

Critical Review on the Relationship Between Religion and Human Rights: In Perspective of Either in Protection or Violation of Human Rights

Tilahun Seyoum Kebede

Assosa University; College of Social Science and Humanities in Department of Civic and Ethical Studies

Abstract

This paper basically emphasized on critical review on the relationship between religion and human rights either in protection or violation of human rights. This is about the place of religion in human rights provision and the place of human rights provision in religion. The basic elements of the reviews are the place of religion in human rights: can religious value promoting human rights? The negative facets of religion to human rights: is religion an impediment to human rights promotion? Freedom of religion and religious choice, equality and non-discrimination gender distinctions, capital punishment framework, the place of human rights in the promotion religion the negative aspects of human rights in religion: is the human rights threat to religion? And religions and the international human rights instruments. To address this issues the utilized method was document analysis and related literatures on the issue in hand.

Keywords: Religion, Human Rights

Introduction

The relationship between religion and human rights has usually been seen as an uneasy one. It has long been the subject of scholars' debate. The debate among the scholars focuses on the source/foundation of human rights principles, whether it is inescapably religious or a secular idea. In addition to this, the debate extends on the issue of whether religion and human rights are mutually reinforcing or not.

There are group of scholars that argues human rights principles are inherent within religious values and teachings. Especially, Christian theologians strongly argued that Western human rights theory is grounded in religious faith. Paul Gordon Lauren also argued that human rights do not have a single geographical or temporal origin rather developed in all cultures and religions around the world. Confirming the above arguments Ishay argued that despite the many controversies regarding the origins of human rights, one should not that few of the drafters of the UDHR and UNESCO's respondents disputed that religious humanism and ancient traditions influence our secular and modern understanding of rights. Putting aside the issue of divine revelation, which has at various times led to arbitrary interpretations and applications most religious texts incorporate a notion of universalism containing altruistic guidelines that could apply in to all individuals, as a contemporary definition would require, then to a substantial portion of humanity.¹ Conversely, many scholars argue that human rights principles are secular not emanated from the divine. Those supporting this argument use the historical origin human rights ideas to strengthen their claim. For them, human rights itself is part of the critique for the religious institutions, therefore claiming human rights as religious is lack of empirical evidence. Thus, Louis Henkin argued that human rights morality is autonomous. The ideologies of religion and human rights differ in their sources, the bases of their authority, their forms of expression, and even their substantive norms. For Henkin the human rights principle does not see human rights as integral to a cosmic order. It does not derive from any sacred text. Its sources are human, deriving from contemporary human life in human society. Human rights are a political idea and ideology that claims to reflect a universal contemporary moral intuition.²

With regard to the mutuality of human rights and religion the assertion that religious values are the foundation of human rights leads to the argument that they (religion and human rights) are compatible in some aspects if not in every points. on the other hand, the claim that human rights are secular that are not rooted in religious value leads that human rights and religion are not compatible because of the conflictual values and principles they possess. However, religion, secularism and human rights are interdependent and apparent, tensions between any or among all of them can be overcome by their conceptual synergy.³

Beyond this, there is a strong argument between cultural relativist and universalism in the human rights issue. There is strong rejection for the ideas of human rights, not because of the values it is offering, mostly because it is originated from the Western liberal countries. Muslim scholars in some countries even see human rights as a project for liberalizing non-Western countries and they see human rights as containing too many Western-hidden agendas. Due to the complex and problematic nature of religion and human rights as it is subject

¹ Ishay R. Micheline. (2004).the history of human rights: from ancient times to the globalization era. University of California press, Ltd. London, England.

²Henkin Louis: Religion, Religions, and Human Rights. The Journal of Religious Ethics, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Fall, 1998), pp. 229-239

³An-Na'im Ahmed Abdullahi. The interdependence of religion, secularism and human rights: Prospects for Islamic societies

to different interpretations and views.

