

Iran and the Universality of Human Rights

Mehdi Zakerian*

Abstract

A review of the events of the past decade and today's demands of the international community demonstrates how the expansion, inclusiveness and universality of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and United Nations Human Rights Covenants serve the common interests of all United Nations member states and nations. Moreover, the consensus of the international community on a series of rules such as the ban on torture and slavery, right to life, freedom of expression and alike - collectively known as fundamental rules of human rights - is inviolable. These two presumptions influence the institutionalization of human rights norms and support for human rights in every corner of the world, including Iran. For this purpose, which strategy can Iran make use of in the process of the universalization of human rights? While many international relations and international law scholars claim that the universality of human rights is a bridge connecting security and progress, putting aside this claim, we propose an answer to the key question of what Iran's optimum strategy towards the universality of human rights should be. This research argues that since every country's culture and native, age-old cultural, religious and national beliefs possess relative grounds of inclusiveness and universality, Iran's optimum strategy should be to seek a cross-cultural character of the fundamental rules of human rights. The author assesses the formation of human rights treaties and Iran's positions, cultural distinctions and types of universalities. Moreover, this study reviews the reservations about, and particular interpretations of human rights as well as theoretical and academic debates concerning the universality of human rights. Lastly, the author discusses cultural relativism and the impact of the cross-cultural character of the fundamental rules of human rights on compromise between relativism and universality of human rights.

Keywords: Iran, Universality, Human Rights, Cross-Cultural, Strategy

* Associate Professor, Islamic Azad University, Sciences and Research Branch.

Introduction

An academic once asked this author two questions about Iran: First, what is the Iranian legal system? Second, is Iran moving towards the universality of human rights or relativism? These two questions led this author to later conduct research on the subject of the universality of human rights and Iran. The question is how Iran can protect civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of individuals as well as protect rights to environment, development and peace within an Islamic legal system, which is close to civil law. Is this effort aimed at the universality of human rights or cultural relativism? This was the primary question this author sought an answer for in his research. Two core assumptions were made in this respect; the expansion, inclusiveness and universality of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and United Nations human rights instruments serve the interests of all UN member states and nations; and the fundamental rules, “noyau dur”, of human rights are inviolable.

This author argued that the realization of the abovementioned two points ensures that the rights of individuals and society are respected.

The course of events in the past decade and today's demands of the international community demonstrate how these two presumptions influence the institutionalization of human rights norms and protection of human rights in every corner of the world, including Iran. These two presumptions are so widely accepted that many international relations scholars believe that the two biggest present challenges the international community faces, i.e. terrorism



and production of weapons of mass destruction, arise from the absence of human rights and democracy. For instance, if Iraq had been a democracy that respected human rights, Saddam Hussein would perhaps never have risen to power and remained in control for so long; weapons of mass destruction would not have been produced, aggression and war with two neighboring countries would have never occurred, genocide and ethnic cleansing of Kurds might not have happened, the uprising of southern Iraqi Shi'as would not have been suppressed; Iraq would not have been occupied by extra-regional powers, and terrorism would not have taken root in the country. It can be assumed that all of this would not have occurred if there had been democracy and human rights in Iraq.

This story is common among all the Middle Eastern countries. That is to say, the cycle of the lack of human rights leads to the continuation of uncivil conduct and treatment. The more human rights become inclusive, and in other words universal, countries will become safer. As many scholars of international relations and international law claim, the universality of human rights is a bridge for the security and development of countries. By placing this claim in context and considering the two aforementioned presumptions in our discussion, we will provide an answer to the key question of what Iran is optimum strategy towards the process of universalization of human rights should be.

This study argues that Iran's optimum strategy should be to seek a cross-cultural character of fundamental rules of human rights since every country's culture and native, age-old cultural, religious and national beliefs possess relative grounds of inclusiveness and universality. In this respect, there will be an assessment of the formation of human rights treaties and Iran's positions, cultural distinctions and types of universalities. Moreover, this study reviews the reservations about, and particular interpretations of human rights as well as theoretical and academic debates concerning the universality of human rights. Lastly, there will be a discussion of



cultural relativism and the impact of the cross-cultural character of the fundamental rules of human rights on the compromise between relativism and universality of human rights.

