporary position of the Communist powers. For vastly different reasons the Symbols also lend weight to this position.

The attitude of the Book of Concord toward civil government, as set forth in the Augsburg Confession, Articles XVI and XXVIII, in the corresponding articles of the Apology, and in the Formula, Article XII, is perhaps best summarized in Luther's compilations of Bible passages in the Table of Duties under the headings "Of Civil Government" and "Of Subjects:"

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall resist to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. Wilt thou, then, not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same; for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid, for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Rom. 13:1-4.

---

<sup>6</sup>Supra, p. 8.



Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's. Matt. 22:21.

Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's minister's attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom, to whom custom; fear, to whom fear; honor, to whom honor. Rom. 13:5-7.

I exhort therefore that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for kings, and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God, our Savior. 1 Tim. 2:1-3.

Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work. Titus 3:1.

Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. 1 Peter 2:13,14.7

Bearing in mind this view of civil government, the opening paragraph of Article XVI of the Augustana appears, we think, to imply that civil rights are, therefore, divinely conferred through the agency of civil governments. The Augustana states:

Of Civil Affairs they teach that lawful civil ordinances are good works of God, and that it is right for Christians to bear civil office, to sit as judges, to judge matters by the Imperial and other existing laws, to award just punishments, to engage in just wars, to serve as soldiers, to make contracts, to hold property, to make oath when required by the magistrates, to marry a wife, to be given in marriage.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>Martin Luther, "Table of Duties," A Short Explanation of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Gatechism (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, c.1943), pp. 26-28.

<sup>8</sup>"The Augsburg Confession," op. cit., Article XVI, Paragraphs 1-2, p. 51.



Furthermore Article XXVIII of the Augustana teaches clearly that it is a function of civil governments to preserve civil justice and peace, and certainly the guaranteeing of human rights would come under that general heading.

The Augustana says:

. . . civil government deals with other things than does the Gospel. The civil rulers defend not minds, but bodies and bodily things, against manifest injuries, and restrain men with the sword and bodily punishments in order to preserve civil justice and peace.<sup>9</sup>

Finally, in negative fashion the Epitome of the Formula, Article XII, teaches that subjects are to invoke the power of governments received from God for protection and defense. Under the heading "Articles that Cannot be Tolerated in the Government" the Formula includes:

That a Christian cannot without injury to conscience use the office of the magistracy against the wicked in matters as they occur (matters so requiring), nor that subjects may invoke for their protection and defense the power which the magistrates possess and have received from God.<sup>10</sup>

Undoubtedly the original subscribers to the Formula had in mind the need for physical protection and defense in times of war, riot, or revolution, but we believe it is not doing the Formula an injustice here to include under the general heading of protection and defense also the protection and guarantee of civil, political, economic, and social rights as we know them today, in short, the defense of human rights.

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., Article XXVIII, Paragraph 1, p. 85.

<sup>10</sup>"The Formula of Concord," *op. cit.*, Epitome, Article XII, Paragraph 3, p. 841.



This we believe to be a necessary and logical conclusion or corollary to the position of the Formula quoted above in our present world with its concept of democratic government, which was virtually unknown at the time of the drafting of the Formula.

It is reasonably apparent, therefore, we believe, that the Symbols teach that human rights are under the domain of civil government. But we do not believe that they clearly and unequivocally teach either that human rights are conferred by governments or that they are inherent in man. In our estimation, in the light of the theology of the Book of Concord, to hold either view is not only possible but allowable. However, since the issue is apparently, as it were, an "open question" in view of the Symbols, we are inclined to accept more of a synthesis of the two views, which we believe is consistent with the spirit of the Confessions. Human rights in the light of the theology of the Confessions may be viewed as inherent in man, the fall and the depravity of man's nature notwithstanding, but by the nature of their attitude towards civil government, promulgation, protection, and implementation of these rights may also (and concurrently) be rightly viewed as a function and aim of governments to be accepted, utilized, and supported by Christians.

The second major question we must deal with is whether or not such principles or statements such as are contained in the Declaration are of any value, insofar as whether or not men have any power or ability to fulfill or to utilize



them purposefully and efficaciously.

According to the Confessions we know that there is a natural knowledge of the law of God,<sup>11</sup> even as Paul teaches in Romans.<sup>12</sup> The Epitome of the Formula, Article VI, teaches that all men are under the Law.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, it states as the first purpose of the Law "that thereby outward discipline might be maintained against wild, disobedient men (and that wild and intractable men might be restrained, as though by certain bars)."<sup>14</sup>

As we have attempted to show previously, human rights we believe to be inherent to a certain extent in men and thereby a part of natural law.<sup>15</sup> Consequently, in light of the first use of the law described above, such expressions of natural law as the Declaration seems to contain are of value in restraining and directing men in the observance of human rights.

