

# An inspiring study of the final narrative of the "Declaration of Human Rights" based on the Western philosophical system and non-Western philosophical and legal traditions

Forough Mirparsa

Master of Jurisprudence and Fundamentals of Islamic Law

*Corresponding author:* Forough Mirparsa

**ABSTRACT:** The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted on December 10, 1948, by forty-eight votes in favor and eight abstentions. From the very beginning of its formation, it provoked important controversies and revealed many fundamental differences in the values and cultures of nations. These conflicts and differences eventually took shape in the two realms of "civilized" and "intra-civilized", and the three realms of "philosophical", "historical" and "practical". One of the most enduring issues was on what basis human rights should be declared. The history of the Declaration makes it clear that the issues discussed at the time and the views that inspired the final version of the Declaration of Human Rights were essentially related to a Western philosophical system. Non-Western philosophical and legal traditions - which may have raised different or complementary ideals of human rights - were seldom considered in negotiations and consultations. Even those members of the Commission on Human Rights who represented non-Western countries often studied in the West themselves or in institutions that represented Western powers and ideas in their own country. Thus, although occasional references were made to non-Western traditions such as Confucianism or Islam, references to Western traditions dominated the polls that led to the final draft of the Universal Declaration.

**Keywords:** Inspiring, Human Rights, Western Philosophy, Philosophical Traditions, Non-Western Law.

## INTRODUCTION

The first and most important internal civil controversy over the "Declaration of Human Rights" concerned the field of Western cultures; But these same conflicts gradually spread to other biosocial systems and traditions as the signs of Western culture and thought spread. This is precisely why we are now witnessing important philosophical, historical, and practical "civilized" debates in Islamic societies, and over the important material of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In this article, after referring to the internal civil conflicts of the West, we deal with the semiotic analysis of this situation in Islamic societies.

### **Western principles and conflicts**

Western civil disputes over the principles and materials of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights can be categorized into four basic categories: the divine basis of human rights; Natural rights; Situational rights; And Marxist ideas. Each of these views had specific images and recommendations on the material of the proclamation. Divine Rights: During the Human Rights Commission's polls, philosophical differences became apparent when the question of whether or not to cite God or nature was raised as the source of the rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Dutch, along with several European and non-European countries, tried to cite the draft declaration in reference to God during the Third Committee. The representative of the Netherlands in the speech of the General Assembly said:

The proclamation does not mention the divine origin of man and the immortality of his soul. In fact, the source of all these rights is God Almighty himself, who has placed a great responsibility on those who have demanded these rights. Ignoring this connection is like separating the plant from its roots, or building a house without a foundation (3).

However, this view was never adopted; But the divine reading of human rights remained one of the most important readings in the history of the United Nations. The Islamic reading of human rights, and the challenges and intra-civilizational perspectives of this view in the Islamic world, are among these perspectives.

**Natural rights:** The inherent rights of the human person and related concepts are a product of the tradition of "natural rights" which is said to have been the presumed and dominant basis of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This concept of human rights is the result of a theory developed by a group of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century political philosophers called the school of contract. The first article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is apparently taken from Rousseau's statement that "man is created free; But he is enslaved everywhere" (4). Rousseau agreed on the natural freedom of man with most of the theorists of the school of natural law; But what makes Rousseau stand out is that he considers this natural freedom inseparable from man and believes that no one has the right to deprive man of his freedom under any circumstances. According to Rousseau, "to renounce one's freedom means to renounce one's human status, to renounce human rights and even one's duties. Such a renunciation is incompatible with human nature (5).

**Status law:** Along with the theory of "natural rights", a very different view emerged on the principles of human rights, which demanded that only the wishes and actions of human beings and governments be the source of rights. This view, which showed a greater propensity for rationalism, believed that human beings, like governments, are by no means bound by external laws, but voluntarily and rationally accept to limit their behavior in a limited and orderly manner to the best of their ability. Individual and national enjoy. According to this view, governments make it possible to determine the scope and scope of human rights by observing the restrictions they impose on their actions (6).