I- Iran and Human Rights Instruments

Iran was among the states that extensively took part in the San Francisco Conference. For this reason, the Iranian representatives enjoyed a scholarly attitude towards the codification and approval of the United Nations Charter. In this relation, Iran was among the states that seriously objected to the veto right. In contrast, Iran possessed a positive outlook on a number of human rights attitudes and women's questions (Zakerian, 2009). Hence, when approving the Charter, Iran ratified it with a positive attitude, particularly with regard to the contents of the preamble, Article 1, Section 3, Article 13, Paragraph B, Article 55, Paragraph C, Article 56, Article 62, Section 2, Article 68 and Article 76. These articles are included among Iran's legal obligations towards the UN Charter.

Today, all states have come to believe that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ratified by the UN General Assembly on December 10, 1948, represents the "human rights bible" of the international community. This Declaration has gained attention to such a degree that all international conventions and regional declarations of human rights have made it as the basis before presenting new norms. In other words, in the specialized literature of international law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is construed as the constitution of the international community. The codification of the Declaration took place between the first and third sessions of the UN Human Rights Commission between January 27, 1947 and June 18, 1948 (Zakerian, 2002: 54). Iran was one of the 14 member states of the Commission which played a role in the codification and correction of the Declaration. Furthermore, Iran voted for the Declaration when voting on it took place on December 10, 1948.



As well as approving the Declaration, the Human Rights Commission tried to codify a number of treaties and conventions in order to further commit states to human rights. In this respect, Iran has adhered to the Civil and Political Rights Covenant as well as the Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Covenant, which were codified by the UN Human Rights Commission. Iran has also joined the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Convention on the Rights of the Child, and Optional Protocol to the Rights of the Child Convention on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution, and Child Pornography (United Nations, 2009). Excluding the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Optional Protocol, Iran has adhered to all the other conventions without any reservation. Meanwhile, most of these human rights conventions have turned into customary law and are automatically binding for all political systems as such (United Nations, 2010: 4).

II- Iran and Cross-Cultural Human Rights

The absolute and unconditional inclusiveness of all human rights rules has been questioned by theorists and practitioners in many countries, both in theoretical and practical-operational terms. For them, the current norms of human rights do not reflect the achievements of all civilized nations of the world. On this basis, human rights rules can be construed and applied according to the cultural distinctions of each country. According to this theory, it is up to every country to interpret and demarcate the necessity and implementation of fundamental principles of human rights, considering native moral precepts for the protection of morals -- although fundamental human rights, including freedom of expression, illegality of torture are respected by all countries and peoples throughout the world (Case of Handyside v. the United Kingdom, 1976). Iran maintains that there might be different interpretations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and that the interpretation advanced by Westerners is inaccurate, because they



regard the only criteria for human rights as their own beliefs and conducts, whereas human rights can be construed in accordance with every country's cultural variations.

The attitude advanced by Iran was supported in a way in the decision made by the European Court of Human Rights in the case of Handyside. The Court indicated that although the European Convention on Human Rights has provided a mechanism for the protection of human rights, this mechanism is complementary, contributing to the national systems of human rights for the protection of human rights (Excerpts of Handyside Decision, 1976). Therefore, the principle is attention to native, national and local norms of member states. Furthermore, it is not particularly possible to find a common moral concept in the domestic laws of all states. This outlook arises from the laws that vary considering the moral characteristics from time to time and place to place (Excerpts of Handyside Decision, 1976).

The Court emphasizes that because of their direct and continuous contact with their own country's values and norms, government authorities are more qualified than international judges in presenting a precise idea of the content of discussion of necessity, restriction or penalties with regards to human rights issues. For this reason, it is up to national authorities to undertake an evaluation of the reality of social needs and of the concept of necessity (Excerpts of Handyside Decision, 1976). The Court also points to the concept of margins of appreciation; that is to say, the Court allows every state to define human rights according to its own variations.

According to this decision, the Court - which has been tasked with supervising states' duties according to Article 19 - states that restriction or punishment can be compatible with the concept of freedom of expression enshrined in Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The Court's supervisory functions oblige it to pay the utmost attention to the principles characterizing a "democratic society" (Excerpts of Handyside Decision, 1976). This



means that every "formality", "condition", restriction" or "penalty" imposed in this sphere must be proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued. From another standpoint, whoever exercises his freedom of expression undertakes "duties and responsibilities"; the scope of which depends on his situation and the technical means he uses. The Court cannot overlook such a person's "duties" and "responsibilities" during its inquiry, as in this case, of whether "restrictions" or "penalties" were conducive to the "protection of morals" which made them "necessary" in a "democratic society". Therefore, it can be concluded that countries' cultural variations are very conducive in their interpretation of the issue of human rights.