Therefore, this paper was basically looked the different views forwarded by scholars on the relationship of religion and human rights. Particularly the place of religion in the protection and promotion human rights, the negative facets of religion to human rights in the protection and promotion, the place of human rights in the protection and promotion of religion, and the negative aspects of human rights in religion. At last it reflected views on the relation of the two (human rights and religion) by considering the argument of relativist and Universalist and finally it was wind up with conclusion.

The Relationship between Religion and Human Rights

As I have tried to note in the introductory part, the relationship between religion and human rights is subject to multifarious argument that emanates from different direction. The main focus in this paper however is to look at whether human rights principles are secular or influenced by religious values and traditions and to see whether religion and human rights are mutually reinforcing or not.

Before I proceed to the detail explanation about the relationship (positive and negative) of religion and human rights at this moment it is crucial to adopt working definition of both concepts- religion and human rights- for the sake of this paper. Thus, human rights are due to all human beings by virtue of their humanity, without distinction on the grounds such as race, sex, religion, language, or national origin. The key feature of human rights, by this definition, is universality.¹ The working definition that I use for religion- it can be defined as a system of beliefs, practices, institutions and the relationship within a community that distinguishes itself from other communities. The key feature of any religion in this sense is the exclusivity of any community of believers. Once I define the basic concepts of human rights and religion now look at their relationship from different directions in detail below.

The Place of Religion in Human Rights: Can Religious Value Promote Human Rights?

The difficulty in achieving agreement among all scholars and communities on a single foundation for human rights and the issue of divine revelation, which has at various times led to arbitrary interpretations and applications. This paves the way to the emergence of different view and perception about the role of religions in human rights promotion and protection. Here, look at the arguments of scholars who claim that human rights principles are based on religious beliefs and religious values promoting human rights-the mutuality of both elements.

So, many scholars reflect that religious values are the foundations of human rights and hence promote human rights. As Perry argues there are many religious values that contain human rights principles that become important foundations for human rights. The basic teachings of religion that regulate human interrelation. Perry cites in the sacred-text as “love one another as I have loved you”, for Perry clearly contains God’s message on how people should live side by side. By arguing this, Perry clarifies the sense that religion is fundamental organization that provides normative principles that should be made as referring values for human beings to behave in their social context. On the other hand, as secularism does not have strong foundation of principles of human interrelations as religion, for Perry it is not sensible to say that human rights are not religious. Human rights are sacred, as human beings are also sacred (Alfirdaus Kholid Laila.2011).²

Similarly; Ishay argued that despite the controversies regarding the origins of human rights, one should not that few of the drafters of the UDHR and few of UNESCO’s respondents disputed that religious humanism and ancient traditions influence our secular and modern understanding of rights. putting aside the issue of divine revelation, which has at various times led to arbitrary interpretations and applications, most religious texts incorporate a notion of universalism containing altruistic guidelines that could apply to all individuals, as a contemporary definition would require, then to a substantial portion of humanity. While human rights force us to think about universality in political and economic terms, they benefit from such portrayals of universal brotherly love as one finds in Mich (the Hebrew Bible), Paul (the New Testament), the Buddha, and others and also in different ways, from the detached universal love fussed by the Stoics, like Epictetus and advocates like Plato and Cicero.³

Maintaining that human rights transcend religious and ideological differences, cited in Ishay; Rene Cassin nonetheless recognized their religious and natural law foundations. By proclaiming that all human beings “should act toward one another in spirit of brother hood,” the first article of the declaration cross pond to the Biblical injection “love the neighbor as they self” and “love the stranger as you love yourself” (Leviticus 19:18-33 Jerusalem Bible). We must not lose sights of fundamentals, cassia claimed, in nothing that “the concept of human rights comes from the Bible, from the Old Testament, from the Ten Commandments”. Whether these

¹Ibid

²Alfirdaus Kholid Laila.(2011).Religion as a tool for Human Rights Advocacy: The case of Southern Kebumen Conflict of State Society over land

