Challenges and Opportunities of Cultural Diversity and Human Rights

Ahmad Montazeri[1] , Babak Baseri[2*] , Ali Faghih Habibi[3] , Masih Behnia [4]

[1, 3] Department of Law, Faculty of Law and Political Science, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

[2*]Department of Law, Faculty of Law and Humanities, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

[4]Department of Public Law, Faculty of Law and Humanities, Buin Zahra Branch, Islamic Azad University, Buin Zahra, Iran

Abstract:

Cultural diversity, multinationalism and human rights are important issues in the field of human rights, fundamental, public and international law. This area can be divided into two discourses: universalism and human rights relativism. And on this basis, it is possible to understand from which point of view governments and human society interpret and implement human rights, which, by the nature of each approach, will have different results. What are the challenges and opportunities of cultural diversity and human rights? On the one hand, cultural diversity can pose a threat (lack of equitable distribution of power, wealth, ethnic, cultural, or religious discrimination, leading to internal conflicts and, consequently, to challenges in the international community). On the other hand, it is an opportunity for countries dealing with cultural diversity and multinationalism. (Development, political, economic, social and cultural prosperity through attracting tourists, the cohesive role and creating a spirit of unity in critical situations and the protection of borders, security, independence and territorial integrity). The aim is to formulate comprehensive and complete laws while respecting the rights of minorities and different cultures while preserving their rights in the distribution of power, position and position in the government. Comprehensive political, economic, cultural and social development, peace and internal security, and, consequently, international peace and security must also be ensured. The necessity and importance of respect for cultural diversity, nationality and ethnicities within the government of states, and distributive justice are among the rules of international law. Ethnicity has always been an important component in social and political studies and research arising from racial differences. Ethnic inequality and ethnic diversity is not in itself a threat, and if it is considered normal in a society and is considered the constituent basis of that society, it can also provide an opportunity for social prosperity. National security and political participation in com-

---

[*]Corresponding Author's Email: baseribabak@gmail.com

munities and its relationship with ethnicities are considered very important. The research method in this article is descriptive-analytical and the data collection method is library resources. And the research findings show that cultural diversity and multinationalism have positive and negative consequences on human rights. That has a direct impact on maintaining security, independence, unity and integrity, and all-round growth and development of the country, or disintegration and ethnic and religious tensions and lack of growth and development, and even leads to separatism and autonomy. This requires a state and a military in the form of cultural federalism of a multinational nation-state or a multi-ethnic nation-state in order to be able to meet the demands of all groups and ethnicities.

Keywords: Cultural Diversity, Nationalism, Human Rights, Cultural Rights, Cultural Relativism

Introduction

Different definitions of cultural diversity, culture, and the formation of traditions have made possible different approaches, which usually refer to the two anthropological and behavioral psychological traditions in explaining the concept of political culture. Basically, countries have multiple ethnic groups with unique characteristics. In the context of global politics, two types of confrontations can be observed in the face of ethnicities. One is to pay attention to this diversity and the other is to strive for maximum unity and uniformity of ethnicities. But in both cases, the emphasis on ethnic culture as part of the cultural capital of any country is obvious. Basically, in most countries, people live with different cultures, traditions, ethnicities or nationalities, which has led to cultural diversity. Human rights, which is one of the most obvious and fundamental human rights, also emphasizes the acceptance of cultural rights, but some believe that due to the growing globalization, ethnic micro-identities will inevitably become impossible in a single global culture. Another group believes that globalization will not only lead to the extinction of ethnic groups, but also to the tools it provides, which will increase ethnic self-awareness and strengthen ethnic movements. Therefore, following the globalization of human rights, the components of cultural diversity, culture, ethnic identity, nationality, multinationalism and human rights should be discussed. By looking at the world today and the tribes that live in it, we can see the diversity of cultures. In such a way that these cultures can differ from each other in some cases; On the other hand, one of the most basic norms of human rights is respect for freedoms and recognition of the right to self-determination of all human beings, which is necessary for the recognition of cultural diversity. There is a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. What challenges and opportunities will human rights create in multicultural societies? In principle, laws and regulations will be enforceable that are formed according to the principles of custom, belief, social, political, and cultural habits of the same society. Otherwise, challenges such as resistance to laws and regulations, chaos, riots, and possibly segregation of parts of the country. On the other hand, it can turn into opportunities such as comprehensive cultural, political, economic and social growth and development. The purpose of this study is the

challenges and opportunities of cultural diversity with human rights and in fact in this research seeks to answer the relationship between cultural diversity and human rights and human rights challenges, what challenges and opportunities does cultural rights face? Research findings show that cultural diversity has positive and negative consequences on human rights. Which has a direct impact on maintaining security, independence, unity and integrity, and all-round growth and development of the country, or disintegration and ethnic and religious tensions and lack of growth and development, and even lead to separatism and autonomy.

Theoretical Framework; Cultural diversity and cultural relativism

Some liberal theorists have suggested patterns of liberal multiculturalism against the pattern of cultural homogeneity. Will Kymlicka is one of the leading thinkers in this field.

Kymlicka seeks to bridge the gap between the concepts of "individual" and "society" to those critics of liberalism who see liberal theory as based on individual rights. Accordingly, Kymlicka, in addition to not seeing a conflict between individual rights and group rights, believes that recent rights can be a means of preventing the exercise of economic and political power of a larger community over a smaller group. To protect the resources and institutions on which a minority is based against the decisions of the majority. (Kymlicka, 2005, pp. 72-73) The importance of cultural diversity is so great that Article 1 of the Charter of the Establishment of UNESCO states: "In order to preserve the independence, territorial integrity and diversity of cultures, the organization has no right to interfere in the internal affairs of the state." (Beygzadeh, 2003, p. 535) The adoption of the World Declaration on Cultural Diversity by the representatives of 188 countries participating in the 31st session of the General Conference of UNESCO (November 2001) contains 12 articles and a work program with 20 topics. Which shows the importance of the issue of culture in global affairs and human rights. The Universal Declaration of Cultural Diversity consists of four sections, each containing three articles. In the first part, cultural diversity is introduced as a common human heritage. In the second part, human rights are introduced as the guarantor of cultural diversity. In the third part, world cultural heritage is considered as a source of creativity. The last section emphasizes the need for international cooperation in the dissemination of cultural productions. According to the first section, cultural diversity is introduced as a common human heritage. Which is the source of exchange, innovation and creativity between human beings and is as important for human beings as biodiversity for living beings. In order for people with diverse cultures to be able to live together in a compatible way, there is no escaping pluralism. Diversity and pluralism are the basis of a kind of development that along with economic growth, also causes intellectual, emotional, spiritual and moral satisfaction. (Vahid, 2004, p. 262) Regarding the relationship between cultural diversity and human rights, two different statements have been made about the relationship between rights and cultural diversity. The first discourse, which can be considered the product of the modern era, was proposed by Western countries. Central to this human discourse is the Western style, and the diversity of cultures can have no effect on human rights norms and values. Contrary to the discourse of relativism, which believes that human rights are relative. And the interpretation of human rights norms and values depends on