On the other hand, Article 29 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stipulates that "everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible." In the second section, it is added "In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society" (United Nations, 1997: 12). Since public order and just requirements of morality have been taken into account, countries may decline to put parts of human rights in the context of their citizens' lives.

Therefore, it can be concluded that Iran's claim has firm legal grounds. In spite of the Handyside case and the content of Article 29 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which presents a guideline for pursuing cultural variations in the subject of human rights and partly supports the argument of cultural relativity according to requirements of morality, it is necessary to pay attention to the misuse of a number of political entities of the international system in this regard. Today, cultural plurality and cultural relativity are pursued by a number of states violating human rights. This is nothing except a cover for the despotic and inhuman treatment of their citizens in



order to perpetuate personalist sovereignty – neither national nor global – over masses lacking consciousness about this matter (Zakerian, 2003: 13). For this reason, Iran - enjoying the concept of cultural relativity - needs to present solely legal rather political arguments for its stance as many researchers of human rights believe that cultural relativism is a tool for covering up human rights violations. They maintain that the issue of universality of human rights has been entailed in many human rights treaties and declarations; hence, how can one draw upon cultural relativism to undermine support for human rights?

In contrast, along with the political representatives of countries that support the concept of cultural variations on the issue of human rights, Iran believes that principles, provisions and norms of many human rights instruments are not the achievements of all civilized nations of the world. In their point of view, human rights concepts have to change and the issue of the universality of such concepts must be revised, since human rights concepts and instruments have been the result and achievement of the Cold War and are currently largely influenced by the global North. For this reason, these human rights mechanisms and norms do not include the cultures of all countries. It is worth noting that unlike such countries, Iran simply calls for the revision of a number of these rules rather than the revision of all such conventions. Hence, Iran has to distance itself from the position advanced by the radical relativists.

Jack Donnelly and Rudy Howard have been quoted as saying that human dignity is a universal value, but human rights are rooted in the West, requiring a liberal regime for their creation. They maintain that human rights are not identical, equal and tantamount to human dignity, but mostly mean perfect protection of human dignity (Goodhart, 2003: 943). That is to say that human dignity is distinguishable from human rights. According to this perspective, a number of countries might allow their citizenry human dignity while lacking respect for human rights. This approach also in essence argues



that human rights are what Westerners have come up with, and that other nations and cultures will find true dignity if they accept such rights too.

To what extent can such approaches enhance human rights rules? We know that human dignity is the same as the protection of the individual as well as collective rights and freedoms. The concepts of human rights and human dignity are not separate, neither in root nor in goal. Cultural variations might be considered in the interpretation of human rights rules, but these variations do not contradict human dignity. As Norberto Bobbio suggests, the issue is not what and how these rights are, or their character or on what foundation they are based, or if they are natural or historical, or absolute or relative. The issue is the finding of a reliable method for safeguarding human rights and preventing their continued violation (Goodhart, 2003: 963).

Iran is among the states that accept human rights in the direction of human fulfillment and human dignity. In this relation, steps have been taken towards the advancement of a normative debate and interaction on the establishment of certain fundamental rights. This is made possible through dialogue among nations, civilizations and religions. Iran has been a pioneer in this respect and has had its proposal of 'Dialogue among Civilizations' approved at the UN General Assembly (Anan, 2001: 13). If realized, and true dialogue among countries and civilizations takes place, we will be in a position to see the rise of unitary global ethics shared by all cultures, nations and civilizations (Monshipouri, 2003: 969). It is plausible that the contribution and brainstorming of all civilizations, states and nations would pave the way for the observance of human rights and human dignity. Taking advantage of the viewpoints of its own human rights scholars, Iran can be a pioneer in this regard.

III- Iran and Universality of Human Rights

Comprehensiveness and vastness of human rights means universality



of human rights. Universalists fall into three categories: 1) De facto Universalists: They believe that human rights have been accepted as a universal value on a global scale. For example, bank robberies are abhorred. Although bank robberies still occur, robbers have to be condemned; 2) Realist Universalists: They consider human rights as a global natural asset. All human beings enjoy them naturally, though some people do not accept them as a reality as some regard the Earth as flat despite it being round. They are ignorant and need to be educated about understanding the truth; 3) De Jure Universalists: They maintain that human rights values do not constitute a truth and are not accepted universally while arguing that they have to be accepted on a global scale (Bauer, 2008: 502-503). Supporters of this approach accept the truth that values vary from a culture to another and from time to time. Nonetheless, they believe that there are important values which are more correct or superior and that we have to accept them (Bauer, 2008: 506).