³Supra note 1

principles were centered on the church, the mosque, or the polis, they were often phrased in duties, which now presume rights. For instance, Thou shall not murder is the right to life. Thou shall not steal is the right to own property, and son and so forth. We must not forget that Judaism gave the world the concept of human rights.¹

Furthermore the proponents argue that the major religions accept the fundamental right of the individuals. For instance both Christianity and Islam accept the right to life: “The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly”. As for liberty and security of person, both the religions guarantee them.² For instance, in this regard Baderin pointed out that the *Qur’an* and the *Sunnah* (i.e. the *Shari’ah*), which constitute the main sources of Islamic religious, moral and legal norms, contain relevant provisions that support the guarantee of human rights and the promotion of development in Muslim States. Also, the methods and relevant principles of Islamic law can be positively employed to ensure the practical realization of that objective. Religion also forms the basis of the actions of many individual and collective humanitarian endeavors in many parts of the world today. He also noted that religion can however be a very sentimental and an explosive phenomenon, which has sometimes been misused to perpetrate hatred and human rights violations in many parts of the world.³

Looking at the African traditional belief, Ghanaian conceptions of why the human being is sacred and worthy of dignified treatment are rooted in religious belief. For example, Southern Ghana societies such as the Akan, the Ga and the Ewe, in their traditional views of the human being, hold that the human being in essence is a composite being made up of material and immaterial components that link him/her to spiritual entities such as God, the deities and the ancestors. These entities constitute the highest possible sublime realities that can be conceived and are therefore worthy of reverence. To link the essence of the human being to these is to ascribe scarality to a person. Commenting on the Akan maxim, “all persons are the children of God; no one is a child of the earth”.⁴ From this one can see that how religious belief and tradition supplies the ground for what we propose to call a “validating foundation” of human rights. A validating foundation provides justification for human rights. Such ground for justification often squares with a society’s core beliefs about humanity. Therefore, what we refer to as a validating foundation for human rights may not be understood in a conventional foundationalism way. It does not include the idea of a single essential foundation of human rights applicable to all cultures; neither does it imply a theory of human nature universally conceived. The idea that human life is sacred may be held in a secular or a conventional religious way.⁵ The positive point in all revealed religions is that they enjoin peace and preach non-violence. It is their votaries who violate the injunctions of their religions and bring disaster upon mankind.⁶

The existence of some provisions that deals with human dignity in the religious text clearly reflects that religious values and beliefs has been used both as a source of human rights and promote human rights even though it is difficult to argue that it is the only one and at the same time there is no violation associated with religious values and traditions.

The Negative Facets of Religion to Human Rights: Is Religion an Impediment to Human Rights Promotion?

Despite the assertion that religion is the base of human rights and respectation of human rights is an inherent nature of the sacred text of religion. There are group of scholars that oppose this ideas and argues on the opposite-religion is an impediment to the promotion of human rights.

The basic argument is that religions have not always welcomed the human rights idea, or recognized its kinship, or sought its cooperation. Religions are much older than the human rights idea and have seen no need for that idea. Religions laid claim to conceptions of the good, of the good society, long ago, without any idea of rights. Religions have not been wholly comfortable with the idea of human rights. They do not welcome the ideological independence of human rights, its insistence on non-theistic supports for the idea, its resistance to the higher law of society and even to divine law. Religions have not had confidence in an ideology that does not claim divine origin or inspiration and has no essential place for the Deity. Spokesmen for religion have declared secular foundations for human rights to be weak, unstable, and doomed to fail and pass away.