Moreover, if, at least to some extent, human rights are included under natural law, it is apparent that the Confessions teach that they have some value, for the Apology, Article IV, Paragraph 7, states that "human reason naturally

<sup>11</sup>Melanchthon, op. cit., Article IV, Paragraph 7, p. 121.

<sup>12</sup>Rom. 2:14-15.

<sup>13</sup>"The Formula of Concord," op. cit., Article VI, Paragraph 1, p. 805.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., Article VI, "The Principle Question in this Controversy," p. 805.

<sup>15</sup>Supra, p. 20 ff.



understands, in some way, the Law (for it has the same judgement divinely written in the mind)."<sup>16</sup>

In addition, the Confessions in numerous instances assume the existence of conscience in men and teach that conscience is affected by the Law of God, in believer and unbeliever alike.<sup>17</sup> And this also would add to the value of formal, legal expressions of aspects of natural law such as the Declaration or the proposed Covenant of Rights.

Finally, Articles XVI and XVIII of the Augustana clearly teach that all men, including also the unregenerate, are capable of certain "good works," under which we would in our estimation certainly include the protection and support of human rights. This ability in man, to perform works of civil righteousness, taught by the Confessions,<sup>18</sup> is described in more detail in the words of Dr. John Theodore Mueller under the heading "The Works of the Heathen:"

Since St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, avers that the heathen "by nature do the things contained in the Law," Rom. 2,14.15. cp. also 1,19.20.32, it is necessary to consider the question in what sense also the heathen or the unregenerate can do good works. While it is true that, properly speaking, only those works can be called good that flow from faith and true love of God, Heb. 11,6, we may nevertheless apply the term "good" to all works of the unregenerate that are done according to the norm of divine Law written in their hearts, Rom. 2,15; 1,32, such as feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, helping the oppressed,

---

<sup>16</sup>Melanchthon, loc. cit.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., Articles IV and III, passim, pp. 119-225.

<sup>18</sup>"The Augsburg Confession," op. cit., Article XVI, p. 51.



being diligent in one's calling, etc. Luther once said that, viewed externally, these works frequently surpass those of the believers; for "Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, and Scipio accomplished greater deeds than ever a Christian" (St. L., II, 461 ff.).

But despite this fact both Luther and our Lutheran Confessions declare that the difference between the good works of believers and unbelievers is one of kind and not one of degree; that is to say, the good works of the unregenerate do not properly belong in the class of Christian good works at all, but are good only outwardly (quoad materiale), not inwardly (quoad formale). Luther says: "Cursed are all works which are not done in love." (St. L., X, 407; cp. also VIII, 1862.)

The works of unbelievers are indeed also actuated by God, not, however, in His Kingdom of Grace (regnum gratiae), where the Holy Spirit produces spiritually good works (iustitia spiritualis) through the means of grace, but in His Kingdom of Power (regnum potentiae), where God, for the purpose of preserving this world, effects civilly good works (iustitia civilis), or externally good works (opera externa), through His divine Law inscribed in the hearts of men. These externally good works (iustitia civilis) are necessary for the welfare of human society, and hence God rewards them with temporal blessings in His Kingdom of Power. In this sense, then, the works of the unregenerate may be called good; they are done according to the divine norm and accomplish much temporal good in the domain of the earthly life.<sup>19</sup>

In conclusion, because the Confessions teach that men do possess at least a remnant of the Law, because all men are endowed with conscience, and because it is clear that even the unregenerate can perform works of civil righteousness, it is possible for men to observe and support human rights, and in the light of Lutheran theology there can be some value in a statement of these rights such as the Declaration.

Regarding the content of particular articles of the Declaration, even a cursory reading of its text makes it

---

<sup>19</sup>John Theodore Mueller, Christian Dogmatics (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, c.1934), pp. 408-409.



readily apparent that many of the articles have very far-reaching theological implications indeed. It is not our purpose here to comment at great length on any particular articles, but a number of them call for at least some brief critique.

The inherent existence of human rights, which the Declaration sets forth in its opening articles, we have discussed previously at some length.<sup>20</sup> Similarly, man's endowment with reason and conscience is accepted by both Lutheran theology and the Declaration.<sup>21</sup>

The articles dealing with civil rights are fully acceptable to Lutheran theology in light of its attitude toward civil government dealt with previously.<sup>22</sup>

Similarly, the articles of the Declaration that have to do with social, economic, and cultural rights and the guaranteeing of security and happiness (in its physical, earthly sense) must manifestly be accepted and supported by Christian believers as an indication of the love and life of Christ active and manifest in them.

Lutheran theology is likewise wholly in accord with the view of the Declaration regarding the importance of the family set forth in Article 16, Paragraph 3, of the Declaration.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>Supra, p. 20 ff.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., pp. 23-24.

<sup>23</sup>"The Formula of Concord," op. cit., Thorough Declaration, Article XVI, Paragraph 3, p. 331.