**Marxist law:** In the philosophical arena, the Marxist conception of human rights was based not on the individual but on the collective. According to Marxists, the attainment of economic prosperity was a precondition for the actual enjoyment of civil and political rights. Thus, human rights, according to Marxists, were conceivable only in the context of the needs and rights of society. Marxists, on the one hand, emphasized the rights of minorities, which required the union of individual and collective rights, and, on the other hand, prioritized the realization of a level of economic equality over the granting of civil and political rights (7).

However, the above four controversies reflect the Western civilizational differences and interpretations of human rights, and have also fueled the debate and analysis of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, its detailed material, and the hierarchy of priorities and preferences of this international document. Although these conflicts are important in the current conditions of the world, their pursuit is of secondary importance due to the religious-political situation of our society and is somewhat far from us and the vital issues of our society. What is important for us is to seek the status of the Declaration of Human Rights in the Islamic intellectual-political space and to link this situation with our current destiny. In the following lines, we will evaluate this issue.

### ***Islam, the West and human rights; Civil disputes***

As we have seen, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is based on the foundations of Western culture, especially the philosophy of natural rights. Liberal human beings in the West, as John Rawls rightly explains, have three basic aspects: first, a democratic government based on a rational constitution, which serves the basic interests of the people; Second, citizens who are united by a string of "commonalities"; And third, a moral nature (8). According to Rawls, the first aspect is a legal and institutional matter; The second cultural aspect, and finally the third aspect, requires a strict conformity with the political concept of right and justice (9).

A study of the various articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights shows the foundation and commitment of this Declaration to the above anthropology. Although many attempts have been made to separate human rights from the anthropology of Western liberal philosophy and to extend human rights to other socio-intellectual traditions, this was not the case in 1948 (the year the Declaration was adopted). At this time, the link between the proclamation of human rights and Western liberalism was evident. The representative of the Saudi government in the third preliminary committee of the Human Rights Commission, considering this attachment, considered some of the provisions of the declaration as a violation of the cultural principles of Islamic states. The following excerpt from the official report on Saudi Arabia's interpretations during the discussions of the Third Committee shows some important contrasts between the Declaration and Islamic traditions (10).

The representative of Saudi Arabia called for the reminder that most of the authors of the Declaration have considered only the accepted norms of the West and have neglected the older civilizations; Civilizations that are no longer at all in the empirical stage and have proven their wisdom over the centuries. The "Committee" should not

have declared the supremacy of one civilization over all other civilizations or set uniform norms for all countries of the world (11).

The representative of Saudi Arabia meant the ancient civilizations, of course, the Islamic civilization. He mentioned many civilizational differences in matters related to freedom of belief, conversion, marriage regulations, and so on. Some Arab states were also skeptical of the provisions of Articles 18 and 19 (on freedom of opinion and conversion). Such a provision was thought to be interpreted in such a way as to guarantee the right to a new religion and a change in religious beliefs, in any form, in Islamic countries and for Christian religious-political missionaries. But despite these concerns, the proposed amendment by these governments, especially Saudi Arabia, was always rejected by an overwhelming majority.

In this article, we are not looking for the details of these abrasions and denials. But what is important from the point of view of the present article is the contradiction of the Islamic traditions prevalent at that time with the general taste of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, on the one hand, and the imbalance of power between the representatives of Islamic and Western governments, on the other. The extension of Western principles, regardless of other intellectual traditions, including Islamic, was finally adopted in 1948. From those years until now, and even before that, from the collapse of the Ottoman Caliphate (1923-4) until today, many changes have taken place in the field of life, thought and theology of Muslims. Many of the principles and perceptions on which, for example, the positions of the Saudi representative in the Third Committee of the Human Rights Commission have been based have now been challenged and virtually marginalized. Instead, newer views of Islam have emerged that are more or less in line with the taste of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. How did these developments take place and what are the nature of new Islamic interpretations of human rights and the provisions of the Declaration and how have they been formed? To understand the importance of these questions, a semiotic review of the evolution of Islamic thought and law in the last one hundred years is of great theoretical and practical value. We will deal with this point in the following.

