Human Dignity, Human Rights, and the Future of Europe

The documentary tradition of the West is suffused with the idea of human dignity. From the Magna Carta (1215), to the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen (1789), to the U.S. Bill of Rights (1791), the notion of human dignity has nourished the affirmation of the solidarity, rights, and obligations of human beings living in community.

Interestingly, by the mid-twentieth century, in the aftermath of the barbarism of Nazism, the great-grandchildren of the Enlightenment were concerned to affirm human dignity and the correlative rights and responsibilities of the human race one to another but could not locate the source of these rights. The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, for instance, proffered that “Recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable right of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world.” Yet Jacques Maritain, one of the philosophers who consulted on the document, famously said: “We agree about the rights but on condition no one asks us why!” Framers of the earlier documents (viz., the Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the Bill of Rights) knew why, but their progeny had forgotten by the time of the UN Declaration.

Today, the idea of human dignity is admittedly contentious. For instance, Australian-American philosopher of animal rights, Peter Singer, vilifies anyone who affirms human dignity by labeling him or her a “speciesist,” someone who should be held in at least as much contempt as a racist or chauvinist.

The consequence of recent agnosticism about human dignity has led to suspicion of the very idea of “inalienable” human rights. Those who have been infected by the viral relativism of late modernity see human rights as a mere construct, little more than a necessary capitulation to prevent anarchy. Even someone as typically perceptive as Notre Dame professor Alasdair MacIntyre has felt coerced to conclude that “[T]here are no such rights, and belief in them is one with belief in witches and in unicorns.”

Are we finally left with human rights as myth? Is human dignity a mere construct; the Western foundation for human personhood an apparition? If so, we are of all generations to be most pitied. We are then members of a very fragile species whose future is uncertain indeed. No wonder Muslims seek to lash our future to a Qur’anic
anchor—something durable and grounded. To do so, however, would mean the annihilation of many of the very rights and freedoms the West has fought to protect.

I and my colleagues maintain that a Judeo-Christian anthropology, with its acknowledgement of the special dignity of human beings, underwrites any coherent conception of human rights. And it is this anthropology, either explicitly or implicitly, that has fueled significant revolutions in human history, including the repudiation of infanticide, abortion, and euthanasia; the abolition of slavery and the slave trade; the social equality and suffrage of women; the revulsion toward and retribution of Nazi war crimes; the genocide in Rwanda; and nourished our intuitions that torture, abuse, and exploitation of human beings is not just distasteful, but morally reprehensible.

### Human Dignity and Human Rights

The foundation of basic, natural, objective, absolute, inalienable human rights is found in biblical religion. Princeton professor of ethics, Max Stackhouse, puts it this way:

Certainly we cannot say that all of Judaism or of Christianity has supported human rights. It has been key minorities within these traditions, arguing their case over long periods of time, that have established the normative view. Nor can we say that even these groups have been faithful to the implications of their own heritage at all times, and the horror stories of our pasts also have to be told to mitigate any temptation to triumphalism. **Still, intellectual honesty demands recognition of the fact that what passes as “secular,” “Western” principles of basic human rights developed nowhere else but out of key strands of the biblically rooted religions.**

Human rights are not free-floating principles that can be untethered from their Judeo-Christian origins without peril. The resurgence of Islam is a clarion call to rebuild the foundations of human dignity and to reinvigorate our commitment to protect the inalienable rights which effervesce from the affirmation of human dignity.

The word “dignity,” as you well know, comes from the Latin *dignitas* ("worth") and *dignus* ("worthy"). When applied to *Homo sapiens*, the etymology suggests that human beings should be understood as having inherent value and each member of the species should be treated with special respect. Over against the stratification of an Aristotelian caste system or the contemporary relativism of “rights talk,” the Western genesis of human dignity is grounded in the value vested in human beings by the Creator.

According to the Bible, all human beings owe their ancestry to a set of common parents. Their parents, Adam and Eve, were made in the “image and likeness” of their Creator (Genesis 1:27), and thus all their progeny, and only their progeny, bear
that image. That is, the origins of human exceptionalism are woven into the creation narrative. Human beings, and only human beings, possess this special dignity.