However, there is a possible point of conflict between the attitude of the Declaration regarding the equal rights of women and the attitude of Lutheran theology regarding this same issue. Lutheran theology traditionally views women as occupying a position of subjection to men and quotes St. Paul at great length on this subject.<sup>24</sup> This topic in itself could well occupy our entire attention, but suffice it to say that it is our opinion that the rights and equalities which the Declaration grants women as inherent, Lutheran theology and practice grants them out of love and a Christian attitude towards marriage and fellowship. The conflict is one of source rather than practice, but it is far too lengthy to investigate fully at this point. However, we should point out that the Augustana, Article XVI, clearly states that it is right for Christians "to marry a wife" and "to be given in marriage."<sup>25</sup> The wording of Article XVI here points up the conflict between the Declaration and the Augustana. Similarly, the implied acceptance of divorce without any stated limits or grounds in the Declaration is another possible point of conflict.

In other cases, however, Article XVI of the Augustana and the Declaration are in full accord. The Augustana states that it is right for Christians "to bear civil office, to sit as judges, to judge matters by the Imperial and other existing

---

<sup>24</sup>Mueller, op. cit., p. 209.

<sup>25</sup>"The Augsburg Confession," op. cit., Article XVI, Paragraph 2, p. 51.



laws. . . . to hold property."<sup>26</sup> These rights as set forth by the Confession and expanded by the Apology are fully in accord with Article 17 of the Declaration, which asserts the right to own property, Article 21, which gives all men the right to participate in their government, directly or otherwise, and Articles 5-12, which gives to all men the right to appeal to law as well as the guarantees and protections of civil law.

In general, in view of all that we have discussed previously, the actual content of the Declaration, with some few possible exceptions, is acceptable to Lutheran theology, in view of its attitude towards the nature of man, the relation of men to civil government, and its doctrine of civil righteousness.

Concluding this brief critique of individual points in the Declaration, we should note here that it would be possible, indeed, quite desirable, to enlarge almost without limits a theological critique of the Declaration. In our desire for brevity we have rather atomistically considered various individual points in the Declaration. It would be exceedingly desirable in a lengthier theological critique of the Declaration first of all to systematically categorize the many different "rights" dealt with in the Declaration and then to examine each separate category in view of its respective theological level of importance, for the rights

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.



described and set forth in the Declaration do not necessarily all lie on the same level, either theologically or otherwise.

### Some Possible Implications

In conclusion, we see three main implications attached to the entire issue of human rights and the human rights movement in the light of Lutheran theology. First of all, there is the entire doctrine of civil righteousness, which has been considered in this paper in some detail.<sup>27</sup> Lutheran theology accepts the existence of civil righteousness, but all too often, perhaps, is it not the custom of Lutheran believers unduly to "look down their noses" at it, and to make of civil righteousness almost a "dirty word?" Rather, should we not as Christian citizens lend our active support to manifestations of civic righteousness and, indeed, encourage them? For works of civil righteousness are instituted by God, though in a different manner than works of spiritual righteousness, as noted previously,<sup>28</sup> and are not necessarily "works of the devil" or some-such, as many in the past have been all too wont to call them.

Secondly, for Christian believers the support, strengthening, maintenance, and advocacy of human rights reaches beyond simply the realm of civil righteousness. Here, as in

---

<sup>27</sup>Supra, pp. 28-29.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.



our every activity, is a legitimate sphere for positive acts of sanctification and Christian life, action, and witness.

And the latter point leads to a third and final possible implication concerning human rights. Many different writers have often pointed out the likeness between democracy's high valuation on the worth of the individual and the inestimable worth that Christ confers upon each individual soul, each and every member (and potential member) of His body. But just as the Gospel does not exist, as it were, in a vacuum and cannot be preached or practiced in solitary confinement, but demands as fundamentally necessary the constant interaction of individuals, of witness between Christians and non-Christians, of fellowship among believers, of "communion" in every sense, of faith active and demonstrating its efficacy by deed one to another, so, too, the human rights movement is one that by its democratic nature is utilitarian and interested not only in the good of individuals alone but in relations between individuals and subsequently groups of individuals. In our humble estimation this all too brief comparison leads to an inescapable conclusion. Christians in this world can and necessarily must lend their support to the human rights movement, for its aims, with possibly some few exceptions, are thoroughly in harmony with the aims and goals of the teachings of Jesus, even though they may stem from differing motivations. But the Christian's motivation we manifestly accept as the highest, the



absolute, the eternally valid motivation, and so in good conscience Christians can actively, whole-heartedly move to the fore in the struggle for acceptance and preservation of human rights. The human rights movement may be merely one of civil righteousness; it may remain only "social," but for the Christian in society it can be much more. Lutheran Christians have often given the term "social gospel" an undeservedly evil connotation. Nevertheless, we as human beings, and as Christian human beings, are inescapably social, and the Gospel of Jesus Christ for us has the strongest and thoroughly unavoidable social connotations and proclaims the highest possible social ethic.