the socio-cultural, geographical and regional characteristics of each nation-state. That is, any nation-state can interpret human rights content based on the circumstances of its country and culture. Central to this discourse is the diversity of cultures. Despite the breadth of theoretical and strategic issues related to ethnicity, ethnicity, and ethnic strife, these concepts are now widely, broadly, and ambiguously semantic. Basically, ethnicity and ethnic groups are vague and controversial concepts. It should also be noted that the usual definitions of ethnicity and ethnic group are based on the experience of the history of the United States of America.

Therefore, we cannot use ethnicity and ethnic group, which has a specific definition, historical and geographical burden, as historical and universal concepts. He said that wherever there is a religious and linguistic difference between the sections of the population, there is a problem of ethnicity and ethnic groups. Given these problems, Schneider emphasizes that the tendency to generalize the word ethnic remains problematic. And he concludes that "the word has taken on so many scattered meanings that it is better to abandon its use altogether" (Ahmadi, 1997, pp. 32-33).

In mental definitions, ethnicity is a sense of ethnic identity and includes a subject, symbol, and mystery that helps to create inner cohesion and differentiate oneself from other groups. From this perspective, issues such as lineage, birth, and kinship are important to group members (Brass, 1991, p. 19).

In defining ethnicity, David Robertson states: Ethnicity is the complex combination of cultural, racial, and historical characteristics by which societies are divided into distinct and possibly hostile political families (Robertson, 1993, p. 169). According to Thomas Hylland, ethnicity is the next dimen-

sion of social relations between those who consider themselves culturally distinct from members of other groups with whom they have minimal regular contact. Ethnicity is also a social identity. In his opinion, the characteristics of an ethnic group are:

- The idea of having a common root and history;
- Claiming to have a definite and different destiny from others;
- Having dimensions of collective cultural individuality;
- A sense of unique collective solidarity (Hylland, 1993, p. 17).

Anthony Smith's definition is widely used. "A nation is a distinct human population with a common ancestral myth, shared memories, cultural elements, a connection to a historical land or homeland, and a degree of sense of interest and responsibility." Which has the central elements of identity, belief, awareness and common culture. (Smith, 1998, p. 186)

Question
Challenges and opportunities of human rights in multicultural societies.

Hypothesis
Cultural diversity, the rights of distinct groups and minorities are preconditions for the human rights discourse. Human rights principles must be based on the cultures and nationalities or interpreted on the basis of the cultural diversity of each society. Otherwise, there will be challenges such as ethnic, religious, and violence, chaos, separatism, and sometimes the emergence of terrorism in societies and human rights. Resolving this issue requires a just and wise distribution of power, wealth, and respect for the rights of minorities and the exercise of rights. By realizing

and consolidating cultural diversity and accepting multinationalism at the international level, citizens will act as active participants in shaping the growth and development of political, economic, social and cultural policies. As a result, global civil society will grow and develop more comprehensively.

Goals
- Investigating the relationship between cultural diversity and human rights.
- Study of cultural diversity and human rights and challenges and opportunities in political, economic, social and cultural affairs.

Cultural Relativism

Relativism is the opposite of absolutism. And the followers of this view believe that there is no absoluteness and that the normal and spiritual aspects of life are constantly changing. Relativism has two meanings in the opposite sense to ethnocentrism. First, others should not be judged by the standards of their culture. Second, individuals' behavior or way of thinking must be judged in specific cultural contexts, in terms of their own values, norms, beliefs, environmental challenges, and history.

Relativism was first introduced by the Greek philosopher Protagoras. That "man is the standard of everything" and his sentence was interpreted in such a way that every human being can be his own owner and standard. The term relativism applies to religious, cultural, and moral perspectives. The theory of cultural relativism is based on the fundamental principle of difference with another and its legitimacy. Relativism tells us that views should be evaluated in terms of their societies and cultures. And judging them and right and wrong, good and bad, reading them according to a general criterion is not correct.

The theory of cultural relativity has many proponents and opponents, each of whom has given reasons. In linguistics, anthropology, sociology, and modern theology, this issue has been the subject of much serious discussion. Postmodernists and proponents of cultural and social pluralism support this view. Perhaps the reason for the proposition of relativity in contemporary philosophy is the failure of religious wisdom in the West. But the failure of ritual wisdom in Western philosophy does not mean the end of the road. It remains to be seen what is the reason for its failure and why Western rationalism does not meet the needs of man today. We must find and eliminate the inadequacies of these philosophical concepts, not accuse reason and drive it off the stage. Conclusions of relativists can be obtained in different ways. Without a commitment to cultural relativism, but this is to the extent that other cultures have shown, or have shown, their intrinsic value, and the way is open for cultures to reason and talk. And the West does not want to impose its culture on others through mass media, indoctrination and propaganda. In this way, humanity can achieve similar interpretations, or unique interpretations of some important socio-cultural elements. But as we see, the West does not allow such cultures. From the relativist point of view, human rights rules can be interpreted and applied based on the cultural differences of each country. In this view, although the foundations of human rights, including freedom of expression and the avoidance of torture, are respectable principles for all countries and peoples, it is the responsibility of a country to live up to its moral principles and to "protect morality." To interpret, demarcate, necessity and implement the basic principles of human rights (Salari et al., 2016, p. 135)

The goal of cultural relativism is not to ignore or discredit the behaviors and thoughts of other people. Rather, the goal is to understand those behaviors and thoughts. Understanding a lifestyle does not necessarily mean accepting it. For example, we may well understand why people in some Southeast Asian countries eat dogs and cats; But this understanding of ours does not mean that we have to do the same. The tendency towards cultural relativism is a very difficult task and requires a high level of understanding. Because it requires us to understand both the values and norms and beliefs of other societies and when judging them, at least temporarily, to set aside the values and norms that we have acted on throughout life (Salari et al., 2016, p. 14).