Human exceptionalism is underscored later in the biblical story when, after the great flood, Yahweh restored the covenant he made with humankind from the beginning. We read that after the flood:

\[\ldots\text{God blessed Noah and his sons and said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth. The fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth and upon every bird of the heavens, upon everything that creeps on the ground and all the fish of the sea. Into your hand they are delivered. Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you. And as I gave you the green plants, I give you everything.} (Gen. 9:1-3)\]

Human beings were thereby enjoined to be good stewards of the created order, including the animal kingdom. Animals, like all of creation, were to be treated as gifts from God's gracious hand, and while this did not give permission to treat them cruelly, they may serve human sustenance and well-being. Yahweh continued:

\[\ldots\text{Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for God made man in his own image.} (Genesis 9:6)\]

Without debating whether this text mandates capital punishment, it indisputably teaches that human beings are distinct from animals and have at least a right not to be unnecessarily harmed. Homicide is therefore a grave offense. Killing non-human animals is not. Note that this claim is rooted in the special status of human beings as imagers of God.

For Christians, especially, human exceptionalism is revealed climactically in the incarnation—the enfleshment—of God in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Through the incarnation God sacralized humanity in Christ's “taking the very form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men” (Phil. 2:7). Consequently, Christians find the dignity of the human person most made manifest in the face of Jesus of Nazareth. The councils of the early Christian Church spent a great deal of time and energy working out what it means theologically for God to be a human person.

Human exceptionalism and dignity posed momentous implications for the moral life of those whose consciences were informed by the idea. Take infanticide, violence, gender equality, racial equality, and freedom of religion, speech, and conscience as cases in point.

**Infanticide**

European historian W. E. H. Lecky called infanticide “one of the deepest stains of the ancient civilisation.”
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Contrary to the cultures around it, Judaism always forbade infanticide. The first-century Jewish historian Josephus wrote that, “The law orders all the offspring to be brought up, and forbids women either to cause abortion or to make away with the fetus.” And the Hebrew origins of the “sanctity of human life” provided the moral framework for early Christian condemnation of infanticide against the bleak backdrop of the barbarism of Roman culture. In fact, some biblical scholars have argued that the New Testament’s silence on abortion per se is due to the fact that it was simply beyond the pale of early Christian practice. For instance, the Didache (c. 85-110), sometimes called “The Teachings of the Twelve Apostles,” commanded, “thou shalt not murder a child by abortion nor kill them when born.”

More than merely condemning infanticide, however, early Christian communities provided alternatives, adopting children who were destined to be abandoned. For instance, Callistus (died c. 223) provided refuge to abandoned children by placing them in Christian homes and Benignus of Dijon (3rd century) offered nourishment and protection to abandoned children, including those with disabilities caused by failed abortions.

Gladiatorial Games

In addition to eschewing infanticide, child abandonment, and abortion, early Christians denounced human sacrifices, suicide, and the gladiatorial games. Because of their commitment to the special dignity of every human being, they found the games detestable. As the gladiators were usually criminals, prisoners of war, or slaves, their lives were expendable in the eyes of the Romans. But in the eyes of church leaders the practice was barbaric, and they called on Christians to boycott the “games.”

Gender Equality

In both Judaism and Christianity woman and man are equal in their natures—both being made in the image and likeness of God. Hence, in biblical times women held positions of high honor. The Ten Commandments require obedience to both father and mother; Deborah, a prophetess, was a judge in Israel; and seven of the 55 OT prophets were women according to Judaism.

Among the Greeks, however, women were treated very differently. Homer had Agamemnon exclaim, “One cannot trust women.” This doleful attitude toward women meant that female infanticide was morally licit in Greece. Roman women were no better off.

In contrast, the New Testament Gospels show Jesus of Nazareth treating women with great respect. He broke the tradition of some of the rabbis, speaking with and listening to the Samaritan woman (John 4:5-29). He violated contemporary educational customs by teaching Mary and Martha (Luke 10:38-42; John 11:25-26).
Christians of the apostolic age welcomed women, according men the status of “brother” and women the status of “sister.”

Examples can be multiplied, but perhaps the greatest affirmation of the equal value of men and women is Paul’s declaration in Galatians 3:28-29: “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you are Christ’s, then you are Abraham’s offspring, heirs according to promise.”

Christian cultures have historically repudiated the Hindu practice of sati, the Chinese practice of footbinding, and the African practice of female genital mutilation, because they violate the dignity of women made in God’s image.

**Racial Equality**

The dignity of our common ancestry also has implications for racial equality. In a culture in which slavery was normative, St. Paul’s instruction to Philemon not to treat Onesimus as his slave, but as his brother, was revolutionary (Philem. 16). According to Lecky, Christians often freed slaves: “St. Melania was said to have emancipated 8,000 slaves; St. Ovidius, a rich martyr of Gaul, 5,000; Chromatius, a Roman prefect under Diocletian, 1,400; and Hermes, a prefect under Trajan, 1,250.”