As Christians, we are concerned with human rights and fundamental freedoms. Though we readily admit that the brotherhood of man through the fatherhood of God is far removed from the brotherhood of Christians that exists through their mutual salvation wrought by Christ, nevertheless the brotherhood of all men through creation exists, and for this reason also we must seek to promote human rights and freedom.

Because the brotherhood of nations and men upon earth and peace in the world is a Christian ideal towards which we strive, we must seek to promote human rights and freedoms, even though we know that wars and rumors of war shall remain in this world till it pass away. This, however, in no sense deters us from constantly striving towards an ideal.

Because we seek to bring the Gospel to all the world,



and to do this we must have religious liberty, we seek to promote human rights.

Finally, because of the social nature of our faith and spiritual existence, as well as our physical life and human existence, and as human beings in this world, as citizens, and as Christians, we must seek to promote human rights and freedoms by the strongest possible means.



## APPENDIX

### THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS<sup>1</sup>

Article 1. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2. (1) Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinctions of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status.

(2) Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional, or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether this territory be an independent, trust, non-self-governing territory, or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3. Everyone has the right to life, liberty, and security of person.

Article 4. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5. No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6. Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7. All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8. Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile.

Article 10. Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11. (1) Everyone charged with a penal offense has the right to be presumed innocent until proved

---

<sup>1</sup>Roger N. Baldwin, Human Rights--World Declaration and American Practice (New York: Public Affairs Committee, Incorporated, c.1950), pp. 8-23.



guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defense.

(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offense on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offense, under national or international law, at the time it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offense was committed.

Article 12. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home, or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13. (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each State.

(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14. (1) Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

(2) This right may not be invoked in the case of persecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15. (1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16. (1) Men and women of full age, without any limitations due to race, nationality, or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage, and at its dissolution.

(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

(3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17. (1) Everyone has the right to own property alone or in association with others.

(2) No one shall arbitrarily be deprived of his property.

Article 18. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in company with others and in public and private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.

Article 19. Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20. (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.



(2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of authority of government; this shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22. Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social, and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23. (1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work, and to protection against unemployment.

(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for any equal work.

(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration insuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

(4) Everyone has the right to form and join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24. Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25. (1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, 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 his control.

(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26. (1) Everyone has the 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.

(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial, or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.



Article 27. (1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

(2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary, or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28. Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29. (1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order, and the general welfare in a democratic society.

(3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 30. Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group, or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Short Explanation of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism.  
St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, c.1943.
- Baldwin, Roger N. Human Rights--World Declaration and American Practice. New York: Public Affairs Committee, Incorporated, c.1950.
- Bible, Holy. Authorized Version.
- Baumer, Franklin Le Van, editor. Main Currents of Western Thought. Readings in Western European Intellectual History from the Middle Ages to the Present. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, c.1952.
- Hamilton, Gordon. Theory and Practice of Social Casework. Second Revised Edition. New York: Columbia University Press, c.1951.
- Madison, Charles A. Critics and Crusaders. New York: Henry Holt and Company, c.1948.
- Mattson, A.D. Christian Social Consciousness. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, c.1953.
- Mead, Frank S. Handbook of Denominations in the United States. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c.1951.
- Mueller, John Theodore. Christian Dogmatics. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1934.
- Nichols, James Hastings. Democracy and the Churches. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1951.
- Nixon, Justin Wroe. The United Nations and Our Religious Heritage. New York: The Church Peace Union, c.1953.
- Nolde, O. Frederick. Power for Peace. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, c.1946.
- Reu, Johann Michael, and Paul H. Buehring. Christian Ethics. Columbus: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1935.
- Stroup, Herbert Hewitt. Social Work--An Introduction to the Field. New York: American Book Company, 1948.
- Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.



United Nations. Economic and Social Council. Commission on Human Rights. Report of the First Session. Lake Success: n.p., 1947.

----- Report of the Second Session. Lake Success: n.p., 1948.

----- Report of the Third Session. Lake Success: n.p., 1948.

----- Report of the Fifth Session. Lake Success: n.p., 1949.

----- Report of the Sixth Session. Lake Success: n.p., 1950.

----- Report of the Seventh Session. New York: n.p., 1951.

----- Report of the Eighth Session. New York: n.p., 1952

----- Report of the Ninth Session. New York: n.p., 1953.

United Nations. Third Committee. Official Records of the Third Session of the General Assembly, Part I: Annexes to the Summary Records of Meetings. Lake Success: n.p., 1949.

----- Official Records of the Third Session of the General Assembly, Part I: Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural Questions. Lake Success: n.p., 1949.