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Summary

Victory in the long and expensive US War on Terror will remain elusive until the root cause – radical ideology among Muslims – is addressed and effectively refuted. Defeating the ideology of political Islam and victory against terrorism can be achieved only through a long-term human-rights based educational program and developing a counter narrative around the UN Human Rights Declaration (UN HRD) that is linked to the primary Muslim scripture – the Qur’an. This combined initiative must be undertaken by Muslims themselves; a process that has already been initiated in the US. An objective public conversation is required that is designed to heighten awareness on these matters.

This paper discusses the background and highlights the gravity of this ideology with a view of enabling the Democratic Party to develop an effective strategy to refute its root cause. I propose a role for the Democratic Party that facilitates public conversations on these issues via public presentations or town hall type conversations, to propagate the narrative that focuses on the UN HRD in line with the Muslim’s combined narrative. In my view, radical violent ideology among Muslims can be combatted and the war on terror won only by supporting and putting into practice UN HRD in support of marginalized minorities.

Background

The US-led war against terrorism began in Afghanistan in 2001 after the September 11th attacks in New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia. Started by the Republican Administration of President George W. Bush and inherited by the Democratic Administration of President Obama, this longest and most expensive war in US history is continuing albeit with the current pause where the US has extricated itself from combat operations. The new Republican Administration of President Trump is promising the use of more force to eliminate ISIL and radical Islamic ideology. Addressing the joint session of Congress on February 28, 2017, the President reiterated his resolve and said: We will work with our allies, including our friends and allies in the Muslim world, to extinguish this vile enemy from our planet.¹

Harvard economist Linda Bilmes estimated the cost of this war through 2013 to range between $4-6 trillion.² Her estimate includes the projected long-term medical care and disability compensation for service members, veterans and families, AND the cost of military hardware replenishment. She could not however quantify the untold human suffering, the loss of life, and the increased polarization in our country. Despite this long and expensive war, victory remains elusive. There is widespread agreement that efforts must be made to end this war and comprehensively defeat terrorism.

² http://time.com/3651697/afghanistan-war-cost/
Terrorism by Muslims is the result of radicalization fueled by an ideology developed by the politicized clergy in reaction to the defeat of the former, long established Muslim empires. This defeatist ideology has long advocated the recreation of an Islamic State. It was first proposed in 1928 by the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) in Egypt after the Ottoman Empire’s defeat in WW1 and the termination of the Caliphate by Kamal Atatürk. Supported by similar political elements in India (Jama’at-i-Islami (JI)), during the British colonial period, this ideology gained traction and is now deeply embedded in the Muslim psyche. The politicized radical Muslim clergy have interpreted these historic developments – the capitulation of the 500-year old Ottoman Empire, the termination of the Caliphate and the British coloniztion of India after more than three centuries of Muslim rule – as divine punishment for their departure from the fundamentals of Islam.

Proclaiming religion as a complete political system – a claim refuted by the Qur’an, MB and JI have demanded the recreation of an Islamic State to be ruled under the Laws of the Caliphate (sharia) that were developed by the Abbasid Caliphate during the 8-10th century. JI redefined jihad as a violent doctrine which they attempted to employ to defeat the non-Muslim colonizers. These convoluted doctrines have only been sharpened over time and more jihadist groups have jumped into the fray. The politicized clergy have successfully implanted several flawed concepts into the religious thinking of Muslims, e.g., Islam is a complete political system, the Islamic State is a prerequisite for Muslims, Islam prohibits befriending non-Muslims, and adopting Western influences. They reject the separation of religion and politics and continually narrow their definition of a Muslim to quell dissent, and equate being secular as being irreligious. These flawed concepts have blurred the boundary between religion and politics, as confirmed by Pew Research, and need to be reversed through education and dialogue within Muslim communities.

The Radical Ideology and its Prior Documentation

Schematically depicted in Appendix 1, the ideology of establishing the Islamic State rests on four pillars – blasphemy (for curbing freedom of expression), apostasy (for curbing freedom of choice), sharia (providing legal cover for their actions) and interpreting jihad (to justify the use of violence). In the past few decades, these pillars have been given legislative cover and protection by the governments of the Muslim-majority countries, including the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC – the 56-member group of ‘Islamic’ countries). The extent of their support can be gauged by the fact that in 1990, the OIC declared the UN Declaration of Human Rights, adopted virtually unanimously in 1948, as un-Islamic and replaced it with an Islamic Declaration with sharia as its main component.