In general, after the expansion of globalization in the field of economics in the form of liberalization of exchanges and circulation of financial and trade flows across national borders, we are witnessing the globalization of culture in the form of "cultural pluralism". In this period called post-liberal, local, indigenous and ethnic cultures have a chance to emerge and there is no longer a superior culture, but all cultures are valuable. The discourse of human rights relativism prevails in this period. Relativists oppose all three types of universality. They have another definition of human rights and its universality. From a moral and value point of view, relativists believe that people with different cultures have different values. At the same time, they do not think that there are more or less common values among people of different cultures. According to them, human rights are valuable and since the values are specific to each culture, then human rights are specific to each culture and there are no universal human rights. (Qari Seyed Fatemi, 2017, p. 411)

The Relationship between Cultural Diversity and Human Rights

In the field of human rights, it can be said that "Western thought does not have a long history, so that the term entered the literature of collegial law after World War II and the founding of the United Nations in 1945. The term became an alternative to natural and human rights, which have an older history. Even if we look for human rights in the school of Kant, the greatest philosopher of the Enlightenment, who based his philosophy more than any other ruling on human beings and their dignity, we do not find any trace of it (Watson, 1982, p. 565). The adoption of the World Declaration on Cultural Diversity by the representatives of 188 countries participating in the 31st session of the General Conference of UNESCO (November 2001) contains 12 articles and a work program with 20 topics. Which shows the importance of the issue of culture in global affairs and human rights. The Universal Declaration of Cultural Diversity consists of four sections, each containing three articles. In the first part, cultural diversity is introduced as a common human heritage. In the second part, human rights are introduced as the guarantor of cultural diversity. In the third part, world cultural heritage is considered as a source of creativity. The last section emphasizes the need for international cooperation in the dissemination of cultural productions. (Heydari, 2016, p. 48).

According to the first section, cultural diversity is introduced as a common human heritage. Which is the source of exchange, innovation and creativity between human beings and is as important for human beings as biodiversity for living beings. In order for people with diverse cultures to be able to live together in a compatible way, there is no escaping pluralism. Diversity and pluralism are the basis of a kind of development that along

with economic growth, also causes intellectual, emotional, spiritual and moral satisfaction. (Salari, 2016, p. 17)

In this section, to understand the relationship between cultural diversity and human rights, we need to address the discourses that examine the relationship between the two concepts. Two different discourses on human rights and cultural diversity are presented. The first discourse can be considered to have emerged in the modern period, which has been expressed by Western countries. The central part of this human discourse is Western-style, and the diversity of cultures can have no effect on human rights norms and values. Opposite this discourse is relativism, which believes that human rights are relative and that the interpretation of human rights norms and values depends on the socio-cultural, geographical, and regional characteristics of each nation-state. This means that every nation-state has the right to be able to interpret human rights according to the conditions of its country and culture. Central to this discourse is the diversity of cultures.

The Universal discourse of Human Rights
Central to the idea of cosmopolitanism is the belief that human rights are the minimum rights that human beings can enjoy because they are human beings regardless of color, race, language, nationality or religion. So it is a universal law. The legal basis of the idea of universalism is the article of a Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights" (Ghaebi, 2007, p. 788). Universalists believe that universal human rights values are universal and enforceable in all countries. Human rights and their examples such as the right to life, marriage, work, insurance, the absence of torture and slavery, and the like are features and concepts that are valuable to human beings regardless of their geography and environment. So Africans, Americans, Europeans and Asians should not be enslaved. Torture is bad for anyone, Muslim, Christian or Jew. In other words, they believe it is bad, even if it is done by a great or holy person or with a charismatic personality. However, these universal and pervasive values have not been discovered and achieved in the same way in all societies. For this reason, universalists are divided into three categories:

In the first category are universalists, two-factor, who believe that human rights are accepted as a universal value. Like bank robbery, which is a global wrongdoing. Although bank robberies occur; But it is the fault of the thieves, not the theft. Similarly, although human rights violations occur around the world, violators are wrongdoers.

In the second category of universalists are realists, who believe that human rights are a universal natural asset. All human beings naturally have it, even though some people do not accept it as a fact. It's just like the fact that despite the fact that the earth is round, some people still consider it flat. They are ignorant and need training to understand the truth.

The last category is the De jure universalists, although human rights values are not a fact and they have not been universally accepted; But they must be universally accepted. According to them, values vary from culture to culture and from time to time. However, they believe that there are important values that are "right" or superior, and that we must accept them. In other words, we must make every effort to include superior values (Zakerian, 2013, p. 51). All three groups stated are opposed to human rights relativism.

The discourse of Human Rights Relativism
Relativist theories state that not all human beings can be led to accept the same concept of human rights. Because law is a social rule and behavior that is born of human societies.

Wherever there is a society, there are rights, so the values of different societies are not the same, but each society has its own beliefs and habits. Accordingly, human rights must be regulated based on the characteristics of each society, so there are no universal human rights (Tharoor, 2000, p. 68). Given that human rights have not been able to encompass all existing cultures; it cannot claim universality. Of course, this does not mean that human rights should not be universal, but that in a multicultural world there is no possibility of universality (Zupancic, 2006, p. 33).