All three types of universalism oppose relativism. As discussed above, relativists are of the belief that human rights are products of values, and since values are specific to every culture, human rights are specific to every culture; thus arguing that universal human rights do not exist (Bauer, 2008: 503). Iran is definitely not among any of these groups. One thing that cannot be denied is that the benefits of the process of universalizing human rights are in the first step directed at individual human beings. The advantages and disadvantages of universal human rights impact the conditions of society influencing the cohesion and solidarity of a society or the conflicts and challenges the society in question faces. For this reason, Iran cannot be wholly indifferent to the issue of the universality of human rights, pursuing a rejectionist position. Hence, Iran has not put its own demands within the category of radical cultural relativists. Iran simply objects to parts of the Western conception of human rights with a special emphasis on some of its double standards. Iran calls for the universality of human rights to be respected by all entities under all circumstances.



Thus, the Iranian president has indicated that Iran's boundary, when it comes to the issue of human rights, is justice.

From an international point of view, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international human rights instruments and the two Covenants on civil and political rights as well as economic, social and cultural rights contain fundamental rules of human rights. Thus, the universality of the Declaration and subsequent human rights treaties is a focal point of discussion (Donnelly, 1992: 259). Nevertheless, Iran, along with other Middle Eastern and Muslim nations, has consistently emphasized its reservations about certain international instruments of human rights. Iran, Saudi Arabia and a number of other Muslim countries have inserted certain general and special reservations into the conventions on children and women's rights, but Iran has never questioned the foundation of human rights (Schabas, 1996: 86).

From another standpoint, the universality of human rights and Iran's viewpoints can be examined through the issue of interpretation and incompatibility. The issue of interpretation can be studied via one of the cases dealt with by the European Court of Human Rights. A complaint against the British Government was lodged with the court concerning the physical punishment of children in the country. The complaint considered such abuse as a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights, with a special emphasis on Article 3, which bans inhuman and humiliating punishment. One of the judges, a British national, stated that he was not surprised and shocked with this kind of punishment at all. The judge's reaction shows that his rearing in that society led him to look at this issue as something natural. Other judges of the Court, who had not experienced the kind of punishment their British colleague had, declared that this punishment contravened the human rights convention. This very case demonstrates two very different interpretations of a case based on the personal and social experiences in different societies. Hence, Iran's demand that the principle of interpretation be respected has had a precedent, even in the West.



However, concerning variations, conflict between a number of Islamic penalties is not compatible with human rights rules such as the ban on inhuman and humiliating punishment. Some conclude that due to such a variation, the issue of universality of human rights is negated, and cultural relativism is the principle governing human rights norms and rules. This shows that universality of human rights is still a contentious matter, and amid the controversy between the concept and cultural relativism, one should seek common ground and rules shared by all nations to achieve the development of true fundamental rules of human rights.

The fundamental rules of human rights represent a suitable paradigm for a discussion of human rights. The cross-cultural character of human rights is a bridge between the two extremes of universality vis-à-vis cultural relativism. The fundamental rules of human rights constitute basic principles which in comparison to other rules of human rights are more paramount, inviolable and in other words, non-derogatory. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of December 16, 1966, which was ratified by 164 states - including Iran - by September 25, 2009, stipulates that a number of rules are non-derogatory rights, including the right to life, prohibition of torture, ban on slavery and servitude, prohibition of detention because of legal obligation, ban on retrospective effect of law in criminal cases, possession of legal personality and the right to freedom of religion and belief. In other words, no derogation from articles 6, 7, 8 (paragraphs 1 and 2), 11, 15, 16 and 18 may be made according to the Covenant, regardless of the situation, including times of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation, force majeure, revolution, insurgency and war (Nations Unies, 1995: 240).

Moreover, in the Barcelona Traction case, the International Court of Justice has described the principles and rules regarding basic human rights, including the prohibition of slavery and racial discrimination, as examples of universal and international duties of states (*Erga Omnes*) towards the international community (Nations Unies, 1995: 510). In the



case concerning the Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, the Court in an advisory opinion on July 9, 2004 reaffirmed the issue of obligations erga omnes. In this advisory opinion, recalling the Barcelona Traction case and the fact that some of these obligations have a character relating to all states, the Court pointed to the importance of such rights and that all states might enjoy legal benefits via support for such obligations (International Court of Justice, 2004: 60-61).