3 Humayun, A. Connivance by Silence: How the Majority’s Failure to Challenge Politically Motivated [Mis]interpretation of the Qur’an Empowered Radicals to Exploit Islam and Propagate Radicalism, Xlibris, Corp.
4 In Qur’anic terms, Jihad refers to the struggle to overcome personal ego and vanity. A defensive battle to defeat all religious persecution and safeguard all places of worship is allowed, but this is accorded the lowest level. The highest being the struggle against personal ego.
5 http://www.pewforum.org/2013/04/30/the-worlds-muslims-religion-politics-society-overview/
This reversal of OIC’s position shows the depths to which the radical ideology of political Islam has permeated into the Muslim consciousness through their propaganda which was encouraged by the Muslim regimes as quid pro quo for their support while the moderate viewpoints were suppressed through convoluted legislations to restrict free speech. This ill-fated decision by the OIC has resulted in much confusion among Muslim believers as they attempt to reconcile their understanding with the contentious religious-political narratives they are exposed to in their Muslim majority societies where any knowledgeable narrative is forcefully suppressed. Two noteworthy documents that refute the OIC position must be emphasized: one a book that cross references each article of the UN Declaration to the Qur’an7 and the other a comprehensive analysis8 of Muslim scholars and jurists’ opinions starting from the 7th century to date showing the convoluted path to engineer capital punishment for blasphemy in the Muslim world. Given this sad situation, President Trump will be hard pressed to find allies in the Muslim world to effectively counter radical Islamist ideology.

The cause of radical Muslim ideology was first documented and explored in a comprehensive judicial inquiry report in Pakistan in 1954. The Report documented how the political clergy engineered religiously-motivated riots to declare the newly-independent Pakistan to be an Islamic State. They accomplished this through the manipulation of Islamic teachings, as a crutch, to achieve their political objectives. Martial Law was declared in the affected parts to quell the disturbances and a high powered judicial commission was formed to investigate the causes and identify the instigators. The following observation from the report on the Punjab Disturbances of 1953 should serve as an eye opener:

“It is this lack of bold and clear thinking, the inability to understand and take decisions which have brought about in Pakistan a confusion which will persist and repeatedly create situations of the kind we have been inquiring into until our leaders have a clear conception of the goal and of the means to reach it. …. And .... **press Islam into service to solve situations it was never intended to solve, frustration and disappointment must dog our steps**. The sublime faith called Islam will live even if our leaders are not there to enforce it....Our politicians [leaders] should understand that **if Divine commands cannot make or keep a man a Musalman [Muslim], their statutes will not**.”9 (emphasis added)

The following extended excerpt from the referenced Commission’s Report clearly identifies the confusion and its causes that need to be addressed in any counter narrative to reverse this radical ideology which misinterprets and abuses the teachings of the Qur’an:10

We have dwelt at some length on the subject of Islamic State not because we intended to write a thesis against or in favour of such State but merely with a view to presenting a clear picture of the numerous possibilities that may in future arise if true causes of the ideological confusion

---

9 Report of the Court of Inquiry constituted under Punjab Act II OF 1954 to Enquire into the Punjab Disturbances of 1953, pg 232
10 Ibid, pgs 231-232
which contributed to the spread and intensity of the disturbances are not precisely located. That such confusion did exist is obvious because otherwise Muslim Leaguers, whose own Government was in office, would not have risen against it; sense of loyalty and public duty would not have departed from public officials who went about like maniacs howling against their own Government and officers; respect for property and human life would not have disappeared in the common man who with no scruple or compunction began freely to indulge in loot, arson and murder; politicians would not have shirked facing the men who had installed them in their offices; and administrators would not have felt hesitant or diffident in performing what was their obvious duty. If there is one thing which has been conclusively demonstrated in this inquiry, it is that provided you can persuade the masses to believe that something they are asked to do is religiously right or enjoined by religion, you can set them to any course of action, regardless of all considerations of discipline, loyalty, decency, morality or civic sense.

Pakistan is being taken by the common man, though it is not, as an Islamic State. This belief has been encouraged by the ceaseless clamour for Islam and Islamic State that is being heard from all quarters since the establishment of Pakistan. The phantom of an Islamic State has haunted the Musalman [Muslims] throughout the ages and is a result of the memory of the glorious past when Islam rising like a storm from the least expected quarter of the world—wilds of Arabia—instantly enveloped the world, pulling down from their high pedestal gods who had ruled over man since the creation, uprooting centuries old institutions and superstitions and supplanting all civilisations that had been built on an enslaved humanity. What is 125 years in human history, nay in the history of a people, and yet during this brief period Islam spread from the Indus to the Atlantic and Spain, and from the borders of China to Egypt, and the sons of the desert installed themselves in all old centres of civilisation—in Ctesiphon, Damascus, Alexandria, India and all places associated with the names of the Sumerian and the Assyrian civilisations. Historians have often posed the question: what would have been the state of the world today if Muawiya’s siege of Constantinople had succeeded or if the proverbial Arab instinct for plunder had not suddenly seized the mujahids of Abdur Rahman in their fight against Charles Martel on the plains of Tours in Southern France. May be Muslims would have discovered America long before Columbus did and the entire world would have been Moslemised; may be Islam itself would have been Europeanised. It is this brilliant achievement of the Arabian nomads, the like of which the world had never seen before, that makes the Musalman of today live in the past and yearn for the return of the glory that was Islam. He finds himself standing on the crossroads, wrapped in the mantle of the past and with the dead weight of centuries on his back, frustrated and bewildered and hesitant to turn one corner or the other. The freshness and the simplicity of the faith, which gave determination to his mind and spring to his muscle, is now denied to him. He has neither the means nor the ability to conquer and there are no countries to conquer.