### ***Human rights in contemporary Islam; Intra-cultural developments***

Semiotic reflections on the relationship between human rights and contemporary Islamic thought are of great use. Semiotics explains the process of turning human rights into an "issue" for Islamic traditions. It also helps to understand the currents and intercultural disputes of Muslims about human rights and reveals the nature of the abrasions and endless denials of the proclamation.

The reality is that we live in times that are not our time. The language of this time is not the language of our traditions. Therefore, we are neither the determinant of events nor the designer of its "issues". Muslims now live in a world that is far removed from their historical traditions. In the last one hundred years, debates have entered the Islamic society through various channels, none of which has arisen from within our traditions. The concept of freedom and human rights is one of these topics; Discussions that are outside the scope of our traditions and are "irrelevant" to them. Mohammad Talebi, a contemporary Tunisian thinker, writes:

Today, this issue has become a "matter of time", especially with regard to Islam; Especially after the realization of a kind of "quasi-consensus" that has been reached on human rights in the second half of the twentieth century. But religious discourse remains unchanged: while the gap between current behavior and the traditional doctrinal position instilled in religious circles, mosques, and schools is increasing every day, the "issue" remains fundamentally vague and suspended at the principal level; And as long as there is this "Manichaeian" dichotomy between the common practice "darkness" on the one hand, and the "light" of teachings that are often out of date in all or most of the Islamic world, on the other, it is not surprising that every day Shocking storms in our communities, and the spread of violence that goes as far as threatening our lives. For this reason, this "problem" must be treated appropriately (12).

Talebi emphasizes that the stock of traditional interpretations is dwindling, emphasizing that the Islamic world needs a convincing religious-civilizational discourse; An honest Islamic discourse and at the same time an "alternative to tradition", which balances the two sides of the rope, fidelity to the religious heritage and companionship with the planet of modernity. (13) This new Islamic discourse is, of course, taking shape, and as a result, a new link is emerging between religious reformism and human rights. We try to follow this discourse development in the field of theology by relying on semiotic concepts.

### ***Semiotics and semantic systems of Muslims***

The main premise of semiotics is that every culture - and, of course, Islamic culture - is born of a set of symbols that give meaning to the lives of Muslims in organized relations with one another. Toshi Hiko Izutsu is one of the first

scholars to pursue his research on the Qur'an with this view. (14) In his and other scholars' view, Islamic culture is a text-based culture (the Qur'an), and other sources of Muslim knowledge - including intellect, experience, and intuition - are all defined by the authority of the text.

Thus, it is not difficult to imagine that the Qur'an contains a set of words - signs - that are organized around the word "Allah". Tawhid is the highest focal word that rules the whole conceptual system of the Qur'an, and all the key words of the Qur'an are gathered around this highest concept. But all this never means that the semantic system of the Qur'an is rigid and unopened. This is precisely why we are always aware of the existence or deformation of semiotic systems and related to the macro semantic system of the Qur'an (15).

It seems that the Qur'an, in spite of its general and all-encompassing address, speaks to the people of every age and history in a special way; Because the flow of the text in history is always mediated by one or more interpretations that arise from the "rationality" that governs each period. Izutsu is rightly aware of this situation and tries to see the semantic construction of the two independently of each other by breaking the definite connection and denying the complete harmony between religious texts and Islamic sciences. Izutsu, for example, compares the traditional words of Muslims with the lexical system of the Qur'an, and writes in an attempt to generalize his evaluation to other Muslim systems of knowledge:

If, on the one hand, theological words are, in a sense, the continuation and expansion of the Qur'anic words, and for this reason, it derives most of its materials from the Qur'an, and yet, on the other hand, by organizing all the materials according to the principle of organization And to construct them is an independent imaginary apparatus, then the difference between the two must be sought mainly in the "relative" aspect of the key terms. But differences are, in many cases, very precise and difficult to recognize; Especially if the correct words are used almost in the same context (16).