Given the type of these obligations in the discussion of the principle of human rights, erga omnes can be described as the universal obligations of the international community towards the common human conscience, which generates a sort of international solidarity in light of international communications. On this basis, the international community will react harshly to violations of these obligations - which are indeed the fundamental rules of human rights - such as apartheid, massacre, slavery and crimes against humanity etc. In the opinion of the Court, the illegality of massacres and principles governing fundamental individual human rights and freedoms such as freedom from slavery and racial discrimination have been considered as erga omnes (Karami, 1996: 84).

On the other hand, while most human rights instruments provide for the right to derogation or limitation or reservation, at the same time, they enumerate a set of principles and rules as human rights whose violation will not be allowed in any situation and time. It is most clearly exemplified, as mentioned above, in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 4, Section 2 as well as in the universal obligations considered by the International Court of Justice. These rules are principles independent of the state's will and cannot be ignored or changed, since they are deeply rooted in rational human conscience (Momtaz and Sharifi Tarazkouhi, 1999: 98).

Considering what has been argued, the fundamental of human rights represent the cross-cultural paradigm accepted by all countries and societies, and include prohibition of torture, slavery, freedom of



expression and belief, right to life, enjoyment of health and well-being; all fundamental rules of human rights which may never be violated or suspended.

These rules are so important that it will be impossible to observe other principles if they are violated or disregarded. In other words, each of these fundamental principles and norms is fundamental to such a degree that it amounts to being the creator of every other right (Droits Intangible Des Droits De l' Homme, 1991: 234-235). While Iran pursues the issue of interpretation and variation in the universality of human rights and relativity of certain human rights rules, it has never argued against the fundamental of human rights. This is because Iran, along with many other states, has ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This means that the Islamic Republic of Iran has to remain bound to the provisions of the Covenant. Meanwhile, the universality of human rights, at least concerning these rules, has been accepted by a majority of the members of the international community. So far, 164 states have ratified this Covenant, and the International Court of Justice - as a non-political and strictly legal organ - has reaffirmed it. These rules are fundamentals consistently recognized by states; therefore, their further inclusiveness can be considered. These fundamental rules represent the same cross-cultural bridge between universality and relativity of human rights. The optimum strategy for Iran with regards to human rights is thus to embrace this cross-cultural bridge.

Conclusion

Iran has been among the states that pioneered the codification and ratification of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Human Rights Covenants. Iran holds a unique stance on the issue of interpretation and variation of human rights principles. The inclusiveness of all human rights principles and rules is debatable, considering the diversity and extensive range of cultures, values and beliefs of UN member nations. According to the theory of



cultural relativism, human right rules are susceptible to interpretation based on nations' cultural distinctions, whereas based on the ratification of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights by 164 states and the provisions of Article 4, Section 2 of the text, the fundamental of human rights are universal. These fundamental rules of human rights are expanding and rapidly becoming universal in the context of globalization in such a way that some researchers believe that the debate on the issue today focuses on globalization and its implications for human rights. In contrast, major human rights debates in the past two decades took place between advocates of the universality of human rights and cultural relativists (Goodhart, 2003: 936). Therefore, it can be argued that at the very least, the universality of the fundamental of human rights has been acknowledged and shared by most members of the international community. The limits of the inclusion of such rules are also expanding, covering further rules incrementally. This has begun with Article 4, Section 2 of the abovementioned Covenant and the opinion of the International Court of Justice in the two cases of the Barcelona Traction and Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. It has been confirmed in regional conventions as well. Furthermore, international customs have also helped this trend. Iran's optimum strategy in this regard is to assume a position aligned with the approach that acts as a bridge between the universalist and cultural relativist camps. Confirming the fundamental rules of human rights, Iran can call for the execution of justice in the international community. Iran maintains that human rights are a cross-cultural issue. Furthermore, Iran believes that the cross-cultural character of human rights is not considered in the evaluation of its human rights situation and that of the international community arguing that the evaluations that are offered have been proven to be biased and politically motivated.