Little does he understand that the forces, which are pitted against him, are entirely different from those against which early Islam, had to fight, and that on the clues given by his own ancestors human mind has achieved results which he cannot understand. He therefore finds
himself in a state of helplessness, waiting for someone to come and help him out of this morass of uncertainty and confusion. And he will go on waiting like this without anything happening. Nothing but a bold re-orientation of Islam to separate the vital from the lifeless can preserve it as a World Idea and convert the Musalman into a citizen of the present and the future world from the archaic in congruity that he is today.

This prophetic 67-year-old statement is more relevant today than in 1954 when the Judicial Commission published its findings. It highlights the confusion in the concept of establishing an Islamic State which we are faced with today in the form of ISIL. Pakistan’s – and the Muslim world’s – failure to implement the Commission’s recommendations to eliminate the root cause of radical Islamist ideology has converted the country into an incubator for nurturing this destructive ideology. The findings of this report are extremely relevant to any strategy to defeat terrorism around the world. The direct testimony11 (Appendix 1) during this inquiry was even more revealing and must be reviewed to understand the full implications of this convoluted concept of radical Islamist ideology.

As an unintended consequence of nurturing the radical Islamist ideology and making it part of their constitution, Pakistan has suffered serious economic and human consequences. Pakistan’s military has launched 13 campaigns against violent Islamist terrorists since 200712, but has been unsuccessful in eradicating terrorist attacks or the radical ideology that causes them anywhere in the country.

The common thread in the failure of Pakistan’s and the United States’ wars against the terrorism is that both are fighting the symptoms, without addressing the root causes. Resorting to more force has not enabled the US win this open-ended war which has largely taken place in the isolated and rugged mountainous regions of Afghanistan and in the densely populated urban areas of Syria and Iraq where military hardware and firepower cannot be efficiently employed. The unintended consequence of the prolonged war has been to spread the conflict to other regions where new, battle-hardened and more barbaric incarnations of ISIL (or ISIS) have emerged, including Boko Haram, Taharek-e-Taliban, etc.

This failed approach of using overwhelming force must be replaced by the proposed new strategy that focuses on education to challenge the radical ideology that fuels Islamist terrorism.

In the 22 March 2017 London attack near the parliament building, the terrorist attacker – a 52-year-old convert to Islam – was born and raised in the UK in a Christian family as Adrian Russell. A recent convert to Islam who took on the name Masood, he was a popular football (soccer) player at school and an extremely popular pupil, who was bright and sporty. He was fond of alcohol and drugs while in school.13 Although the British Government has not yet established any definite connections with terrorist groups,

---

11 Humayun, A. Connivance by Silence: How the Majority's Failure to Challenge Politically Motivated [Mis]interpretation of the Qur'an Empowered Radicals to Exploit Islam and Propagate Radicalism, Xlibris, Corp. pg 145-197
the Saudi Arabian Government has confirmed that he spent time in Saudi Arabia teaching English.\textsuperscript{14} His motivation for the terrorist attack has not yet been confirmed by the British authorities.

**The Facts behind the Misconception about UN HRD and Islam**

The common perception among many Muslims and non-Muslims is that the UN HRD is incompatible with Islam. This misconception is fueled by several factors. Saudi Arabia objected to two articles of the UN HRD and later abstained from voting for its adoption at the UN in 1948. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) rejected the UN HRD as being un-Islamic in the 1990s and adopted their *Islamic* version in June 2000 (Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam) which cites sharia as their supreme law. The OIC decision required the Muslim majority countries to reverse their prior support of the UN HRD. The OIC action occurred amid prevailing propaganda against Western influences as well as befriending non-Muslims. The OIC action, driven by Saudi Arabia, was prompted by Iran whose representative, defending his country’s human rights violations at the UN in 1984, stated: “… apart from Islamic law,... conventions, declarations, and resolutions or decisions of international organizations, which were contrary to Islam, had no validity in the Islamic Republic of Iran.... The Universal Declaration of Human Rights which represented secular understanding of Judeo-Christian traditions, could not be implemented by Muslims and did not accord with the system of values recognized by the Islamic Republic of Iran; his country would, therefore not hesitate to violate its provisions.”\textsuperscript{15}

The root cause of this misconception clearly is Saudi Arabia’s objections to the adoption of the UN HRD in 1948. The reason for the Saudi opposition must be analyzed to understand the facts. Mary Ann Glendon\textsuperscript{16} and Tayyab Mahmud\textsuperscript{17} have documented the discussions at the UN General Assembly’s 182nd Plenary Meeting of the 3rd Committee where the Draft of the International Declaration of Human Rights was discussed in 1948. Per Tayyab Mahmood’s account:\textsuperscript{18}