Izutsu's phrase has important semiotic points and results: First, Islamic knowledge, in that it derives its words and most of its material from the Qur'an, should be considered a semiotic extension of the Qur'an. Second, in terms of semiotic organization, these sciences have a distinct infrastructure from the macro-semantic construction of the Qur'an, and it is necessary to define each of these sciences as imaginary devices independent of the Qur'an. The third point, which is the result of the second point, is that by accepting the independence of the semantic system of the Qur'an and Islamic sciences, one should be sensitive and curious about the differences and relative differences of key and often similar terms. This is where the importance of semiotic analysis comes into play. These analyzes try to identify the semantic and semantic system of life that are produced within each discourse by evaluating the relative value and weight of concepts in two different semantic systems, such as the arrangement of signs and their precedence and lag in each sign system.

Now, if we can develop Izutsu's logic, the relation of the above to the subject of human rights becomes clearer: The school of contract is. From a semiotic point of view, freedom and other rights defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are among the key features of liberal philosophy and the school of contract, which have been born and appeared within the "semantic magnet" of this philosophy. Theoretically, what is the relationship between human rights and the semantic system of the Qur'an, on the one hand, and the imaginary systems or semantic domains considered in the traditional Muslim sciences, on the other?

Here we are warned not to neglect to know the type and nature of the relations between semiotic or semantic systems; Because the relations between sign systems have special and delicate rules. Explain that every semantic system has three basic characteristics:

key words. Semiotic analysis, whether in the Qur'an or Islamic tradition (traditional knowledge) or liberal human rights, never means research into the whole vocabulary of these semantic systems, but only research into those important words and signs that seem to play a decisive role in the characterization of the sign. And they have the dominant thought in a semantic system and have found a hegemonic position in relation to other signs. These are the key words that determine the characteristics of the whole device.

Key words or signs in any semantic system, especially in historical-human semantic systems, are usually divided into two categories: first, static and permanent words which, despite relative changes in their meanings, are "simultaneous" and coexist with other words in a system. ; And second, historically variable words that have a "temporal" status and appear at a moment in the historical life of a semantic system become active and concentrated words for a period of time and may, after a while, reach a state of coma or permanent death.

A word or a focal sign. All key words, in any semantic system, are important signs; But among the many key signs, the word or sign always finds a focal position, which in other systems may not provide such a position for such a sign. The concept of "freedom" or "faith" in Western philosophy and the Islamic world is one of these words. In this way, a group of important words around the keywords are provided. The focal word assumes the unifying role of

concepts, and other words act as symbols of diversity, individuality, and distinction. If we consider the concept of "freedom" to be the central concept of human rights, other words and articles of the Declaration - such as the right to equality between men and women, the right to change religion, the right to rule and governance, and the personalities derived from the central concept. The design of this conception has important implications for contemporary Islamic civilization.

Semantic field. Each semantic system, although it loses some of the clarity of its boundaries in its circles, nevertheless has a distinct semantic field in which the arrangement of keywords and the transformation of one of them into a focal position is the result of the activity and magnetic attractions of this field. . Thus, each semantic field is an independent magnetic field that, by its very nature, belongs entirely to its own vocabulary. The semantic field in this sense is a regular system or orderly system; The organization is the key words and ideas.

The nature of what is called a magnetic field or semantic device requires that if an important point in it changes or moves, in all the remaining parts of that device, a reflection of that change and displacement is felt (17) and the internal structure of the semantic system undergoes a kind of transformation. It becomes. It seems that the semantic system of the Qur'an has special geometric coordinates and openness; However, the expansion of human rights into the "semantic system of tradition" in the Islamic world, or the expansion of the concept of religion and monotheistic principles into the concepts and signs of human rights, has shocking semiotic consequences, which we will discuss below.

### ***Islamic tradition and human rights; Movement in signs***

Tradition in this article, not in the common sense in the principles of jurisprudence, but in the methodological sense as opposed to "modernity" and as a set of attitudes.

Since the semantic system of tradition has been the only semantic system for producing meaning and justifying the life of Muslims, which has been formed historically and in the face of modernity, its semantic reserve has been reduced and analyzed, this article moves the signs between this type of system. Islamic semantics and the semantic system that produces human rights have been considered.