The legal techniques of judicial authorities, regional and international mechanisms as well as opinions of researchers and scholars of international law all indicate a continued challenge



between cultural relativists and Universalists. Moreover, the international community continues to make efforts to present a shared relative understanding of the fundamental of human rights. Yet, a sufficient chance has not been offered to Iran to present its own strategies. Iran maintains that its dialogue on human rights with Europe has always been a one-way conversation. So far, countries of the global South have not been given the chance to play a role in the definition of human rights. In this respect, the dominant discourse in the West tries to maintain contemporary definitions of human rights and press for their universality. This leads the rulers of the countries violating human rights to misuse the opportunity to keep marginalizing even the universality of fundamental rules of human rights, incorrectly drawing upon cultural relativism. Such rulers invoke the facts of how the West calls for the universality of human rights despite its colonial record, imposition of economic and technological sanctions against other countries and discrimination in regards to the protection of human rights depending on the natural resources of concerned states. They argue that non-Western countries have not been given the chance to define and present their own viewpoints on this matter. Moreover, Westerners have never seriously considered the violation of human rights by Israel. The United States' failure to ratify human rights conventions has to be added to this list of double standards as well. The United States has not ratified the Women's Anti-Discrimination Convention, Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Convention on the Rights of the Child, and many other specialized human rights conventions.

These are the questions and points raised by Iran at international gatherings. Yet, most Western countries have chosen to ignore such a stance. For this reason, Iran's favoring of the cross-cultural fundamental of human rights - including their inclusiveness, potential for the execution of justice as well as negotiation on cultural models of the global South – is a prudent stance that offers a realistic solution for a compromise between universalist and relativist states.

Reference

- Annan, Kofi. 2001. "Dialogue among Civilizations," in Mehdi Zakerian, *Khatami's Foreign Policy in the Perspective of Scholars*, Tehran: Hamshahri Publications.
- Bauer, Joanne. 2008. "Challenges to International Human Rights," in M. Monshipouri et al., *Constructing of Human Rights in the Age of Globalization*, Trans. M. Zakerian, Tehran: Research Institute of Cultural and Social Studies.
- Case of Handyside 1976, *Handyside v. the United Kingdom*, Application Number 00005493/72, Dated 07/12/1976.
- Donnelly, Jack. 1992. "Human Rights in the New World Order," *World Policy Journal*, Spring.
- Droits Intangible Des Droits De l' Homme 1991, Fribourg: Editions Universitaires.
- Goodhart Michel. 2003. "Origins and Universality in the Human Rights Debates: Cultural Essentialism and the Challenge of Globalization", *Human Rights Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 4, November.
- <http://www.echr.coe.int/-european court on human rights>, Excerpt of "Handyside" Decision.
- International Court of Justice. 2004. Legal Consequences of the Construction of A Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, Advisory Opinion, 9 July 2004, General List, No. 131.
- Karami, Jahangir. 1996. *UN Security Council and Humanitarian Intervention*, Tehran: Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Publications.
- Momtaz, Jamshid and Sharifi Tarazkouhi, Hossein. 1999. "Minimum Rules of Humanitarian Rights Applicable in Domestic Unrests and Insurgences, *Journal of Faculty of Law and Political Science*, Vol. 45, Fall.
- Monshipouri, Mahmood. 2003. Claude, E. Welch, Evan Kennedy, "Multinational Corporations and the Ethic of Global Responsibility: Problems and Possibilities", *Human Rights Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 4, November.
- Nations Unies. 1995. *Les Nations Unies Et Les Droits De l' Homme, 1995-1995*, New York: Publications Des Nations Unies.
- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. 2009. *Status of Ratifications of the Principal International Human Rights Treaties*, as of 25 September 2009.
- Schabas, William A. 1996. *Dimensions Juridiques Et Judiciaires Des Droits De l' Homme*,



Strasbourg: IIDH.

- United Nations. 1997. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, Tehran: UN Information Center.
- United Nations. 2009. Status of Ratification of Human Rights Instrument (As of 25 September 2009), www.un.org.
- United Nations. 2010. *The United Nations Human Rights Treaty System: An Introduction to the Core Human Rights Treaties and the Treaty Bodies*, Geneva: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- Zakerian, Mehdi. 2002. *Human Rights in the New Millennium*, Tehran: Faculty of Law and Political Science, Tehran University's Press.
- Zakerian, Mehdi. 2003. "Globalization and Universality of Human Rights," in *Human Rights and Perspectives*, Tehran: Faculty of Law and Political Science, Tehran University's Press.
- Zakerian, Mehdi. 2009. *Iran and the United Nations*, Pamphlet for the Doctoral Program, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Islamic Azad University, Sciences and Research Branch, Spring Semester.