

### 3.2.2.3.2.71 US human rights

The US is a great pretender when it comes to human rights.

They present themselves as champions of human rights.

What human rights?

The right of free speech? They favor this specifically for members of oppositionist elites in Third World countries. However, if “free speech” threatens the US, or if it violates their Christian “values”, then it will be curtailed by law, or at least there will be an almost unbearable level of harassment by US law enforcement agencies.

Opposition politicians (usually members of competing elites) can advocate the overthrow of established governments or state systems. In their own countries. In other countries. They will be protected by a US interpretation of the human right of free speech.

But if this kind of free speech propagates hatred of America, as does the free speech in many Islamic religious schools, than it may violate US law that classifies such free speech as preparatory to terrorist acts against the US, even if it happens abroad.

Or how about free speech on the sexual liberation of young adults below the age of 18. One would have to be very careful indeed not to violate US child pornography laws, or laws that prohibit the interstate solicitation of minors for sexual acts (and the use of the Internet for such purposes, even if it happens on the other end of the globe).

Apart from free speech (as long as it doesn't violate US security interests), another human right the US concerns itself with, is the human right to worship a god, or hold religious services. The US claims this right primarily for Christian groupings in far away countries, especially if these groupings are politically sympathetic to the US.

The US obviously is not inclined to advocate the religious rights of

the Taliban, or those Mormons who still advocate polygamy, or, hypothetically, religious sects that were radically pro-sexual.

The US government's advocacy of human rights is, obviously, hypocritical and highly selective.

But free speech for opposition elites and Christian fundamentalists are fringe human rights.

The primary human right that a state would have to protect would be the human right to live in a society free of physical violence against its members.

And when I say physical violence I primarily mean: murder, mugging, physical injury, physical threats. I do not mean construed cases of rape and sexual violence.

I do want to emphasize this because the US, especially their NGO alliances of Christian fundamentalists and feminazis are experts in twisting issues and highjacking them for their anti-sexual right-wing agendas.

Therefore, if one discusses the human right of protection from physical harm with Christian fundamentalists and feminazis, they come up all in favor of this. And they demand the implementation, no, not of the protection of ordinary people from murder and mugging, but of unmarried women from being approached sexually (construed cases of sexual violence), and of 2-week embryos from being aborted.