The colloquy that took place between the representatives of Saudi Arabia and Pakistan during the discussion of the Draft UN DHR\textsuperscript{210} is very instructive. The Saudi delegate took the position that the draft was based largely on the patterns of culture dominant in the West, patterns frequently "at variance with the patterns of culture of Eastern States."\textsuperscript{211} He particularly took issue with Article 18’s construction of freedom of conscience as including the right to change one’s religion.\textsuperscript{212} According to the Saudi delegate, the right to change one’s religion was not recognized in Islamic law [sharia], and he castigated representatives of Islamic countries who voted for the provision as a betrayal of their constituency.\textsuperscript{213} The representative of Pakistan,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{14} http://www.dailynews.com/general-news/20170325/london-attacker-had-worked-in-saudi-arabia-teaching-english
  \item \textsuperscript{15} UN General Assembly; Thirty Ninth Session, Third Committee, 65th meeting held on Friday, 7 Dec 1984. (seen in http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1010&context=honorscollege_theses)
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Mary Ann Glendon, A World Made New – Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Random House, 2001
  \item \textsuperscript{17} Tayyab Mahmud, Freedom of Religion & Religious Minorities in Pakistan: A Study of Judicial Practice, Fordham International Law Journal Volume 19, Issue 1, 1995. Article 5
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Ibid, p 86
\end{itemize}
however, characterized the adoption of the UDHR as an "epoch-making event," and "thought it necessary to set out very clearly his delegation's position as to that part of article 19" which "dealt with the freedom of conscience, including freedom to change one's religion." He said that "the Moslem religion had unequivocally proclaimed the right to freedom of conscience and had declared itself against any kind of compulsion in matters of faith or religious practices. The Pakistan delegation would therefore vote for article 19 [subsequently changed to Article 18 in final Declaration], and would accept no limitation on its provisions.

Objecting to Articles 16 and 18, the Saudi Arabian delegate Jamil Baroody charged that the authors of the draft Declaration had adopted Western standards for family relations, and had “ignored more ancient civilizations, which were past the experimental stage, and the institutions of which, for example marriage, had proved their wisdom through the centuries.” Documenting the Saudi opposition to Article 18 (freedom to change religion), “Baroody was again the most outspoken critic. His delegation supported the freedom of conscience and religion but objected to the right to change one’s religion because proselytization historically caused so much bloodshed and warfare. Saudi Arabia’s vigorous opposition to the marriage and religion articles in the third committee foreshadowed that country’s abstention from the Declaration.”

Baroody was neither a Saudi nor a Muslim but a Lebanese Christian Arab. Baroody did oppose including a phrase on the freedom to change religion that was eventually to be guaranteed in Article 18 of the UDHR, which some observers have attributed to Islam, but he did not expressly invoke Islam as a reason for his opposition. Johannes Morsink notes that Baroody's objections to Article 18 included his assessment that the language concerning the freedom to change religion was superfluous and that it was inconsistent to provide for the right to change religion as part of the freedom of religion when there were no corresponding provisions guaranteeing the right to change positions in the provisions on freedom of thought and conscience. Some other delegations supported Baroody's objections, and not all of these were from Muslim states. Thus, using Baroody's remarks to generalize about a supposed Islamic hostility to the UDHR is unwarranted.

According to Glendon, “The main speaker on the issue in the General Assembly was Muhammad Zafrulla Khan [Pakistan’s foreign minister and head of its UN delegation] who told the delegates that the article on religious freedom would have the full support of Pakistan, then the UN member with the largest Muslim population. The issue, he said, “involved the honor of Islam” and cited the Qur’anic passage for the proposition that faith could not have an obligatory character: Let him who chooses to believe, believe, and him who chooses to disbelieve, disbelieve. Speaking with the authority of a religious

---

20 Ibid, p 148
22 Ibid, p 168
scholar\textsuperscript{23} Zafrulla Khan’s forceful support of Articles 16 and 18 convinced all other Muslim countries, except Saudi Arabia, to support the Declaration. Elaborating on his explanation of the cited Qur’anic teachings, Zafrulla Khan said: \textit{Let he who chooses to believe, believe, and he who chooses to disbelieve, disbelieve}, and it formally condemned not lack of faith but hypocrisy. \textit{“The Moslem religion was a missionary religion: it strove to persuade men to change their faith and alter their way of living, so as to follow the faith and way of living it preached, but it recognized the same right of conversion for other religions as for itself.”}\textsuperscript{24} Following Zafrulla Khan’s rebuttal of the Saudi position using scriptural justification, all Muslim countries, except Saudi Arabia, supported the Declaration. Zafrulla Khan was a distinguished jurist who later served as the president of the International Court of Justice in The Hague and later published a book, cross referencing each article of the UN-HRD to the Quran.\textsuperscript{25}

