

Religious duties and human rights: a meeting point?

José Luis Llaquet

Universidad Loyola Andalucía (Spain)

Abstract:

Traditional historiography has highlighted the important role of religion in the creation of human rights. However, some traditional religious bodies put obstacles to the contents of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* by the UN from the autonomy of human rights respects God, secularizing the world.

Why do these religions claim to protect human rights but then put obstacles to its regulation? This is a complex question. Traditional religions still often use old concepts, and therefore have difficulties in adapting to the new social challenges; unlike religions-ups, which are much more malleable.

Moreover, traditional religions have promoted alternative statements, such as the *Islamic Declaration* of El Cairo, in 1990, and the *Draft Declaration* adopted at the 8th Assembly of the World Council of Churches of Harare in 1998. Also, they have regulated the religious rights of its members and, in the case of State of the Vatican, the *Draft Fundamental Lex Ecclesiae* (1966-1971), and the *Basic Law of the State of Vatican City* (2005).

In my opinion, religious rights are conceived from religious obligations of the faithful; on the contrary, human rights generate obligations that accompany these rights.

Is there a meeting point between the generic and global rights of the humanity and the local and individual religious rights of faithful members? I consider there are two meeting points. Firstly, the concept of the "Glocal" entity (global + local) of the fundamental rights of citizens may balance the human rights and the religious rights with social realism. The fundamental rights "glocalized" could contextualize both, accommodating the human rights and the religious rights in the secular society. Secondly, conscientious objections have to be adapted to current needs. These objections should not be weapons of the rebels against the legality of the State but a legal instrument of the State itself in its service to society. While the State currently protects social diversity and legal equality, social dynamics require open legal means to unite sensibilities in one common project.