



*Steven Murphy / CHOICE GB / Earthism*

## **Human Rights – Our Arrogance**

Throughout history, humans have deployed a wide range of societal frameworks, each leaving an indelible mark on civilisation. In recent times, none has been more influential — or more unquestioned — than Human Rights. A small group of self-styled saviours has assumed the authority to confer rights and entitlements on others, yet their mandate is rarely challenged. Are these decisions rooted in democratic consent? Divine sanction? Or are they simply a carefully staged spectacle designed to pacify the public, a theatrical performance that concentrates power while pretending to protect the masses.

And nowhere is this more evident than in the European Convention on Human Rights.

A document written by humans, interpreted by humans, and enforced by a court run entirely by humans — all of whom behave as though they possess some superior moral insight. They act as if they speak on behalf of all humanity, as if their judgement is universal, unquestionable, and blessed by one god or another. But strip away the ceremony and the robes and the solemn language, and the truth is painfully simple:

- Humans gave themselves these rights.
- Humans wrote the rules.
- Humans appointed themselves the guardians of morality.

There is nothing divine about it, nothing natural, nothing inevitable. Just humans granting other humans the right to do as they please.

To understand how Human Rights became a tool of control, you only need to look at the broader European landscape. Across the EU and much of the rest of Europe, a particular political culture has taken hold — one that thrives on moral superiority, institutional power, and the belief that it alone knows what is best for everyone else.

Human Rights have become its favourite instrument. The ECHR didn't emerge from public demand, it wasn't born from grassroots pressure, it wasn't the result of millions of people begging for salvation. It arrived fully formed, wrapped in ceremony, presented as enlightened doctrine, and immediately positioned above criticism. A ready-made structure of power, imposed from above, not grown from below.

This is how influence spreads, not through debate, but through institutional certainty. Not through consent, but through bureaucratic inevitability, not through democracy, but through theatre. Power has always relied on performance. Dress the actors, build the stage, add ceremony, and suddenly ordinary people become unquestionable authorities.

Robes, titles, chambers, rituals — all the ingredients of a carefully crafted spectacle. A performance designed to create the illusion of wisdom, superiority, and divine sanction. A tried and tested method of controlling large populations throughout history.

It's all in the ceremony, because without the costumes, without the rituals, without the solemn choreography, what are they really?. Just humans, pretending to be something more. Humans granting themselves the authority to decide what everyone else is entitled to. The ceremony creates obedience, theatre creates legitimacy and the performance creates power.

And of course, all of this moral grandstanding happens from the comfort of their chambers — chambers paid for by the taxpayer. Another service we never asked for, never voted for, and never required, yet we fund it all the same. A court that hands out rights like confetti, yet never pays the price for any of them.

They sit in publicly funded offices, protected by publicly funded security, collecting publicly funded salaries, and looking forward to publicly funded pensions — all while telling the rest of us what we must tolerate, who we must support, and what we must pay for.

A good job if you can get it. They enjoy the luxury of consequence-free generosity, they can afford to be benevolent because we foot the bill. They can afford to be compassionate because we absorb the cost, they can afford to hand out rights because we carry the burden.

What makes this entire structure even more absurd is the belief — spoken or implied — that these rights and entitlements come from some higher authority. As if one god or another whispered into the ears of lawmakers and judges, granting them the divine permission to hand out privileges without consequence.

Because let's be honest, none of these people have to pay for the rights they distribute. They hand out entitlements that cost them nothing:

- rights for criminals
- rights for the idle
- rights for the destructive
- rights for anyone who demands them

And every one of these “rights” comes with a price — a price paid not by the court, not by the lawmakers, but by everyone else. It's easy to be generous when someone else is footing the bill.

One of the most astonishing features of modern Human Rights is the belief that even the most dangerous individuals — rapists, murderers, terrorists, paedophiles — are entitled to the same protections as the people they harm. We have created a system where those who destroy lives are shielded by rights they have shown no respect for. Where the violent are protected from consequence, where the cruel are defended by legal structures they openly reject.

This is not justice, this is not societal progression. It's the arrogance of a species that believes morality is a performance, not a responsibility. The entitlement doesn't stop with the violent, we have extended unconditional rights to those who contribute nothing — these non-contributing individuals sit idle, consume resources, demand support, and expect others to carry the burden.

Human Rights have become a shield for:

- the unwilling
- the unproductive
- the permanently dependent
- individuals who take but never give

We have normalised the idea, that simply being human and alive entitles you to endless support, regardless of effort, contribution, or impact. This is not compassion, this is not progress. It is a system that rewards dependency and punishes contribution. And then there is the most absurd entitlement of all, the human right to destroy the very planet that sustains us. We have granted ourselves the right to:

- consume without limit
- pollute without consequence
- extract without restraint
- reproduce without thought
- degrade ecosystems beyond repair

We behave as if the Earth is our theme park, one that is obligated to absorb our waste, our excess, and our irresponsibility — as if the planet itself is bound by our Human Rights legislation.

No other species behaves this way, no other group claims the right to destroy its own habitat, or is stupid enough to do it. We believe ourselves to be intellectually advanced compared to the other species we share this space with, what we are doing is not just ignorant, it is arrogance on a planetary scale.

Human Rights, as currently framed, operate on a remarkable assumption, that simply by being born human, you are entitled to everything whilst being accountable and responsible for nothing. We have created a system where:

- the dangerous are protected
- the idle are supported
- the destructive are excused

And all of it is justified under the banner of “rights”, we have built a culture where individuals can:

- sit around
- consume resources
- produce nothing
- demand everything

And expect someone else to pay, we defend this as if it were sacred, untouchable. Strip away the legal language and the moral posturing, and you are left with a simple question — one society refuses to ask. If your only output is harm, dependency, waste, or destruction, what is the point of your existence?.

This is not cruelty, this is not ideology, it is reality. A society cannot survive when many take and few contribute, a species cannot endure when entitlement replaces effort. But most important of all, a planet cannot sustain a population that believes it has the right to destroy it.

## Conclusion

Human Rights, as they stand today, are not a reflection of moral progress. They are a reflection of human arrogance — a self-awarded entitlement system that disconnects humans from consequence, responsibility, and reality.

We created these rights, we enforce them and treat them as sacred. We use them to justify societal behaviours that no other species has the luxury of, that no other species has the intellectual ability or arrogance to implement.

If we continue down this route, if humanity continues to grant itself unconditional entitlement without accountability, the collapse will not be philosophical — it will be practical. Humans and every species that we share the Earth with will suffer the consequences.

*See **CHOICE GB** - Earthism / Earth Tax*