The slight difference in detail about the reason for Saudi opposition to Article 18 notwithstanding, Zafrulla Khan forcefully established that the Islamic scripture validates freedom of conscience, including changing faith, at this important international forum. The Saudis did not refute his position nor did they oppose the Declaration – they abstained. The fact that Saudi Arabia has not changed its original position regarding the \textit{un-Islamic} nature of the UN HRD is disturbing. After failing to convince the Muslim majority countries on facts at the UN in 1948, the Saudi petrodollars succeeded in convincing the Muslim world THROUGH OIC to reverse their previous position in favor of the Saudi position. This reversal shows the widespread propagation and acceptance of the Saudi-based Wahabbi ideology in the Muslim world. It also helps contextualize the results of the 2013 Pew Research study (Ref 4 cited earlier) which shows resurgence in the demands for implementation of sharia in Muslim majority societies, and the associated confusion in Muslim countries that is giving credence to the medieval conspiracy theories about the West being at war with Islam.

\textbf{The UN Human Rights Declaration and the Proposed Strategy}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Race disconnected us}
  \item \textit{Religion separated us}
  \item \textit{Politics divided us} ..... (anonymous)
\end{itemize}

This sad but relevant quote implies the fundamental bond that can bring people together – our common bond of humanity. Unfortunately, people have failed to understand the role of religion – to unite humanity by gradually elevating the adherents’ behaviors from instinctive to moral and spiritual consciousness. Tragically, religion instead has been exploited as a tool to secure political power, control and securing wealth by monopolizing truth, condemning the other to eternal damnation, and causing destruction, etc. Awareness of the common bond of our humanity can be used to reverse this

\textsuperscript{24} http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1450&context=ilj cited in footnote215, pg 86
disparaging trend. Led by Western societies, following the widespread suffering and destruction of World Wars I and II, this awareness was catalyzed in the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 (Appendix 2).

The Declaration is a voluntary statement of ideals that every human being aspires to attain. The Declaration is not contrary to any religious teachings because world’s major religions all foster unity and peace rather than division and war.\(^{26}\) Therefore, all the major religions have upheld the thirty Articles of the UN Declaration. Emphasizing this point, Eleanor Roosevelt, commented: The important thing is neither your nationality nor the religion you professed, but how your faith translated itself in your life.\(^{27}\) She characterized this Declaration as "the Magna Carta"\(^{28}\) for people around the world. Some of her other quotes are as relevant today as they were in 1948 when this Declaration was adopted:

- Remember always that you have not only the right to be an individual; you have an obligation to be one. You cannot make any useful contribution in life unless you do this.\(^{29}\)
- Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home – so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any maps of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person; the neighbourhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, farm or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere. Without concerned citizen action to uphold them close to home, we shall look in vain for progress in the larger world.\(^{30}\)
- It isn’t enough to talk about peace. One must believe in it. And it isn’t enough to believe in it. One must work at it.\(^{31}\)

Some US Muslim organizations have formally promoted the importance of the UN HRD and developed educational programs around its principles to counter the growing threat of radicalism among Muslims. Two examples of these initiatives are the Muslim Reform Movement\(^{32}\) launched by a group of Muslim organizations in North America and Europe and True Islam\(^{33}\) launched by the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community.

\(^{26}\) Mary Ann Glendon, *A World Made New – Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, Random House, 2001 p75-6 cites independent UN surveys before adopting the HRD to confirm there was no conflict between the HRD declaration and teachings of major world religions.

\(^{27}\) https://themindsjournal.com/lessons-from-eleanor-roosevelt/

\(^{28}\) Magna Carta, signed in 1215, was drafted by the rebel nobles in England to curb the tyrannical power of their own monarch and secured liberties for England’s elite classes. Its language protecting due process and barring absolute monarchy has guided the fundamental principles of common law in constitutions around the world for the last 800 years. The Magna Carta brought an end to the absolute power of English sovereigns as they, too, were required to be held accountable by the law.

\(^{29}\) http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/45956-remember-always-that-you-have-not-only-the-right-to


\(^{31}\) https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/e/eleanorroo131302.html


\(^{33}\) http://www.trueislam.com/home/
The Democratic Party should develop their strategy to counter the radical ideology around the UN Human Rights Declaration which should also include:

1. Support public conversations (through invited presentations or town hall type meetings) on these matters to expound the root cause, history, and the illogical position behind the radical ideology.
2. Public discussions will draw Muslims, who are disengaged, to contribute to this debate, and help propagate the counter narrative developed by Muslims based on the Qur’an and the UN Declaration of Human Rights.

Such a strategy will go a long way in uniting the society around noble ideals that all human beings aspire to attain. In Eleanor Roosevelt words, 34 “We’ve found ourselves in a situation where we must know about all the other peoples of the world. We must know about the way we live, what they are like, what their beliefs are, what their aspirations are … To me, the fact that there is contact, a bridge on which we can meet and talk, has value.”