Movement pattern in signs. Every semantic system, whether Islamic tradition or liberal human rights, contains a set of symbols that may be formally identical. For example, the concepts of "freedom", "man", "right", "equality", etc., as seen in the system of Islamic tradition, are also found in the liberal philosophy of the West. But each of these signs has an "intrinsic" meaning and a "relative" meaning. Differentiation in this "relative" sense is created within a semantic network that separates a semantic system from other sign systems. The movement of a sign means the movement of this relative meaning from one semantic system and the attempt to enter another semantic system. This requires the methodological assumption of at least two sign systems in a historical period and in a bio-world, one of which is in a state of hegemony over the other and exports the relative meaning of its key symptoms into a non-dominant culture. It seems that in the twentieth century, in the context of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the highly active Western sign system, by moving the relative meanings of its keywords into other cultures, including traditional Islamic culture, is a significant semiotic turmoil in systems. It has created a Muslim tradition.

Relying on the rule of "contemporaneity" and "contemporaneity" of signs, the forced coexistence of Islamic tradition with the dominant modernity of the West, caused new elements (new relative meanings) to enter the semantic system of tradition and new signs were formed within the network of old signs. This, of course, leads to a dual and reciprocal metamorphosis in the symptoms. The next section explains this.

Dual groundbreaking signs. The implication of the dual foundation is that the introduction of new concepts of human rights into the Islamic tradition, on the one hand, has led to the collapse of the old elements of the Islamic tradition, the signs of which have become obsolete for some reason. On the other hand, due to the active focal magnetism of the Islamic tradition (such as the concept of monotheism and the validity of religious texts), the new elements have undergone a kind of curvature and metamorphosis under the pressure of this focal point. In this situation, some of the new signs or even some of the conceptual aspects of a new sign find a good place in the Islamic language apparatus and others, quickly or gradually, disappear and give way to newer signs. This is precisely why we are witnessing repeated contradictions and conflicts, as well as continuous efforts to localize the concept of human rights, ie the emergence and birth of the Islamic concept and reading of human rights, in Islamic societies.

The spread and localization of human rights in the Islamic world. As we have seen, human rights are one of the central signs of the new philosophy that has entered the semantic system of Muslims. Basically, when alien concepts enter a new semantic system, some of them have such a strong semantic load that their magnetism breaks even the most important focus of the previous semantic system. Nietzsche had addressed this issue in the conflict between modern systems of thought and Christianity. In his view, modern concepts are so complex and have such a strong

meaning that they have dismantled the most central sign of Christianity, and that is the concept and definition of the Christian God. Nietzsche thinks that "this definition" of God is dead (19).

But this has not happened in the Islamic world. New concepts, such as human rights, when in fact entered our realm of signs, were only able to break the semantic system of tradition; What we call cultural texts or type III texts. The new signs could not even attack the second type of texts. This situation shows that we are now facing a special phenomenon and that is the semiotic crisis in the Sunni system, while the continuity and activity of the semantic system of the Qur'an with those two reservoirs of Shiite commentators (news) and Sunni (the practice of the Companions) that are still unbroken. This is why imported concepts such as human rights, under the pressure of the semantic magnet of the Qur'an, have undergone a conceptual transformation and become indigenous. If the new words could break the set of the second and first texts, especially the first text (the Qur'an), then we would not have an Islamic system of knowledge at all; But this has not happened. New concepts seem to have only challenged our traditional knowledge systems, and some disintegrated networks of signs (20).

However, new concepts have a special status: first, they carry a new and distinct semantic burden. Second, when Muslims are placed in the network of meaning, while changing in the network, they somehow lose their previous meaning. For example, when Western democracy enters the Islamic world, it somehow becomes empty of part of its former and Western meaning, and by coexisting with other similar and similar concepts in the Islamic world, it finds a new concept called council and allegiance. But this allegiance and the council, which have been re-aligned with modern electoral systems and redefined, are no longer traditional allegiance. The same is true of the concept of human rights. The new concept of human rights with its semantic burden, when it deals with relatively synonymous signs but with a special semantic burden in the Islamic traditional system, inevitably distances itself from its originality as if it were something new, a new concept and sign of human rights. Or the same Islamic human rights are born. Comparison of materials from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the Islamic Declaration of Human Rights (1990).