Some religions resist what they see as the concentration on, indeed the apotheosis of, the individual and the exaltation of individual autonomy and freedom. Religions, was not upon the individual but upon the community the People of Israel, Christendom, Islam, on the cosmic or the social order.⁷ Religions have not often been committed to democracy, or to universal suffrage, or to representative government. The authority of the majority

¹Ibid

²Chaudhry Rehman ur- Hafeez ; Religion and Human Rights: A Comparative Analysis,Pakistan Vision Vol. 9, No.1

³Baderin Mashood; The Role of Islam in Human Rights and Development in Muslim States. religion, human rights and international law, a critical examination of Islamic practices, vol.6 Martious Nijhoff,Leiden.Boston

⁴Religion and Human Rights: Linking tradition and modernity in the context of globalization

⁵ Ibid

⁶Supra note. 8

⁷Supra note 2

is supported in the Bible, but not as a political ideology. Religion was for a long time closely identified with the divine right of kings, not with universal suffrage. In our times, religions have sometimes identified with totalitarian repressive regimes.¹

The assertion that religion is not the source of human rights principles and religion has never promoted human rights can be seen from different historical accounts of religious practices. The idea and the morality of religions differ from the idea and ideology of human rights in their sources and in the bases of their authority; in the forms in which their respective moral codes are given expression; and, to some extent, in elements of their respective moral codes. The argument against religion starts from the foundational principle and goes whether religion promotes human rights or not by looking at historical context. We have summarized shortly the negative relationship between religion and human rights as argued by scholars of human rights in the following sub topics.

Freedom of Religion and Religious Choice

Unlike the human rights principles Religions however, reject the recognition of freedom of conscience and religious choice to every human being. Religions reject atheism. In the past, religions condemned idolatry (and killed idolaters). Religions generally continue to condemn apostasy and resist the proselytizing of their constituents by other religions. Religious anti- Semitism (or anti-Semitism supported or tolerated by religions) has not been unknown².

Equality and Non-discrimination

For the contemporary human rights ideology, human dignity requires equality and non-discrimination, including non-discrimination on grounds of religion or non-religion. Religions, in contrast, have accepted- indeed mandated distinctions on the basis of religion, permitting (requiring) distinctions between one religion to other religions, between the faithful and the infidel³. All religions promise to save only their own adherents. Christ is supposed to save those who believe in Him as the second person of the Trinity, whose blood will save them from the wrath of God the Father. Similarly Mohammed promises to save only those who believe in Allah (One God) and him as the last prophet. The approach of all religions is, in a manner of speaking, quite insular. No revealed religion promises to save all mankind⁴.

Gender Distinctions

The principal religions have established distinctions between the genders. Religions may insist that not only men but women also find their human dignity in such distinctions. The consequence is that women are denied various freedoms that men take for granted, for example those relating to dress, to access to public spaces, and in the context of personal laws. The reality is that both religion and culture are asserted to justify the subordination of women for a whole range of reasons, including the retention of economic, political, and social power by elites within patriarchal structures. This subordination manifests itself in women's low economic status, discriminatory laws that justify exclusion from owning or accessing property and restrictive personal laws.

For example assertions that religion demands that women cannot move outside unless accompanied by a male relative impacts upon their freedom of movement, participatory rights, freedom of association, rights to paid work and choice of place and type of work, and access to non-discriminatory education. These restrictions may lead to feelings of isolation, depression and undermine the right to health and even to life. Discrimination and exclusion from public life contributes to women's poverty, itself fuelling recourse to begging, prostitution and vulnerability to violence and trafficking.⁵

To be more evident here measures taken in the name of Islamisation in Pakistan, for instance have threatened gender equality and denied women's equal human rights. Conversely, steps taken to ensure greater equality between women and men have been condemned as un-Islamic. Conflicts have arisen primarily in matters relating to the family, sexuality and reproduction, matters that, within international human rights law, have frequently been defined as private, religious or cultural and beyond the tests applied to spheres defined as public or political⁶.

To conclude many scholars and writers argued that the foundation of women's subordinate status is rooted in the religious traditions Judeo-Christian traditions. Thus, religion does not promote human rights. The above examples are some indications of the way how religion impedes the protection and promotion of human rights.