Concluding Comments

The UN Declaration of Human Rights provides a neutral platform and common ground for human beings to come together in support of the lofty ideals all individuals aspire to attain. Although supported by most religious scriptures, the Declaration is a secular document. It upholds America’s critical constitutional elements of equality under the law, non-discrimination, separation of religion from government (a prerequisite for rejecting the concept of Islamic State), and grants individuals the right to basic human freedoms that are critical for the individuals’ intellectual, moral and social development.

The Democratic Party is in a good position to develop a strategy to counter the Republican position which relies on the use of force alone; the Republican approach lacks the critical educational component to resolve the radical ideology. This positive, fact-based proposed strategy for the Democratic Party will not only attract the Muslim votes, it will also showcase the Party as the leader for social justice and a supporter of marginalized minorities. Additionally, it will promote a counter narrative to effectively refute the Republican Party’s anti-Muslim rhetoric and the radical ideology of creating an Islamic State.

Appendix 1

Muslim Radical Ideology details established through cross examination by Munir Commission in Pakistan in 1954

The formation of an Islamic State, ruled by a Caliph is the overall ideology. Integral parts of the mythical Islamic State are sharia, jihad, apostasy and blasphemy (schematically shown in Figure 1).

Figure 1. Schematic depiction of Islamic State concept

The following direct testimony of politicized Muslim clergy, excerpted from the Munir Commission Report, is presented to explain this destructive ideology.

**Integrity of the Qur’an:** Accepting the integrity and completeness of the Qur’an is an essential article of faith and Allah guarantees its preservation in the Qur’an. Contrary to this, the Pakistani Muslim scholars conceded, under cross examination, that a verse of the Qur’an that prohibits violence under jihad had been abrogated. The Commission observed:

> The generally accepted view [of the scholars] is that the fifth verse to Sura-i-Tauba (Sura IX) abrogated the earlier verses revealed in Mecca which permitted the killing of kuffar only in self-defence. As against this the Ahmadis believe that no verse in the Qur’an was abrogated by another verse and that both sets of verses, namely, the Meccan verses and the relative verses in Sura-i-Tauba have different scopes and can stand together. This introduces the difficult controversy of *nasikh* [extant] and *mansukh* [expired], with all its implications.

**Status of non-Muslims in an Islamic State:** None of the scholars examined by the Commission were ready to accord equal status to minorities despite the clear and unequivocal confirmation of equal status for all human beings contained in the Qur’an and the Holy Prophet’s traditions. The evidence of some leading scholars is presented below as examples of this discrepancy:

**Maulana Abul Hasanant** on being questioned on the subject stated as follows:

---

35 Verily, We Ourselves have sent down this Exhortation, and most surely We will be its Guardian, (Ch 15, v 10)
36 Report of the Court of Inquiry constituted under Punjab Act II OF 1954 to enquire into the Punjab Disturbances of 1953, p 223
37 *ibid*, p 213-215
“Q[uestion] If we were to have an Islamic State in Pakistan, what will be the position of the *kuffar* (non-Muslims)? Will they have a voice in the making of laws, the right of administering the law and the right to hold public offices?

A[nswer] Their position will be that of *zimmies*. They will have no voice in the making of laws, no right to administer the law and no right to hold public offices.

Q[uestion] In an Islamic State can the head of the State delegate any part of his powers to *kuffar*?

A[nswer] No.”

*Maulana Ahmad Ali, when questioned, said:*

“Q[uestion] If we were to have an Islamic State in Pakistan, what will be the position of the *kuffar*? Will they have a hand in the making of the law, the right to administer the law and the right to hold public offices?

A[nswer] Their position will be that of *zimmies*. They will have no say in the making of law and no right to administer the law. Government may, however, permit them to hold any public office”.

*Mian Tufail Muhammad [Jam’at-i-Islami] stated as follows:*

‘Q[uestion] Read the article on minorities’ rights in the ‘Civil and Military Gazette’ of 13th October, 1953, and say whether it correctly represents your view of an Islamic State? (It was stated in the articles that minorities would have the same rights as Muslims).

A[nswer] I have read this article and do not acknowledge these rights for the Christians or other non-Muslims in Pakistan if the State is founded on the ideology of the Jama’at”.

The confusion on this point in the mind of *Maulana Abdul Haamid Badayuni*, President, Jam’at-ul-Ulama-i-Pakistan, is apparent from the following:

“Q[uestion] Have you ever read the aforesaid speech (the speech of the Quaid-i-Azam to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan on 11th August, 1947)?

A[nswer] Yes, I have read that speech.

Q[uestion] Do you still agree with the conception of Pakistan that the Quaid-i-Azam presented to the Constituent Assembly in this speech in which he said that thereafter there would be only one Pakistan nation, consisting of Muslims and non-Muslims, having equal civic rights, without any distinction of race, religion or creed and that religion would be merely a private affair of the individual?

A[nswer] I accept the principle that all communities, whether Muslims or non-Muslims, should have, according to their population, proper representation in the administration of the State and legislation, except that non-Muslims cannot be taken in the army or the judiciary or be appointed as Ministers or to other posts involving the reposing of confidence.