After the expansion of globalization in the field of economy in the form of liberalization of exchanges and circulation of financial and trade flows across national borders, we are witnessing the globalization of culture in the context of "cultural pluralism". In this period called post-liberalism, local, indigenous and ethnic cultures have the opportunity to emerge and there is no longer a superior culture, but all cultures have value. The discourse of human rights relativism prevails in this period. Relativists oppose all three types of universality. They have another definition of human rights and its universality. From a moral and value point of view, relativists believe that people with different cultures have different values. At the same time, they do not think that there are more or less common values among people of different cultures. According to them, human rights are valuable and since values are specific to each culture, then human rights are specific to each culture and there are no universal human rights (Zakerian, 2013, p. 56)

The intellectual basis of this discourse is based on the hypothesis that not all human beings can be led to accept the same concept of human rights; Because law is a rule of social behavior that is born of human societies. In other words, on the one hand, wherever there is a society, there are rights. On the other hand, the values of different societies are not the same, but each society has its own characteristics, beliefs, habits and values. Therefore, no nation has the right to impose its ideology and values on another nation. Human rights must also be regulated based on the characteristics, facts and values of each society. According to this group, in the world of polyphony and multiculturalism, one cannot speak of the universality of human rights.

Third World Discourse on the Rights of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity
The Third World discourse is, in fact, a temporary solution, and that ethnic and minority groups will disappear during modernization and development, and in most cases, at least, is nothing more than an illusion. Turning ethnic issues into a security issue also alienates ethnic minority groups while adding to the costs of dealing with threats (real or imagined). And it leaves bitter memories that undermine the possibility of reaching an understanding and establishing and institutionalizing a democratic culture in the future. It also delays police and intelligence dealings with ethnic activists, minorities, and the establishment and consolidation of democracy in these countries. Because democracy is not applicable in part or in part. Or at least it will not be institutionalized, and in the event of the establishment of democratic institutions, the marginalized forces will be forced to take advantage of them. The important point is to direct these forces towards democratic

processes and procedures. Regarding the regional situation, it should be said; The Western discourse on the rights of minorities, ethnic groups, and democracy and human rights in general is spreading eastward. For example, compliance with EU standards and standards, known as the Copenhagen criteria, is a requirement for new countries to join the EU. And these standards have spread to the Middle East (Turkey) and Eastern Europe. Also considering the developments in the Middle East and the emerging democracies of this region (Afghanistan and Iraq), although they have been imported from abroad. The discourse of human rights and the rights of minorities, Western ethnic groups, is also expanding in these areas. Therefore, the type of behavior of these countries will be different from the existing tribes in neighboring countries (Ghaebi, 2007, p. 793).

The relationship between minority rights and human rights

In the late nineteenth century, efforts to recognize the rights of minorities gradually paid off. In international law, however, there were no documents governing these groups, and they were not significant until after the Second World War; But after the war, and especially in recent decades, important changes have taken place in granting self-government and promoting ethnic languages to the official language. Acceptance of autonomy for the province of Catalonia in Spain (as well as the province of the Basque Country). Granting cultural rights and self-government to the Flemings in Belgium. Granting local self-government and recognition of local languages in Wales and Scotland. And many other indications show that Western governments have changed their old approach to suppressing transnational or local nationalism. And they are trying to resolve

the issue by granting official status in ethnic and local languages and self-government to minority states (Ghasemi, 2005, p. 614).

Similar developments can be seen in Latin America, Australia and New Zealand. The problem in these countries was the situation of the natives and the main inhabitants of the mentioned areas. These governments believed that the above groups would eventually disappear and merge into the mainstream society through the industrialization of their living areas and through migration or marriage to the majority society. In this way, various measures were taken. And many natives were expelled from their ancestral lands, their pastures were taken over by the government, and the possibility of their cultural, linguistic and ethnic life being continued as much as possible. However, since the end of the twentieth century, many of these governments have adopted multiple languages for minority ethnic groups, including internal self-government and cultural and legal independence. The rights granted to the Maori in New Zealand and the concessions granted to Native Canadians are a few examples (Ghasemi, 2005, p. 615).

In addition, Western governments have granted cultural rights to new immigrants and nationals. Regardless, they need immigrants to provide labor and even their own specialists. In order to regulate the affairs of immigrants, who make up, for example, nine per cent of the British population, it was necessary to abandon the idea of "one state, one nation, one language" and the idea of a "monoculture" state. And try to provide a definition of national identity that encompasses the above diversity. In Britain, for example, there have been measures to teach religion in schools, the way women dress, and the establishment of prayer halls in the workplace and the like. In the Netherlands, for example, if

the number of students reaches the quorum, the government hires a teacher to teach their mother tongue (Anwar Qadir, 2002, p. 53).

Challenges and Opportunities

Cultural diversity and its relationship to human rights are important issues in the field of public and international law. The relationship between cultural diversity and human rights in the comprehensive development of society and vice versa can lead to security challenges, independence and territorial integrity, unity and integrity.

Challenges

Basically, in human society, laws and regulations remain stable that are based on justice, equality, equality, nature, culture, social customs, beliefs and norms of the same society. Under no circumstances will the enactment of laws and regulations that infringe on the natural and acquired rights of individuals. And it also faces society with challenges such as security, political, economic, social and cultural challenges.

Rights come from the will of the state: that is, it must guarantee the implementation of a rule in order to be included in the law. However, sometimes the government sets the rules directly through legislation, and sometimes it validates the rules created by the public conscience and accepts the customary jurisprudence in the legal system. This is not to say that the power of the state alone has the power to govern the legal system. Because, whether we like it or not, economic and international pressures, ethics and religion, and the habits and customs of judges are effective in formulating and interpreting laws and the way they are implemented. And in most cases, these values impose social forces on the will of the government. And it forces the legislature to adopt new rules like

a wanderer. Nevertheless, the government is the ultimate and direct agent and decision-maker, and law enforcement always tries to make efforts in the name of the law and within its will. In such cases, the intervention of the judicial system of the government is necessary to implement those rules, and the judge has a duty to rely on the new solutions in the spirit and provisions of one of the laws or custom and certain customs (Katouzian, 1998, p. 38). Therefore, the inconsistency of the laws with the principles governing the political, economic, social, cultural and religious life in any society may face security and peace challenges, violence and chaos.

Security challenge

Security in any society is one of the most essential things in the shadow of security, comfort and tranquility. That the political, economic, social and cultural affairs of individuals will grow and develop. Otherwise, and the lack of security, people will not have the motivation to grow and develop, creativity, initiative and thinking.