¹ Ibid

² ibid

³Ibid

⁴Supra note.12

⁵Chinkin; Christine 2007. Women's Human Rights and Religion: How do they Co-Exist?, religion, human rights and international law, a critical examination of Islamic practices, vol.6 Martiousnijh off, Leiden Boston

⁶ Mullally Siobhan; 2007: women, Islamisation and human rights in Pakistan: developing strategies for resistance, religion, human rights and international law, a critical examination of Islamic practices, vol.6 Martiousnijh Off, Leiden. Boston

Particularly women's, children's, persons with disability were discriminated and marginalized from participation in the political, economic and social aspects due to the wrong values of religion on these group.

Capital punishment

According to Henkin the Bible prescribes principles and norms of justice- procedural justice, criminal justice, and distributive justice; but its criminal justice calls for capital punishment for many offenses. (In Judaism, later generations had to mitigate the rigors of capital punishment by setting up nearly insuperable procedural and evidentiary obstacles to convicting the accused). The human rights ideology, though it has not wholly outlawed capital punishment, clearly it aimed to abolition because it derogates human dignity- the dignity of the person executed, as well as the dignity of the members of the society that executes (It does not accept the argument that the human dignity of the victims of crime requires or justifies capital punishment)¹.

The Place of Human Rights in the Promotion Religion

According to Henkin the human rights code declares freedom of conscience and religious choice to human person. The human rights ideology recognizes individuals to freedom of religion-to adopt once own belief and exercise it freely. Basically when Winston Churchill and F.D. Roosevelt met on the Atlantic in 1941 to define the Allied war aims in the Second World War, they included amongst the four fundamental freedoms and right to "worship God in one's own way anywhere in the world". By giving primacy to freedom of religion as one of the most fundamental of human rights, the Allies were addressing the oppression which the leaders of Nazi Germany were inflicting upon Jews, Jehovah's Witnesses, and other religious minorities.² Currently the right to freedom of religion is a core rights that was entrenched in international law before many other human rights.

The right to freedom of religion is clearly stated in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR) of 1948 under art.18 declares that: "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance." This article has been largely replicated in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), article 18 and in the regional human rights treaties: the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), article 9, the American Convention on Human Rights (ACHR), article 12, and the African Charter of Peoples' and Human Rights (ACPHR), article 8³.

These articles provide both positive and negative state obligations with respect to freedom of religion. The negative obligation requires states not to interfere with an individual's development of their religious belief. The state must also positively protect the right to manifest such belief through, for example ensuring the security of places of worship. Thus it can be said that international human rights instruments positively serve the religion- the freedom to have one's own religion.

The Negative Aspects of Human Rights in Religion: Is the Human Rights Threat to Religion?

Despite the fact that the international human rights instrument guarantee religious freedom by stating as a fundamental rights to be enjoyed universally. There are group of peoples that express their frustration against the human rights ideology. The argument comes dominantly from cultural relativist- that sees the impossibility of universal application of human rights across the world which has different cultures and way of life. Their claim is that human rights principles accord in the international normative framework mainly focus on the individual rights (even though the socio economic and cultural rights are included later) spoils the religious values of some communities and is inconsistency in some instance. For example the issue of home sexuality even though not clearly stated in the international human rights standards it is all most recognized as a human rights, and many countries legalized it however this is strongly opposed by most religious communities since it contradict with the religious text. Similarly Moslem scholars in some countries even see human rights as a project for liberalizing non-Western countries and they see human rights as containing too many Western-hidden agendas. In fact there are so many values and traditions of religion that are not compatible with human rights standards.

Anthropologist Sally; Claims that human rights lawyers talk about culture, they refer to it as traditional harmful practices, old customs, and sometimes, as ancient ways. They considered themselves and their project as rooted in modernity and law and picture culture as the obstacle. Their tendency to see culture as a problem is enhanced by their commitment to a model of legal rationality, an idea that is incompatible with celebrating local cultural complexity⁴. From the legal perspective on human rights, she claimed the texts, the documents, and compliance the matter of culture. Universalism is essential while relativism is bad. This is a sense of moral

¹ Supra note .17

² Kirby Michael; 2009. Law, Human Rights and Religion-of genocide, sexuality and apostasy. Macquarie Law Review, December.