Q[uestion] Are you suggesting that the position of non-Muslims would be that of *zimmies* or any better?

A[nswer] No. By *zimmies* are meant non-Muslim people in lands which have been conquered by an Islamic State, and the word is not applicable to non-Muslim minorities already living in an Islamic State. Such minorities are called *mu’ahids*, i.e. those people with whom some agreement has been made.

Q[uestion] What will be their status if there is no agreement with them?

A[nswer] In that case communities cannot have any rights of citizenship.

Q[uestion] Will the non-Muslim communities inhabiting Pakistan be called by you as *mu’ahids*?
A[nswer] No, not till the absence of an agreement with them. To my knowledge there is no such agreement with such communities in Pakistan.”

So, according to the evidence of this learned divine, the non-Muslims of Pakistan will neither be citizens nor will they have the status of zimmies or of mu’ahids.

This stance is contrary to the fundamental human rights. The Commission highlighted the dilemma caused by this position of according unequal status to non-Muslims in a Muslim country and commented: 38

“... This being the position, the State will have to devise some machinery by which the distinction between a Muslim and a non-Muslim may be determined and its consequences enforced. The question, therefore, whether a person is or is not a Muslim will be of fundamental importance, and it was for this reason that we asked most of the leading ulama to give their definition of a Muslim, the point being that if the ulama of the various sects believed the Ahmadis to be kafirs, they must have been quite clear in their minds not only about the grounds of such belief but also about the definition of a Muslim because the claim that a certain person or community is not within the pale of Islam implies on the part of the claimant an exact conception of what a Muslim is. The result of this part of the inquiry, however, has been anything but satisfactory, and if considerable confusion exists in the minds of our ulama on such a simple matter, one can easily imagine what the differences on more complicated matters will be”.

The Commission then questioned the scholars on the expected reaction of non-Muslim governments where Muslim are in minority. They specifically referred to India as it had a sizeable Muslim population even after partition in 1947.

REACTION ON MUSLIMS OF NON-MUSLIM STATES: 39 The ideology on which an Islamic State is desired to be founded in Pakistan must have certain consequences for the Musalmans [Muslim] who are living in countries under non-Muslim sovereigns. We asked Amir-i-Shari‘at Sayyad Ataullah Shah Bukhari whether a Muslim could be a faithful subject of a non-Muslim State and reproduce his answer:

Q[uestion] In your opinion is a Musalman bound to obey orders of a kafir Government?
A[nswer] It is not possible that a Musalman should be faithful citizen of a non-Muslim Government.

Q[uestion] Will it be possible for the four crore [forth million] of Indian Muslims to be faithful citizens of their State?

The answer is quite consistent with the ideology which has been pressed before us but then if Pakistan is entitled to base its Constitution on religion, the same right must be conceded to other countries where Musalmans are in substantial minorities or if they constitute a preponderating majority in a country where sovereignty rests with a non-Muslim community. We, therefore, asked the various ulama whether, if non-Muslims in Pakistan were to be subjected to this discrimination in matters of citizenship, the ulama would have any objection to Muslims in other countries being subjected to a similar discrimination. Their reactions to this suggestion are reproduced below:

38 Ibid, p 214-215
39 Ibid, p 227-230
Maulana Abul Hasanat Sayyed Muhammad Ahmad Qadri, President, Jami'at-ul-Ulama-i-Pakistan:

Q[uestion] You will admit for the Hindus, who are in a majority in India, the right to have a Hindu religious State?
Q[uestion] Will you have any objection if the Muslims are treated under that form of Government as malishes or shudras under the law of Manu?

Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi:

Q[uestion] If we have this form of Islamic Government in Pakistan, will you permit Hindus to base their Constitution on the laws of their own religion?
A[nswer] Certainly. I should have no objection even if the Muslims of India are treated in that form of Government as shudras and malishes and Manu’s laws are applied to them, depriving them of all share in the Government and the rights of a citizen. In fact such a state of affairs already exists in India.”

Amir-i-Shari’at Sayyad Ata Ullah Shah Bukhari:

“Q[uestion] How many crores [1 crore = 10 million] of Muslims are there in India?
A[nswer] Four crores [40 million].
Q[uestion] Have you any objection to the law of Manu being applied to them according to which they will have no civil right and will be treated as malishes and shudras’
A[nswer] I am in Pakistan and I cannot advise them.”

Mian Tufail Muhammad of Jama’at-i-Islami:

“Q[uestion] What is the population of Muslims in the world?
A[nswer] Fifty crores [500 million].
Q[uestion] If the total population of Muslims of the world is 50 crores [500 million], as you say and the number of Muslims living in Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Indonesia, Egypt, Persia, Syria, Lebanon, Trans-Jordan, Turkey and Iraq does not exceed 20 crores [200 million], will not the result of your ideology be to convert 30 crores [300 million] of Muslims in the world into hewers of wood and drawers of water?
A[nswer] My ideology should not affect their position.
Q[uestion] Even if they are subjected to discrimination on religious grounds and denied ordinary rights of citizenship? :

This witness goes to the extent of asserting that even if a non-Muslim Government were to offer posts to Muslims in the public services of the country, it will be their duty to refuse such posts.”