Even though slavery was revived in the seventeenth century in England and in the eighteenth century in America, long political battles and civil wars were fought to abolish it. One of the noteworthy examples of the efforts to end the slave trade was that of William Wilberforce and his Clapham Group, whose motivation to abolish slavery was underwritten by the special dignity of every human being. Artisan Josiah Wedgwood even crafted a lapel pin to be worn by the abolitionists. The brooch showed an African man exclaiming, his shackled wrists lifted high, “Am I not a man and a brother?”

**Freedom of Religion and Speech**

One of the most spectacular contributions of the Judeo-Christian tradition has been the development of principled pluralism, including religious freedom and freedom of speech. Due to its origins and tribal context, Judaism was in many ways admittedly theocratic. Even so, the people of God were commanded to “Pick from each of your tribes men who are wise, discerning, and experienced, and I will appoint them as your heads” (Deuteronomy 1:13, NJPS *Tanakh*). So some form of representative government was ordained from Israel’s beginning. Likewise, when Jesus said to his followers, “Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s” (Matt. 22:21), he recognized the separation of religion and government.
St. Peter reminded the Christians of Asia minor: “Be subject for the Lord’s sake to every human institution, whether it be to the emperor as supreme, or to governors as sent by him to punish those who do evil and to praise those who do good . . . Honor everyone. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the Emperor” (1 Peter 2:13-14, 17).

Separation of church, synagogue, and state is not, therefore, the invention of modernity or a triumph of secularism but a tenant of historic Christianity. In The City of God, St. Augustine laid the foundations of contemporary church/state separation, arguing that Christians are members of two cities: the earthly and the heavenly. God will one day unite the two, but in the mean time the faithful are to take up the duties of each realm. Unlike in Islam, religious institutions and the state are separable.

Sadly, there have been periods in history when even Christians were confused on this point. The Spanish Inquisition, Calvin’s Geneva, the martyrdom of John Wycliffe and John Hus, and the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony on American soil are cases in point. Attempts to establish a heavenly city on earth through the rule of law have been notorious failures. Nevertheless, from the crucible of these failures has emerged a more vigilant resolve to preserve religious tolerance. That resolve is enshrined in the establishment clause of the American Constitution: “Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion . . .”

Because the American founders understood so well the importance of religious liberty, the free exercise clause of the Constitution completes the circle: “Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” The founders intended to create a state that was free from religion’s control, not free from religion’s presence.

Freedom of Conscience

Free exercise means that individuals must be free to worship God (or not to worship at all) according to the dictates of conscience. The offspring of the Lutheran Reformation in Europe, the doctrine of liberty of conscience came into its adulthood in the American context, especially among the Baptists and others in the free-church tradition.

Islam, however, does not possess a concept of separation of mosque and state. In fact, quite the contrary, as we read in the standard instruction book for Islamic converts, What Islam is All About by Yahiya Emerick. Says Emerick in “Lesson 89: What is an Islamic State”: “… There is no separation of Masjid [Mosque] and state for the object of the Islamic state is the establishment of the Deen [religion] of Allah . . . Muslims know that Allah is the Supreme Being of the universe, therefore, His laws and commandments must form the basis for all human affairs. If we didn’t follow Allah’s commandments, but then still called ourselves Muslims, we would be hypocrites like the Christians, Buddhists, and Jews are today.”
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**Freedom of Expression**

Corollaries of freedom of conscience, free speech, and a free press are enshrined in the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the European Convention on Human Rights. Freedom of expression is an integral part of liberal democracies and derives from the Jewish and Christian affirmations of the free moral agency of every human being.\(^19\)

One need only to point to the tragedies surrounding the publication of cartoons of Muhammad in a Danish newspaper to see that freedom of expression—even for non-Muslims—is contrary to Islamic doctrine. And secularism, as such, has no resources to secure freedom of expression except willful stubbornness.

Resurgent Islam poses its own moral source for its claims. By definition, Islam is both a theology and political ideology that promulgates a theocratic regime for every population under its sway. The entailments of human dignity (e.g., freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion) are inimical to Islamic orthodoxy.

Western civilization faces a pressing challenge. Nature abhors the vacuum created by inattention to the moral source of our solidarity. The West will, therefore, either succumb to resurgent Islam for lack of sufficient moral resources to resist, or she must re-embrace the vitality of the tradition that has grounded her narrative, practices, institutions, and resilience.