³ Supra note .18

⁴ Merry Engle Sally, 2003 Human Rights Law and the Demonization of Culture (And Anthropology along the Way); Polar: Vol. 26, No. 1. American Anthropological Association; Wellesley College

certainty which taking account of culture disorder. This means, however, that the moral principle of tolerance for difference is misplaced.

As human rights law criticized culture; it misunderstands culture (religion). Recognizing the extent to which the human rights project is itself a cultural one and that it can build upon culture rather than only refuse to accept it, would foster its expansion and use by local promoter¹.

Another anthropological point of view; the effects of religion are so extensive that some scholars regard religion as the very foundation of culture. The way religion is able to put forth such a wide range of influences on peoples and cultures through dealing with indispensable issues such as right and wrong, life and death. But right and wrong mean different things in different places, and although we all must die, not all religions teach their followers to fear or worry about this fact. We will never understand religion if we regard it as simply a belief system about spirits or issues of ultimate meaning, as just a mechanism of social control, or as a means to allay fear. Religions do indeed serve these purposes, but they also do much more. Religions structure our perceptions of the Universe, linking the present to both the past and the future. Religions inform us about unseen beings and powers that are responsible for the phenomena we perceive in the everyday world, and postulate unseen aspects of our own nature that motivate our behaviors².

Based this explanation what we are going to add is that religion is also part of culture which preaches the way how to respect and protect the dignity of human being by praying to one God even if it has various sect (in teaching of religion the basic issue is love, peace and liberty to God i.e. the same is true for individuals). But in some extent the human rights lawyers relatively rejected the role of culture (religious) in promotion of rights even though religion has its own flaws.

For example when we see the practical conflict resolution mechanisms in religious aspect it is more of effective in non-occurrence of revenge between the compliant if they are resolved their disputes on the behalf of the religion and religious leaders compared with the legal aspects of human rights (this has relatively high opportunities for revenge even if they are based on the court). So, here we are not saying that the human rights lawyers could not give an opportunity for cultural or customary practices in protection of human rights theoretically but the practical implementation is not ineffective. In connection to this there is proverb says "*bunna yellella kurse ena kisse yellella mesikere waga yelewum*" (coffee without breakfast and priest without cross does not have respect).

Thus, merely the existence of the principle is nothing. The implication of this principle in the legal system of human rights is for the sack of resisting the complains which are come from religion point of view and its implicit issues are the drafters of rights are rushing to their political and economic interest rather than promoting and protecting the religion rights of the groups.

Analysis and conclusion

As it is noted in the introduction points of analysis are emphasized on two elements-to see whether human rights are secular or has a religious foundation and to evaluate whether religion and human rights are mutually reinforcing or not.

It is obvious that the relationship between religion and human rights has been characterized by complex history. Due to this fact there is a little agreement on the foundations of human rights and religion. My argument regarding the issue of foundational aspect is that human rights are not purely secular and cannot escape from the influence of religious values. So, for effective protection and promotion of human dignity if both religion and human rights law work together is better as we are living in global village and diversified society. This means that the society who experience and practicing various culture (religion) and political system religion and human rights law are function interdependent.

Even though, it is hard and unsound to argue all human rights principles that currently operate have religious foundation, the contribution of religion is substantial. Human rights principles are not something that comes out of vacuum; rather they are rooted both in the religious and secular. Every custom *and religion as part* of culture has the notions of human rights and has its own unique system to handle human rights issues. As Ishay (2004) has argued in this case religious humanism and ancient traditions influence our secular and modern understanding of rights. Undeniably; the religious text and teachings had contributed to the development of human rights. The Bible, the Quran and the traditional systems such as the Akan in Ghana has contributed to the concept of human rights. Alleviating internal contradiction (as a reality in every sphere) most religions preach peace and non-violence.