### ***Reflection of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the Constitution and Ordinary Laws of Islamic Countries***

The Universal Declaration, in addition to the Islamic Declaration of Human Rights in Cairo, is also present in other international declarations and instruments to which Islamic countries are members. Even in the final document of the Eleventh Summit of the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement, which was held in Cairo in 1994, the authority of the Universal Declaration can be seen. The representatives of the Islamic countries, in spite of some conditions and reservations, in paragraphs 95 and 99 of the final document, declared their serious commitment to fulfill the requirements of human rights, in accordance with the UN Charter and other international instruments (29).

In line with these views and their continuation since the adoption of the Universal Declaration, we have witnessed the direct or indirect presence of human rights signs in the constitutions and ordinary laws of Islamic countries. These include the Constitution of Morocco (1961), Algeria (1963), the United Arab Emirates (1964), Pakistan (1964), (30) and the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Hossein Mehrpour has briefly introduced the position of human rights in the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran. He refers to issues such as "freedom", "equality before the law", "prohibition of torture", "education", "women and the family" as common principles of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Universal Declaration. (31) Mehrpour, emphasizing that "our commonalities with the Covenant are much more than the points of difference" adds:

Disagreements and inconsistencies should be identified at the outset; Because some cases that seem to be inconsistent with Islamic norms and may even be contrary to some provisions of the relevant laws are solvable; Because it is possible to amend the laws in accordance with the Covenant (International Civil and Political Rights), without compromising the Islamic basis (32).

Mehrpour rightly points to several important points: First, he points to the opposition or independence of two different semantic systems, namely, "Islamic principles" and "Western human rights", which in the case of fundamental human rights are "commonalities and differences". have. Second, it refers to the guarantee of the enforcement of human rights in accordance with the applicable international treaties, which, in any case, is aimed at power. The third point in Mehrpour's phrase is the need to amend at least "some cases" of the laws of the Islamic Republic of Iran in "compliance" with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and finally the fourth point is the "solvability" of these amendments without "violation of Islamic principles." Is.

The fundamental question that immediately arises is how these "adaptations" can be "solved" and based on any definition of "Islamic principles". In other words, if these issues and problems can be resolved by relying on traditional Islamic theological principles and without disturbing them, then why has it not been resolved so far or why has such

a conflict and difference been formed at all? If this requires modernist interpretations of Islamic principles, how can these interpretations be placed in the realm of decision-making and legislation?

It seems that the spread of signs of human rights in Islamic civilizations and countries has become so internalized that it requires inter-civilizational debates within Islamic culture. In this sense, human rights are one of the signs of modernity that requires the emergence of a kind of Islamic self-awareness and modernity, on the one hand, and the contrast between traditional and modernist interpretations in Islamic societies, on the other. Perhaps it can be said that today one type of "Islamic principles" is opposed to another type of "Islamic principles" and with the design of Islamic traditionalism and Islamic modernity, the conflicts related to human rights are not inter-civilized conflicts, but intercultural-inter-civilized conflicts. The Islamic world has changed. Here are the consequences of this situation.

### **Conclusion**

Two semiotic assumptions must be repeated: First, the semantic system of the Qur'an, like any other system of signs, is an open system, and therefore, according to the principles, its semantic circle is larger than the semantic circle of traditional Muslim tradition or systems and knowledge. The consequence of this semiotic assumption is that if signs such as human rights do not have the ability to project or coexist with the semantic network of tradition, this does not necessarily mean its inconsistency with the entire semantic system of the Qur'an, and in general, the main principles of Islam.

The second assumption is that the coexistence of multiple semantic systems in the world, especially in the globalized world, is not voluntary and selective; Because signs, according to the principle of vitality and movement, tend to expand and are forcibly adjacent to the existing and living semantic systems of the world. As a result of this coercive neighborhood, the words of the semantic systems move into each other and acquire intercultural color and glaze. Perhaps this process can be further explained by the following diagram: The above diagram may be able to better illustrate some of the semiotic developments in the last one hundred years of the Islamic world, especially in the field of human rights. Coercive coexistence and interplay of signs between Islamic and Western civilizations have highlighted the similarities and contradictions of new and old signs not only between Islamic and Western cultures, but even within Islamic culture. The result is the emergence of new intra-civilizational non-civilizations in the system of Islamic symbols.

