

Human rights are the 1st casualty in any conflict.

Outline:-

## I. Introduction

**Thesis statement:** Human rights are the <sup>casualty</sup> ~~1st~~ <sup>first</sup> casualty in any conflict, indeed. Although it is said that changes in international socio-political structures have changed the conflicts into a positive <sup>phenomenon</sup> that ultimately protect the individual rights, situations in various domestic and international conflicts revealed the fallacy of this claim.

Thesis statement needs improvement.

## I.I. Importance of human rights

## III. Human rights are the 1st casualty in a conflict;

A. Compromise on political rights of people during domestic political rivalries

a. Suffering of common masses in ~~between~~ PMLN and PTI <sup>rivalry</sup> rivalry

B. Compromise on political liberty of people during international conflicts:

b. US president assume dictatorial powers during wars: A. Lincoln + F.D. Roosevelt

C. Humanitarian bss during direct conflict;

Always write in full form whenever you introduce an acronym.

right to life compromised:

C. Thousands of civilians killed in Afghan War

D. Minority rights of people are compromised in case of mass genocide during conflicts:

d. Holocaust of Jews during WW2

E. Basic needs and rights of women are compromised:

e. Suffering of pregnant women due to **unavailability** of medical services in torn Palestine

F. Freedom to practice a religion or ideology is compromised:

f. Religious persecution of Muslims of Palestine by Israeli Jews; Zionism

IV. Why it is said that Human rights are not compromised during conflicts:

A. Domestic political conflicts; a **beauty** of democracy that actually works in favour of common masses.

a. Rivalry of democratic party **and** Republican Party in the USA.

B. Conflicts of modern international socio-political system actually **work** in favour of economic rights of people:

b. US-China rivalry and opportunities of economic development.

C. Some conflicts are actually a freedom fight; basic right of masses:

C. Kashmir cause

### Fallacy

V. Falacy of claim of protection of human rights during conflicts:

A. Domestic political structures actually favour the demagogues by allowing them to manipulate the common masses:

a. Manipulation of <sup>Common</sup> Indian people by anti-muslim demagogue of BJP.

B. Modern socio-political structures actually protect the state's interest, not the interests of common masses:

b. Trump's policies of protective tariff against China & inflation caused by it.

C. In epistemic fights of so called freedom fighters, common masses suffer:

c. Extremist organisations in middle east causing damage to the lives of common people.

### Conclusion

"If only you could peer behind the wagon  
that we flung him in...

If you could see his white face  
hanging like devil is sick of sin...  
blood come if only you could hear  
blood come gagging through foath  
currupted lungs...

Obscene as cancer...

Vile as cad...

Only then, my friend, you would not  
have dare to tell the children ~~about~~  
arduent for some desperate glory, the  
old lie 'Dulce est decui, pro patria  
mori (It is sweet and proper to  
die for one's country.)'"

These beautiful lines by Lawrence Ferlinghetti  
deeply highlights the misery and sufferings  
caused by the dreadful wars and conflicts.

These avalanches and conflicts, may it be  
ranging from minute political avalanches to  
the large international conflicts of history, cause  
highly heavy distraction to the lives of  
people and compromise the basic human  
rights. Instances of dictatorships, minority  
and religious persecution, women's suffering  
and mass genocides are common examples  
of the havoc caused by any conflict.

Subject verb disagreement

Is it a widely held opinion or the opinion of few?

However, due to the changing socio-political dynamics of the world, it is ~~widely~~ widely held opinion that conflicts actually are a struggle for protection of human rights and have a positive impact on human lives in a long run, although the deep observation of situation oppose this view. In fact human rights are the 1st casualty in any conflict. Although some people consider conflicts favourable for human rights in long run, current situations of various domestic and international conflicts prove the validity of this claim.

First of all, it is highly important to recognize the importance of human rights. In modern era, due to increased awareness, the importance of human rights have been enhanced. Various international organizations and non-governmental organizations have assumed their role as a guardian of human rights. UNHRC is one of the most important agencies of the United Nation that works for the protection of human rights. These efforts highlight highlight the increasing importance of human rights.

To begin with, there are number of arguments that prove that human rights

are the 1st causality in any conflict. First of all, the compassive ~~canon~~ basic needs caused by domestic political rivalries strongly favour this kind of political polarization in any society leads to the two jaw and order situations and hinders in smooth working of the state. This, in turn, causes uninterruption of in the provision of basic needs of people. This situation is very evident in politically fractured society of Pakistan where rivalry between the two political parties; namely, PTI, and PMLN, has heavily disrupted the economic machinery of the state due to day-to-day strikes and protests. This has resulted into increased inflation and unemployment rate in Pakistan. Thus, it can be said the domestic political rivalries can hurt the basic interests of people.

Similar political rivalries are also visible at international level between the two or more states. These ~~conf~~ rivalries sometimes lead towards direct conflict which can result into imposition of emergency and martial law in participating states. This allow the head of the state to assume dictatorial powers that ultimately result in

comports to the political liberty of the people. From history of the United States, it is evident that the presidents were used to assume dictatorial powers during the conflicts. Periods of Abraham Lincoln during civil war and powers of F.D. Roosevelt during World War 2 are the best examples of it. Thus, it is evident that state's conflicts allow the access to ~~violation~~ the basic right of political liberty of people.