Here, the claim that religious values has contributed to the development of human rights concept however does not totally reflect that religious values and teachings are absolute in the promotion of human rights as well as its development. Depending on one's own perspective, religion as a form of social ordering in communities

¹ Ibid

² Anthropology and the Study of Religion; <http://www.pearsonhighered.com/samplechapter/0131893033.pdf>

can be conceived either as a positive or negative factor in the promotion of human rights. Especially; in the case of hardline traditional and conservative interpretation of religious text can be of negative effect in the quest for human rights.

Religion is a very sentimental and explosive phenomenon, which has sometimes misused to perpetrate hatred and human rights violations in many parts of the world. To this effect religious communities have often themselves violated human rights. However, the fact that violation of human rights by religious communities does not make void the contribution of religion to human rights development. Governments currently are violating the rights of citizens as do the religious communities for the sake of their interest.

On the vein of this, the fact that religious values has something that they contributed to human rights norm logically leads to the conclusion that human rights and religion are to some extent compatible if not in every aspect or there is a possibility of synergy between the two. In this regard Na'im asserted that religion and human rights are interdependent and the tensions between the two can be overcome by their conceptual synergy. Methodologically he asserted that the relationship between religion and human rights should be; human rights need religion to authenticate their moral foundation and to organize religious believer in support of individual rights¹; religion needs human rights to protect the dignity and rights of religious adherent inside any political system save for human rights also ensure freedom of belief and practice within each religion itself and ensure the evolution and continuing relevance of each religion to its own membership. For instance secular movement in Egypt by women does not see religion as anti-ethical to feminism, and they perceive religious affiliation as integral to their struggle for human rights.

To conclude this discussion; human rights are thought of in secular terms most of the time and they are viewed as a legal issue by many scholars. However, as I noted there is a growing recognition of the fact that human rights ideology needs to be rooted in the value systems of the various cultures in order to flourish. Currently there is high demand by the Universalist proponent that the UDHR expects all peoples and nations to nurture themselves into maturity with respect to human rights. However, this can be realized more easily when human rights are embedded properly in the various cultures of the world.

The affirmation that human rights are secular and the claim of Universalist may not work well to the promotion of human rights. It is impossible for human rights to be universal unless it goes deeply local and to be universal they have to address plural philosophies and beliefs that sometimes collide or appear to resist its application of universal norms.

Therefore, human rights need religion to validate their moral foundation and to mobilize religious adherents. Religion needs human rights to protect the dignity and rights of religious adherents within any political system, but human rights also ensure freedom of belief and practice within each religion itself and thus ensure the evolution and continuing relevance of each religion to its own membership.

References

- Abdullahi Ahmed An-Na'im. The interdependence of religion, secularism and human rights: Prospects for Islamic societies anthropology and the study of religion <http://www.pearsonhighered.com/samplechapter/0131893033.pdf>
- Chinkin;Christine 2007. Women's Human Rights and Religion: How do they Co-Exist?,religion, human rights and international law, a critical examination of Islamic practices, vol.6 Martious Nijhoff ,Leiden. Boston
- Hafeez-ur-RehmanChaudhry. Religion and Human Rights: A Comparative Analysis,Pakistan Vision Vol. 9, No.1
- LailaKholid Alfirdaus.(2011).Religion as a tool for Human Rights Advocacy: The case of Southern Kebumen Conflict of State Societyover land Law, Human Rights and Religion-of genocide, sexuality and apostasy. Macquarie Law Reviw,December 2009.
- Louis Henkin: Religion, Religions, and Human Rights. The Journal of Religious Ethics, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Fall, 1998), pp. 229-239
- Mashood A. Baderin.The Role of Islam in Human Rights and Development in Muslim States. (great book); Religion and Human Rights: Linking tradition and modernity in the context of globalization
- Merry Engle Sally, 2003 Human Rights Law and the Demonization of Culture (And Anthropology along the Way); Polar: Vol. 26, No. 1. American Anthropological Association; Wellesley College
- Micheline R. Ishay. (2004).the history of human rights: from ancient times to the globalization era. University of California press, Ltd. London, England.

¹ Ibid