"National security is the ability of society to provide and protect the physical, biological and livelihood, cultural and value existence of the people and the land and to promote and optimize it and to pursue and guarantee national interests in times of war and peace against internal and external threats." It follows from this definition that national security has both negative and positive dimensions. In the negative dimension, it refers to the negation, elimination and reduction of threats, and in the positive dimension, it refers to the improvement and optimization of the ecological condition of societies in economic, cultural, military and political terms. In addition, the software approach of threats is not only of a military nature and is influenced by the external environment, but also the threats

take various political, social, cultural and economic forms and are also rooted in the internal environment. From this perspective, national security can be defined in line with McNamara, sustainable comprehensive and balanced development (Hassanpour, 2003, pp. 83-84). The most important national security goals are:

- Preservation of independence and territorial integrity;
- Achieving the welfare of the people and the stability of the country;
- Preservation and dissemination of national and economic values;
- Providing leisure facilities to potential threats (Roshandel, 2009, pp. 13-14).

Independence and territorial integrity

The principle of independence and territorial integrity or territorial integrity is one of the important principles accepted in international law. This right is based on respect and non-interference with the territory of other countries. According to this principle, the territory of a country should never be invaded, invaded or divided. The principle of territorial integrity means that the territory of the country is a whole and indivisible. The challenges that exist in this regard and may undermine the principle of independence and territorial integrity of the country are injustice and not paying attention to the legitimate demands of the people and ignoring the rights of people in society, especially minorities.

Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations: "All Members in their international relations shall refrain from any threat or use of force which is directed against the territorial integrity or political independence of a State or in any manner contrary to the purposes of the United Nations." Any military, economic, political, etc.

pressure against the territorial integrity of a state is wrong. The territory of a country should never be militarily occupied or invaded by other countries and neighbors. Any domination or occupation of a territory that results from the use or threat of force is illegal. In fact, according to the principle of sovereignty and independence of countries, which is accepted and respected, interference in their affairs will harm this principle. Some thinkers and representatives of governments have considered humanitarian intervention as an example of human security in practice, in which the protection of individuals takes precedence over the judgment of governments. Representatives of the Canadian government, for example, have called NATO military intervention in Kosovo an operation motivated by human security and an important step in elevating human security as a value for global action. Some theorists have endorsed this theory. In this case, however, there is debate as to whether intervention in Kosovo is a good example of action for human security or even humanitarian intervention. With this in mind, the more important question is whether the human security approach logically or necessarily endorses humanitarian intervention. And does it substantiate the claims made for its moral and legal justification? Human security has been said to be intrusive in nature. Because it increases the security obligations of governments beyond their borders and legitimizes the use of force for global purposes. The International Commission on Government Intervention and Governance identifies human security as part of the Foundation for Responsibility for Protection, which reports on the Commission as a new framework for discussing humanitarian intervention. This has shifted the focus from the right to intervene to the shared responsibility to protect individuals. But it still seemed ne-

cessary to justify the intervention, including the justification of military intervention. However, others have questioned whether the use of force is in line with the characteristics and agenda of human security, and have therefore challenged the issue of human security to justify intervention. Even those who are generally sympathetic to the concept of human security, some advocates of human security have been cautious about interventionist tendencies. Fear that human security may be used to justify intervention is one of the things that has prevented widespread acceptance of human security. Especially among non-Western governments, which are seen as representing a kind of neo-colonialism. Therefore, the relationship between human security and humanitarian intervention deserves more attention. Both to evaluate these different perspectives and to determine whether the human security perspective can be useful in engaging in lengthy discussions of humanitarian intervention. (Van Tigerstrom, 2010, pp.127-128).

The issue of ethnic and religious pluralism of the country becomes extremely important and sensitive when it is accompanied by foreign colonial goals and ambitions and enemies. And the diversity and heterogeneity of ethnic and religious sects and minorities is one of their most important tools. Looking at the events and happenings in the contemporary history of the country, we see traces of foreign influence and intervention in ethnic riots. (Assariannejad, 2004, 48-49)

According to the Charter, governments and the United Nations are prohibited from interfering in the internal affairs of countries. The Charter mentions two exceptions to the general rule of non-use of force against States. According to Article 51 in the position of legitimate defense, which states that whenever a country is violated, it can resort to force (military force) against the aggressor as a legitimate defense, as long as the Security Council has not intervened. The second case, the Charter in paragraph 7 of Article 2, prohibits the organization from interfering in matters which are "essentially" within the purview of States. Except when the Security Council deems it necessary to carry out coercive measures under Chapter 7. The UN Charter entrusts the task of maintaining world peace and security with the Security Council (Article 34 of the Charter). In this case, the Council has exclusive competence and has the right to establish any dispute or situation that may lead to international conflict or its continuation endangers peace and security (Article 39 of the Charter). Therefore, in two cases of legitimate defense and executive measures of Chapter 7, in order to maintain peace, the sovereignty of governments can be broken by the Security Council. The inclusion of the word essentially in paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter is sufficiently flexible to accept the adjustment of sovereignty of States as a result of international developments. In other words, this article of the Charter has not sufficiently guaranteed the freedom of action of states in the field of international relations (Eftekhar Jahromi, 1996, p. 35). Preserving the independence and territorial integrity of countries is one of the indisputable and internationally accepted principles. However, under the false pretext of non-observance of human rights and the rights of minorities, they have been placed at the disposal of international institutions and countries in power to interfere in the internal affairs of countries, especially developing countries. Therefore, one of the challenges facing the government-countries is the lack of justice and equality and fulfillment of the rights of all members of society, the violation of the principle of independence

and territorial integrity of government-countries.

Territorial Integrity

The constituent population of any state-state is basically made up of tribes, ethnic groups with different religious, social, and cultural principles, and they have created territorial integrity. Each of these tribes and clans has its own culture and is respected by all.