**Conclusion: The Future of Europe**

There has been no stauncher defender of human dignity and human rights than the philosopher of personalism, Pope John Paul II. While serving as bishop he played a formative role in drafting both *Gaudium et Spes* (Joy and Hope) and *Dignitatis Humanae* (Human Dignity).

*Gaudium et Spes* devotes the entire first chapter to exposing the foundation of “the dignity of the human person,” as arising from the endowment of the Creator’s image and likeness, stating that

...there is a growing awareness of the exalted dignity proper to the human person, since he stands above all things, and his rights and duties are universal and inviolable. Therefore, there must be made available to all men everything necessary for leading a life truly human, such as food, clothing, and shelter; the right to choose a state of life freely and to found a family, the right to education, to employment, to a good reputation, to respect, to appropriate information, to activity in accord with the upright norm of one’s own conscience, to protection of privacy and rightful freedom, even in matters religious.\(^20\)
In a Vatican Radio address on October 19, 1964, then Karol Wojtyła remarked, “Although none of the completed constitutions or directives [of the Church] has the human person as its specific topic, the person lies deep within the entire conciliar teaching that is slowly emerging from our labors.”

As Thomas Williams points out, from his early years as a philosopher through his entire papacy, John Paul II was devoted to the reinvigoration of respect for human dignity, making it the leitmotif of his entire pontificate. His first encyclical, *Redemptor Hominis*, praised efforts “conducive to the definition and establishment of man’s objective and inviolable rights,” expressing hope that “human rights will become throughout the world a principle of work for man’s welfare.”

Two noteworthy, specific human rights defended by John Paul are religious freedom and the right to life. “John Paul has singled our religious freedom,” says Williams, “as the ‘source and synthesis’ of human rights, since it represents the right to live in the truth of one’s faith and in conformity with one’s transcendent dignity as a person.” To deny religious freedom is to trample human dignity under foot.

The second and most basic of human rights underscored by John Paul is the right to life. It is among the most important of human rights, in his view, because it is “the fundamental condition, the initial stage, and an integral part of the entire unified process of human existence.”

All of this is to point out that we are legatees of a great tradition. We have, all of us, drunk deeply from the springs of the Judeo-Christian tradition and have been beneficiaries of its life-giving sustenance.

We have inherited a worldview—a way of inhabiting the world—with its reservoir of stories, moral precepts, and religious imagery. This worldview has created a culture that, as we have seen, has contributed to human flourishing for millennia. Today, however, Western civilization is at risk of forfeiting the very tradition that has led to her greatness.

The acids of modernity and our contemporary historical amnesia have eroded the legacy of the West from the inside. The tradition may be recoverable if faithful men and women are committed to its renovation. But that presumes that the West is not moribund. The vitality of the tradition depends on the commitment of those who embrace, nurture, and propagate it. Traditions do not spring *ex nihilo* from the soil of culture. They are planted, watered, and cultivated. Since the Judeo-Christian worldview created Western culture as we know it, only those who value the tradition can sustain it. We owe it to our forbears and to the future.

We are witnessing, from the outside, the failure of secularism to sustain the ideals that built the West. In his defining volume, *A Secular Age*, the formidable Canadian intellectual Charles Taylor has observed that “Our age makes higher demands of solidarity and benevolence on people today than ever before. Never before have
people been asked to stretch out so far, and so consistently, so systematically, so as a matter of course, to the stranger outside the gates”

Yet, the moral source of our solidarity—viz., the affirmation of human dignity and concomitant respect for human freedom, responsibility, and benevolence—is found most robustly in the Judeo-Christian tradition. We have no reason to believe that self-interest (rational or not), nationalism, or even secularism can adequately secure reasons for treating every human being as a possessor of dignity worthy of respect. The recovery of the tradition, then, will mean a recovery of the sanctity of every human life and with it a celebration of liberty of conscience, protection of freedom of religion, and championing of innovation, economic development, and the arts. For these are the ideals that have animated the Western imagination.

On the other hand, resurgent Islam offers its own moral source for its claims. By definition, Islam is also a worldview. It, too, is animated by its text and traditions. When followed most faithfully, it is both a theological system and a political ideology that promotes a theocratic regime for every population under its authority. The entailments of human dignity (e.g., freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion) are suppressed under the requirements of the Qur’anic faith. Hijabs and shari’a are not optional among the faithful or among those who live within the boundaries of the faithful.