Do not repeat "evident" again and again. Diversify your vocabulary.

International conflicts and wars not only affect the people politically but also affect them directly by causing damage to their lives, houses and livings. Eruption of direct conflict in area also affect the local population by destroying their homes & lives. This situation was very much visible in war torn Afghanistan during the last two decades. Thousands of civilians were killed and millions were displaced in the last 2 decades due to the then ongoing war on terror. Hence, one can say <sup>that</sup> international conflicts cause violation of basic right to life of humans.

In addition, in any conflict, minor or huge, minorities are the most favorite targets of the fighting parties. This situation is more visible in partitioning the <sup>so</sup> ~~partitioned~~ domestic

Evident  
Clear  
Apparent  
Obvious

8

conflicts, where one community is trying to suppress the other through use of force. This argument can be backed by the Holocaust of Jews in Europe during the WW2, where fascist Hitler and his forces committed one of the biggest genocide of the history. Thus, it is evident by the facts that conflicts result in violation of minority rights.

Just like the minorities, the second most class to suffer from these conflicts is the women. All people are aware the difficulties faced by women due to their physiological processes. Wars and conflict make this world a living hell for the women by aggravating these problems, as wars limit the provision of necessary medical services. These sufferings of women are more visible in ongoing Israel-Palestine conflict. The reports claim that millions of women are thousands and million of pregnant women are facing threat of death due to non-availability of required medical assistance. Hence, it is evident that women rights are at risk in any conflict.

Lastly, the situation of a direct conflict allow the rulers, carrying a particular ideology to limit the religious practices of others and to cause the forceful conversions. In war times, the rulers



have dictatorial like powers and are in position to impose any decision, no matter how much it is disliked by people. The religious persecutions of Palestinian Muslims by the Zionist leaders of Israel, despite the opposition of some non-Zionist Israel, is the best example of it. These types of incidents indicate that religious freedom of people is hindered during conflicts.

Although the above gives arguments strongly favouring the idea that human rights are the first casualty of any conflict, it is equally important to consider the opinion of opposers. They claim that current socio-political dynamics make conflicts a tool for protection of human rights instead of violating them. They base their arguments on number of arguments.

Their first argument is that domestic political institutions are a benefit of democracy, that actually facilitate in securing political rights of people. Political differences and rivalries broaden the people's choice for electing their representatives and in this way, they can practice their democratic right more effectively by electing representatives who are synchronizing with their

ideology. This situation is clearly manifested in the political environment of the USA, where rivalry of Democratic and Republican party have facilitated the democratic process, as people are efficiently using their democratic right to elect the party of choice. Hence it seems logical to believe that domestic conflicts actually protect the democratic rights of people.

Secondly, they claim that changes in international socio-political structures have changed the past negative meaning of conflict into positive meaning of healthy competition and reciprocal growth. Positive competition allow states to perform more efficiently to outperform the rival state, as modern conflicts are economic conflicts. US-China economic rivalry is the best manifestation of it where a competition to outperform has boosted the economic development, and eventually provided economic security to the people. Thus, it can be said that a positive economic competition is not a bad thing for human rights in long run.

lastly, the critic claim that some conflicts are actually fight for the freedom, that is one of the most primary human rights. In plenty

of cases of conflicts, rivalry is basically based upon the hindrance in the freedom of a nation by a dominant fascist group. This argument is often backed by the struggle of Kashmiris to gain their freedom from the fascist India, which is depriving their freedom through various tools of force and coercion. So, the conflict caused by fight for freedom is actually trying to secure freedom instead of ~~him~~ violating it.

While it is important to acknowledge the above concerns of the critics, they have overlooked certain socio-political facts that clearly indicate that conflicts actually hurt human rights.

Their first argument that political rivalry is actually a beauty of democracy is nullified by the factor that it is actually a manipulation by demagogues to fool the common masses.

Their second argument that modern socio-political structures allow the rival state to boost economic development is dismissed by the fact that these rivalries actually work in favour of the state's interest at the cost of suffering of common masses. Trump's policy of protective tariff and its effect on

Paragraph is too small

World's economy is the best example.

Lastly, this third argument have overlooked the fact that it is the common masses who suffer in the egoistic fights of major stakeholders. Freedom fighters of middle east, i.e. ISIS and others are causing more damage than good to the poor people. Thus it is wrong to say that conflicts caused by freedom fighter are playing any positive role regarding human rights.

In conclusion, the ~~human~~ common masses **conflict** are the first to suffer in any conflicts.

In wars of ego and state interest, the human rights are compromised as a 1st casualty of war and conflict. This start from simple political rivalries of local rulers where basic needs of masses are compromised. This ultimately followed by bigger international conflicts which results in violation of right to life, right to property, right to vote, women rights, minority rights and other rights of minute importance. Some people observe this view by making modern socio-political dynamics of conflict, but deep observations of facts show that they are wrong in their approach.