In any country, the sense of identity of a minority is not always based on a specific factor or factors, and the identifying factors are not always constant over ages. Population displacements, dual citizenship, differences between parents' birthplaces and children, and even being multilingual, have undermined the sense of belonging and identity to each individual or group. Language or race alone cannot be identifying. What essentially creates an identity between individuals of a nation and distinguishes it from another nation is the common cultural character, that is, the set of beliefs, behaviors, and rituals. These individual characteristics form an individual identity and the set of individuals' identities constitutes a group identity from which a person feels a sense of dependence on a nation or group. (Khobrooy Pak, 2001, p. 85)

When tribes at various times see their identity in danger through the extinction of a language or territory or other factor, they defend themselves to acquire that cultural identity by highlighting that factor. This is the case even for tribes that live in equal rights communities but see their cultural identity and character in danger. The origin of the sense of identity of minorities is different and is divided into different groups according to human geography. Some minorities are born in a particular land and have lived there for a long time. Here the land plays an important role in identifying them. If such minorities live in geopolitical areas, they will be supported by neighbors who are interested in their fate. Therefore, they have a good platform for independence movements. But sometimes minorities live and are scattered in different areas, and their cultural identity network is established between people who have special socio-cultural and spiritual relationships with each other. The bond between the members of this group differs according to the conditions of establishing a communication network, the method of intellectual transfer, the maintenance of collective rituals and the methods of transferring collective values (Joseph et al., Zamani, 2016, p. 360). The feeling of dependence and interest in the land and the environment of human life is inherent and this interest and relationship is not or will not be replaced in any other place as the motherland. Therefore, another challenge that may arise in this regard is the damage to the territorial integrity, which as a result of ethnic and religious conflicts and violence, etc., leads to the disintegration and secession of regions.

Welfare of the People and Stability of the Country

Policy-making, management and planning and supervision for the equitable distribution of wealth, income, production, employment, social welfare. And securing the future of citizens can lead to political, economic, social and cultural stability, and ultimately, improve the state of national security and, consequently, the security of the international community.

Improper discrimination, disrespect and disrespect between the various ethnic groups that make up a nation can be challenging for national solidarity and identity. Mismanagement brings about the unity and solidarity of

different social groups and their transformation into a united political and social force, new security threats, leading to autonomy and the disintegration of the country. The severity of the disputes between the government and the citizens that endanger peace and security. And it can pave the way for the intervention of the international community (others) in the rule of governments and undermine the stability of the country and lead to instability.

The UN Charter entrusts the task of maintaining world peace and security with the Security Council (Article 34 of the Charter). In this case, the Council has exclusive competence and has the right to establish any dispute or situation that may lead to international conflict or its continuation endangers peace and security (Article 39 of the Charter). Therefore, in two cases of legitimate defense and executive measures of Chapter 7, in order to maintain peace, the sovereignty of governments can be broken by the Security Council. The Charter, in paragraph 7 of Article 2, prohibits the organization from interfering in matters which are "essentially" within the purview of States. Except when the Security Council deems it necessary to carry out coercive measures under Chapter 7. The inclusion of the word essentially in paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter is sufficiently flexible to accept the adjustment of sovereignty of States as a result of international developments. In other words, this article of the Charter has not sufficiently guaranteed the freedom of action of states in the field of international relations (Eftekhar Jahromi, 1996, p. 35).

Humanitarian interventions by associations, countries or international organizations, without any specific criteria, are basically to save the lives of the citizens and minorities of that country. In fact, in the Charter of the United Nations and in the custom of international law, no specific rule can be found that is fully accepted by all states and there is basically no consensus on this. Powerful and interventionist countries adhere to human rights, thereby justifying their so-called "humanitarian" interventions in other countries. Such interventions are often political in nature and serve the specific political purposes of the intervening states.

Unity, Cohesion and Integration

Unity, cohesion and integration is one of the necessities of human life. Human social life, in spite of the existence of different races, tribes, languages and religions, requires in order to grow, develop and protect itself and the continuity of the generation and based on the principle of division of social work and cooperation; Maintain unity, cohesion and integrity. In the shadow of unity and empathy of all citizen groups; Political, economic, social and cultural contributions are well received. Otherwise, despite the divisions and differences, the participation has decreased and in addition to the lack of comprehensive political, economic, social and cultural growth and development; Social and civic order and security will also be destroyed.

Racial and ethnic conflicts have always played a role in the political life and formation and collapse of governments. The conquest of an ethnic land by another ethnic group has been one of the factors in the formation of governments. In the history of social and political ideas, the idea of racial and ethnic superiority has been one of the most ancient and common ideas. Aristotle argued that some races were inherently serfs and others were inherently winners. Naturally, such notions are devoid of rational foundations, but the very notion of racial inequality and superiority over one another has impor-

tant political consequences and has led to major conflicts. In multi-racial and multi-ethnic countries, the dominated races have become a source of political conflict through the theory of natural rights and human equality. The domination of one race or ethnic group over the state apparatus has been the source of ethnic discontent and resentment. In ancient empires, one racial group usually dominated other groups. In the age of imperialism, in the modern sense, racial clashes also became significant. Ethnic migration due to population growth, economic poverty or political repression has increased the face of racial confrontation. In some cases, capitalists have advocated the migration of other races in order to obtain cheap and obedient labor and to fight against trade unions. In such cases, there is usually a conflict between the migrant labor force and the indigenous labor force, sometimes leading to racial riots. Thus, in such cases, ethnic and racial interests take precedence over class interests. Ethnic and racial uprisings require the emergence of the necessary objective and subjective conditions. Economic and social inequality and inequality as a ground for dissatisfaction with the emergence of the organization and the necessary awareness provides the ground for political action. The impossibility of political participation due to racial reasons and racial discrimination at the level of political affairs has been the main cause of ethnic uprisings (Bashiriyeh, 2012, pp. 279-280). With the proper distribution of power and wealth and welfare facilities in a rational way and based on justice among individuals and members of society, we can prevent the growth of discrimination and consequently prevent challenges in the country and the international community.

Opportunities

The growing expansion of human communication and communication with each other and access to news and information and the latest findings in the field of science, knowledge, industry and technology has become very fast. And humans can access a wide range of news, information and scientific findings about their political, economic, cultural and social affairs and needs in various dimensions at any time. And develop their individual and social life in sync with science, knowledge and technology.