On the contrary, the color dot within the white part of the Islamic semantic system clearly shows that within the efforts of Islamic modernization, there is always a part of traditional concepts with special semantic potential, and this situation causes important semantic curves and problems in interpretations. It has also been modernized from Islam. This is precisely why Muslims, in the face of the concept of human rights, are grappling with a series of anxieties, doubts, and successive certainties. With this in mind, Kirkgard's description of anxiety can be seen as another interpretation of the "possibility of freedom." From this point of view, "anxiety, as a general phenomenon, arises from the ability - and indeed, the necessity - to think about the future; Thinking and anticipating the possibilities imaginable compared to the current action. "But in a deeper sense, anxiety (or the possibility of its occurrence) stems from the same 'faith' in the independent existence of persons and things that the security of existence implies (33).

When Kirkgard analyzes anxiety as "the struggle of existence against inequality," he is, in fact, referring to the same thing: for the human being, "being" means being aware of existence. For the Muslim man today, existence is a kind of "being in the valley of the world." The Muslim man is also in constant struggle in the struggle of existence against iniquity; Not to "accept" the reality of today's world, but to create reference points of existence within Islamic beliefs and texts, in the uninterrupted "continuation" of daily affairs. The Muslim man, like all other human beings, as a human being, answers his question about "what is existence" by "doing" the things of daily life, of which human rights are one. But the answer, which by virtue of the new nature of life is a different answer from the traditional semantic apparatus, has created reciprocal reactions within Islamic culture. We are now witnessing the emergence of a kind of disease of civilization, as a result of which Islamic culture produces products against itself; Reciprocal production of traditional anti-modernist and anti-modernist concepts and signals that have challenged the existence of Islamic civilization. This phenomenon is now happening in Islamic countries. In this state, the old and the new signs are next to each other and release their semantic potential against each other. The question to be followed in another article is where will this two-way semiotic conflict end? Will the necessary coherence and uniformity of signs reappear in the Islamic world? If the answers are positive, how, at what cost, and at what cost will the future order of the Islamic world be reorganized? The design and explanation of these issues should be left to another opportunity.

## REFERENCES

- Glen Johnson, *Universal Declaration of Human Rights and its History*, translated by Mohammad Jafar Poyandeh, Tehran, Ney Publishing, 1998, p.87.
- Ibid., P. 64; Quoted from: General Assembly, Summary Records, p. 874. Third Committee, Summary Records, pp. 755-756.
- Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Social Contract; Text and in the context of the text*, translated by Morteza Kalantari, Tehran, Agah, 1379, p.56.
- Michael Akehurst, *A Modern Introduction to International Law*, London, 1987, pp. 13-15.
- John Rawls, *The Law of Peoples*, London, Harvard University Press, 2000, p. 23.
- Third Committee, Summary Records, op.cit, p. 370.
- Islam and Contemporary Challenges, Tunisia, Publishing House, 1996, pp. 117-118.
- Toshihiko Izutsu, *God and Man in the Qur'an*, translated by Ahmad Aram, Tehran, Islamic Culture Publishing House, 1994, pp. 51-53.
- Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, translated by Mohammad Jafar Sharif, Tehran, Jam, 1998, p. 141.
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights and International Covenants, Tehran, Farzaneh, pp. 6 and 7.
- Hossein Mehrpour, *Human Rights in International Documents and Positions of the Islamic Republic of Iran*, Tehran, Information, 1995, pp. 399-397.
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights and International Covenants, supra, p.
- Hossein Mehrpour, the former, p. 403.
- Anthony Giddens, *Modernity and Identification; Society and personal identity in the modern era*, translated by Nasser Movafeghian, Tehran, Ney Publishing, 1999, p. 75.