Europe, and the rest of the West, faces a pressing challenge, therefore. Nature abhors the vacuum created by inattention to the moral source of our solidarity. Islam has stepped up, ready to fill that gap. Thus, in our view, the West will either succumb to resurgent Islam for lack of sufficient moral resources to resist, or she must re-embrace the vitality of the tradition that has grounded her narrative, practices, institutions, and resilience. There are no other choices, and Europe has become the grand laboratory in which this experiment is being executed.

We are engaged in a battle of ideas—a clash of worldviews. Our future, and more importantly, the future of our children’s children, will not be won or lost with swords or landmines, machetes or nuclear missiles. It will only be won by the vital re-appropriation of the tradition we have been bequeathed.

May Providence, vigilance, and steadfast resolve be ours.
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11 In his book de Spectaculis, for example, Tertullian (died c. 220), devoted an entire chapter to the games, enjoining Christians not to attend—powerful testimony to Christianity’s humanitarian impulse. Lecky opined that, “There is scarcely any other single reform so important in the moral history of mankind as the suppression of the gladiatorial shows, a feat must be almost exclusively ascribed to the Christian church” (2:34). Happily, the gladiatorial games in the East were finally terminated under Christian emperor Theodosius I (378-395), and in the West they were ended in 404 under his son Honorius.
For instance, St. Paul addressed one of his letters to “Philemon our beloved fellow worker and Apphia our sister…” (Philem. 1-2). Phoebe was called a “deaconess” (Rom. 16:1-2, Jerusalem Bible), and Priscilla was described as a “fellow worker” (Rom. 16:3).

Sadly, during the third through fifth centuries women did not fare so well. Clement of Alexandria (died c. 215) taught that women should blush because they were female; Tertullian (died c. 220) blamed Eve for the fall of man, and thereby the death of Christ; and Cyril of Jerusalem (died c. 387) maintained that women may pray with moving lips, but their voices should not be heard.

At the same time, women were protected from polygyny in Christian cultures. Just as Jesus' view of marriage supported monogamy, so the nearly universal affirmation among Christians down the ages has been that marriage consists of one man and one woman, in a one-flesh relationship, for life (cf., Matt. 19:5). Our own age can give ample testimony of the trauma associated with the abandonment of that maxim.

Lecky, 2:69. In his *Divine Institutes*, Lactantius declared that there were no slaves in God’s eyes. In the fourth century Chrysostom preached that “in Christ Jesus there is no slave. . . . Therefore it is not necessary to have a slave. . . . Buy them, and after you have taught them some skill by which they can maintain themselves, set them free” (*Homily 40 on 1 Corinthians 10*). Cited in Richard N. Longenecker, *New Testament Social Ethics for Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 64. Augustine forthrightly maintained in *The City of God* (19.15) that slavery was a product of sin and not God’s plan.

When, under Marcus Aurelius and Commodus in the second century AD, the Christians were accused of rebellion because they would not embrace the divinity of the civil ruler, a Christian apologist called Athenagoras pointed out that their fidelity to the one true God did not mean rebellion against the emperor. Declared Athenagoras to his earthly rulers:

> And now do you, who are entirely in everything, by nature and by education, upright, and moderate, and benevolent, and worthy of your rule, now that I have disposed of the several accusations, and proved that we are pious, and gentle, and temperate in spirit, bend your royal head in approval. For who are more deserving to obtain the things they ask, than those who, like us, pray for your government, that you may, as is most equitable, receive the kingdom, son from father, and that your empire may receive increase and addition, all men becoming subject to your sway? And this is also for our advantage, that we may lead a peaceable and quiet life, and may ourselves readily perform all that is commanded us.


An early Baptist in America, Roger Williams, argued over against the Puritans in the early 17th century that citizens should be free to follow their own convictions in religious matters. His founding of Providence, Rhode Island, was an effort to establish a community based on, among other things, liberty of conscience.

Less than one hundred years later, John Leland, a prominent Baptist minister and acquaintance of Thomas Jefferson’s wrote: “Every man must give account of himself to God, and therefore every man ought to be at liberty to serve God in a way that he can best reconcile to his conscience. If government can answer for individuals at the day of judgment, let men be controlled by it in religious matters;

On January 1, 1802, Jefferson wrote his famous letter to the Danbury Baptist Association in which he declared: “Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should ‘make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,’ thus building a wall of separation between church and State.” See Thomas Jefferson, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (H. W. Derby, 1859), 113.

Like Luther, Mr. Jefferson did not believe it was the role of the civil magistrate to dictate either a person’s religious practices or conscience.
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