The right of development

Development means managing and planning for a better life with excellent political, economic, social and cultural status, being highly developed organizationally and being very strong in terms of technology. Comprehensive growth and development in any country requires security, comfort, tranquility, unity and integrity, cohesion and unity of members and individuals, including tribes and clans with any characteristics, including language, creed, race and color. People in social life, despite the necessary cultural facilities, will succeed in growth and development in other fields.

Economic growth is only a necessary condition for development and not a sufficient condition for it, and as a result, the quality of this growth is as important as its quantity. Therefore, human beings should be the focus of development and pursue major goals such as the fundamental reduction of poverty and the possibility of fair economic opportunities. Provide the minimum consumption that is necessary to have healthy people. Provide minimum standards for access to public services, access to employment opportunities for the poor, and empowerment to earn the desired minimum

income; The right to participate in decisions that affect human life and livelihood is one of the basic needs of society that must be met as a priority. (Joseph et al., Zamani, 2016, p. 451). A new perspective was developed on the concept of development. This attitude took the concept of development out of the cocoon of economic growth and placed it in a large and humane atmosphere. In this new approach, the development of a multidimensional process that requires fundamental changes in social structure, attitudes of people and national institutions, as well as accelerating economic growth, reducing inequality and eradicating absolute poverty. In this theory, high income level indicates the potential talent for development, but if not everyone shares in this income, development has not occurred (Simonides, 2004, p. 152). Poverty, both cultural and material, is one of the roots of degeneration, and in degeneration there will be no success in growth, development and innovation. It is in free and healthy competition and within the framework of cultural principles that people seek to grow and develop in order to compete more with each other and create a dynamic and fluid society. The right to development in international human rights instruments is largely based on the recent approach. Because the key to understanding the concept of the right to development is whether the right to development is a process in which human rights and fundamental freedoms are established. Or, conversely, the realization of development requires the establishment of fundamental freedoms and respect for human rights. (Qari Seyed Fatemi, 2009, p. 209). Achieving growth and development is in the shadow of the establishment of fundamental freedoms and respect for human rights. Without freedom, in principle, individuals will be fixed in predetermined constraints, and there will be no growth and development. In freedom of thought, thought, criticism and suggestion, which will provide the grounds for growth and development through thinking and reasoning.

Human Rights Approach to Development

There has been much debate as to whether the right to development can be considered an example of human rights. This issue can now be considered resolved after the consensus reached on the Vienna Declaration and the 1993 Action Plan, which was later reaffirmed at a number of international conferences. As a result, the right to development involves a human rights approach to development. The focus of this approach is on the protection and realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms. This approach recognizes recognized human rights as a common framework for evaluating, guiding, and enhancing development. From this perspective, the ultimate goal of development is to guarantee all human rights for all. (Joseph et al., Zamani, 2016, p. 207).

The right-to-development approach seems to reinforce human-centered development. By recognizing human dignity and worth and the principle of non-discrimination, it creates equal choices and opportunities. Humans have the opportunity to develop their unique talents and individuals are placed in a position to contribute to social and economic development in society.

If we accept that respect, protection and implementation of human rights are considered as development; As a result, there are three assumptions about the relationship between human rights and development:

A) Development is the result of the establishment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. (Development as a goal)

B) Development, the process of expanding human rights and freedoms. (Development as a process)
C) Development is the means to achieve freedom and the observance of human rights. (Development as a tool)

In the human rights approach, development is seen not only as a process but also as a result. According to this view, an appropriate standard of living, adequate health care, gender equality, and primary education are not only the goal of development but also part of human rights. The aim of this approach is to improve the quality of life under a process that leads to the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Hence, human rights are not only the goal but also the means to achieve a quality of life. Which corresponds to the dignity and humanity of each person, as a result, the development process is just as important as the result (Habibi Majandeh, 2000, p. 86).

Sustainable development is not possible without considering the cultural factor, cultural identity and cultural mechanisms and the basic and principled link between development and culture that exists between them. The relationship between culture and sustainable development can be considered as a cultural context that refers to the set of existing knowledge and techniques that are available to inventors. In other words, as culture grows and knowledge and technology are added to the collection, so does the ground for new inventions and discoveries. The more fabrications and inventions and the more information about its ingredients. As well as understanding the environment in which the invention takes shape and the possibility of using it exponentially as the cultural context grows. And the richer the cultural context than other cultures. The possibility of inventions and

initiatives will increase and sustainable growth and development will increase. In other words, it can be said that cultural development is a precondition for the sustainable development of the world.

Conclusion

Cultural diversity is a common human heritage and human biodiversity that can live together in a compatible way with different cultures. Diversity and pluralism are the basic foundations of human rights and democracy, as a result of which the development and growth of all political, economic, social and cultural fields will follow. Today, countries around the world have identified values, principles, rules and norms of human rights, strategies to ensure, implement and monitor them through a set of documents, teachings, procedures and institutions; This is called the international human rights system. According to this system, in the light of all international human rights regulations, a protection system has been created that with all its principles and institutions seeks to benefit everyone from the common global values and guarantee their respect for human beings. Human rights are a divine gift and one of the inherent and natural rights of human beings, and no one can grant or remove these privileges or part of them. Human rights are the inalienable right of all people regardless of race, color, gender, language or religion. Human rights laws enacted by others and interpreted from the outside will not be able to be judged and enforced within countries. And it may conflict with domestic law and the acquired rights of individuals in enforcing foreign law in any country, and will challenge the country and the international community. Thus, the challenges and opportunities posed by cultural diversity and human rights in governments and, consequently, at the interna-

tional level have been significant. And in the implementation of human rights and the realization of rights, action must be taken with regard to justice, equality and equality, respect for the acquired rights of individuals, including minorities. And the non-observance of justice and the acquired rights of individuals, especially minorities, with security challenges, separatism, autonomy, chaos and terrorist phenomena, and as a result, we will cause a lack of comprehensive growth and development in the country and the international community. The results showed that cultural diversity on the one hand can be considered as a threat (lack of fair distribution of power, ethnic, cultural and religious discrimination lead to internal conflicts and consequently create challenges in the international community). And on the other hand as an opportunity. (Development and political, economic, social and cultural prosperity through tourist attraction. Cohesive role and creating a spirit of unity in crisis situations and protection of borders. Independence and territorial integrity) For countries dealing with cultural diversity and multinationalism. The findings also showed that cultural diversity and multinationalism have positive and negative consequences on human rights. To have a direct impact on maintaining the independence, unity and integrity and growth and all-round development of the country or the disintegration and ethnic and religious tensions and lack of growth and development. This requires laws, regulations and a system that can meet the demands of all groups and ethnicities.

References

Abbasi, Bijan, (2011). **Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms**, First Edition, Tehran, Justice Publishing

Ahmadi, Hamid, (1997). Ethnicity and ethnicity in Iran; Myth or reality? **Quarterly Journal of Political-Economic Information**. No. 116-115, April and May.

Anbari, Musa (2014). Sociology of Development: From Economics to Culture, Second Edition, Tehran, Samt Publications

Anwar Qadir, Mohammad, Bakhsh, (2002). **State Policies towards Muslims in Britain**, University of Warwick, Center for Research in Ethnic Relations

Assariannejad, Hossein, (2004). Security and ethnicity in the Islamic Republic of Iran. **Journal of the Higher National Defense University**. 48 and 49.

Azer, Edward, Yin Moon, Chong, (2000). **Rethinking National Security in the Third World**, Tehran, Publications of the Research Institute for Strategic Studies

Azkia, Mostafa, and Gholamreza Ghaffari, (2014). **Sociology of Development**, 11th edition, Tehran, Kayhan Publications,

Beygzadeh, Ebrahim, Koleini, Shahnaz, (2003). **Law of International Organizations**, **World Organizations**, Volume One, Tehran, Majd Publications

Buzan, Bari, (1999). **Governments and Fear**, Tehran, Research Institute for Strategic Studies Publications.

Eftekhar Jahromi, Goodarz, (1996). Sovereignty of States and Restrictions of the UN Charter, **Journal of Legal Research**, No. 18

Ghaebi, Mohammad Reza, (2007). Cultural Diversity: A Way Out of the Deadlock of the Universal Conflict and the Relativism of Human Rights, **Foreign Policy Quarterly**, Volume 21, Number 4

Ghasemi, Mohammad Ali, (2005). Discourses on the Law of Cultural and Ethnic Diversity, **Quarterly Journal of Strategic Studies**, Year 8, Number 3

Ghazi, Seyed Abolfazl (2014). **Constitutional Law and Political Institutions**, 13th Edition, Tehran, Mizan Publishing

Goodarzi, Hossein, (2006). **Basic Concepts in Ethnic Studies**, Tehran, Iranian Civilization Publications

Hashemi, Seyed Mohammad, (2014). **Constitutional Rights of the Islamic Republic of Iran**, 25th Edition, Volume II, Sovereignty and Political Institutions, Mizan Publishing

Hassanpour, Mohammad, (2003). Ethnic Heterogeneity and National Security. **Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences,** Third year, numbers 9 and 10

Heidari, Fariba, (2015). The Ratio of Human Rights and Cultural Diversity, **Quarterly Journal of Women's Rights Protection**, No. 3

Joseph Sarah, Schultz Jenny and Melissa Kessen, (2016) **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: Lawsuits, Doctrines, Interpretations** (Vol. I) Translated by Dr. Seyed Ghasem Zamani, Institute of Legal Studies and Research, Tehran

Katouzian, Nasser, (1998). **Principles of Public Law**, First Edition, Tehran, Justice Publishing

Khobrooy Pak, Mohammad Reza, (2001). **Minorities**, Tehran: Shirazeh Publishing and Research.

Kymlicka, Will, (2005). "Liberalism and Ethnic Pluralism", Farzin Aram, **Dialogue Magazine**, No. 43

Niko, Hamid, (2017). **Society, Identity and Cultural Diversity in the European Union**, Hadaf Publications

P.C., Arnold, (1996). **Technology and Culture**, translated by Bahram Shalgoni, Second edition, Tehran, Markaz Publications

Panahi, Mohammad Hossein, (2015). Cultural Development Necessity of Economic, Social and Political Development, **Quarterly Journal of Welfare Planning and Social Development**, No. 33

Qari Seyed Fatemi, Seyed Mohammad, (2011). **Human Rights in the Contemporary World**, Tehran, Shahid Beheshty University Press

Roshandel, Jalil, (2009). **National Security and the International System**, Sixth edition, Tehran, Samt Publications

Salari, Mohammad Javad and Moradi, Maryam, (2016). Human Rights: Cultural Relativism or Universalism from Jack Donnelly's Perspective, **Quarterly Journal of Legal Studies**, No. 2.

Salehnia, Narges, Dehnavi, Jalal, and Haghnejad, Amin, (2010). The Role of Culture in Economic Development, **Cultural Engineering Monthly**, Fourth Year, No. 43 and 44.

Simonides, Janus, (2004). Human Rights: **New Dimensions and Challenges**, translated by Mohammad Ali Shirkhani, Faculty of Law and Political Science, University of Tehran, Tehran.

Smith, Anthony, (1998). Ethnic sources of nationalism. **Quarterly Journal of Strategic Studies**, No. 1, Spring.

Tharoor, Shashi (2000). " Are Human Rights universal? ", Word Policy Journal, Vol. xv1, No. 4.

Thomas, Hylland, (1993). Ethnicity and Nationalism, Anthropological Perspectives

Vahid, Majid, (2004). "Global Convention on Cultural Diversity: A Study of Intellectual, Historical Backgrounds, Subject and Perspective of Approval and Consequences in Cultural Policy", **Journal of the Faculty of Law and Political Science**, No. 63

Van Tigerstrom, Barbara (2010). **Human Security and International Law**, translated by Ardeshir Amirarjmand, Hamid Ghanbari, Tehran, Majd Publications

Watson, Gary, (1982). (ed.), **Free will**, Oxford University.

Weiner, Myron, and Samuel, Huntington, (2013), **Understanding Political Development**, translated by the Institute for Strategic Studies, Second Edition, Tehran, Institute for Strategic Studies Publications

Zakerian, Mehdi, (2009). **Key Concepts of International Human Rights,** Tehran, Mizan Publications

Zupancic, Bostjanm. (2006). "On Universality of Human Rights", **The constitutional court of Turkey**. September 22