Despite this assertion, Muslims have flocked to non-Muslim countries to escape persecution in their native countries and seeking better educational and economic opportunities. This assertion flies in the face of this defective ideology.

Ghazi Siraj-ud-Din Munir:

“Q[uestion] Do you want an Islamic State in Pakistan?
Q[uestion] What will be your reaction if the neighbouring country was to found their political system on their own religion?
A[nswer] They can do it if they like.
Q[uestion] Do you admit for them the right to declare that all Muslims in India are *shudras* and *malishes* with no civil rights whatsoever?
A[nswer] We will do our best to see that before they do it their political sovereignty is gone. We are too strong for India. We will be strong enough to prevent India from doing this.
Q[uestion] Is it a part of the religious obligations of Muslims to preach their religion?
Q[uestion] Is it a part of the duty of Muslims in India publicly to preach their religion?
A[nswer] They should have that right.
Q[uestion] What if the Indian State is founded on a religious basis and the right to preach religion is disallowed to its Muslim nationals?
A[nswer] If India makes any such law, believer in the Expansionist movement as I am, I will march on India and conquer her.”

So, this is the reply to the reciprocity of discrimination on religious grounds.

**Master Taj-ud-Din Ansari:**

“Q[uestion] Would you like to have the same ideology for the four crores [forty million] of Muslims in India as you are impressing upon the Muslims of Pakistan?
A[nswer] That ideology will not let them remain in India for one minute.
Q[uestion] Does the ideology of a Muslim change from place to place and from time to time?
Q[uestion] Then why should not the Muslims of India have the same ideology as you have?
A[nswer] They should answer that question.”

The ideology advocated before us, if adopted by Indian Muslims, will completely disqualify them for public offices in the State, not only in India but in other countries also which are under a non-Muslim Government. Muslims will become perpetual suspects everywhere and will not be enrolled in the army because according to this ideology, in case of war between a Muslim country and a non-Muslim country, Muslim soldiers of the non-Muslim country must either side with the Muslim country or surrender their posts.

The following is the view expressed by two divines whom we questioned on this point:

**Maulana Abul Hasanat Sayyed Muhammad Ahmad Qadri, President, Jami’at-ul-Ulama-i-Pakistan:**

“Q[uestion] What will be the duty of Muslims in India in case of war between India and Pakistan?
A[nswer] Their duty is obvious, namely, to side with us and not to fight against us on behalf of India.”

**Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi:**

Q[uestion] What will be the duty of the Muslims in India in case of war between India and Pakistan?
A[nswer] Their duty is obvious, and that is not to fight against Pakistan or to do anything injurious to the safety of Pakistan.”
The soldier or the policeman will have the right, on grounds of religion, to disobey a command by a superior authority. Maulana Abul Hasanat’s view on this is as follows:

‘I believe that if a policeman is required to do something which we consider to be contrary to our religion, it should be the duty of the policeman to disobey the authority. The same would be my answer if ‘army’ were substituted for ‘police’.

Q[uestion] You stated yesterday that if a policeman or a soldier was required by a superior authority to do what you considered to be contrary to religion, it would be the duty of that policeman or the soldier to disobey such authority. Will you give the or the soldier to disobey such authority. Will you give the whether the command he is given by his superior authority is contrary to religion?


Q[uestion] Suppose there is war between Pakistan and another Muslim country and the soldier feels that Pakistan is in the wrong and that to shoot a soldier of the other country is contrary to religion. Do you think he would be justified in disobeying his commanding officer?

A[nswer] In such a contingency the soldier should take a fatwa of the “ulama.”

We have dwelt at some length on this subject of Islamic State not because we intended to write a thesis against or in favour of such State but merely with a view to presenting a clear picture of the numerous possibilities that may in future arise if true causes of the ideological confusion which contributed to the spread and intensity of the disturbances are not precisely located. That such confusion did exist is obvious because otherwise Muslim Leaguers, whose own Government was in office, would not have risen against it; sense of loyalty and public duty would not have departed from public officials who went about like maniacs howling against their own Government and officers; respect for property and human life would not have disappeared in the common man who with no scruple or compunction began freely to indulge in loot, arson and murder; politicians would not have shirked facing the men who had installed them in their offices; and administrators would not have felt hesitant or diffident in performing what was their obvious duty. If there is one thing which has been conclusively demonstrated in this inquiry, it is that provided you can persuade the masses to believe that something they are asked to do is religiously right or enjoined by religion, you can set them to any course of action, regardless of all considerations of discipline, loyalty, decency, morality or civic sense.

An Islamic State is *dar-ul-Islam*, namely, a country where ordinances of Islam are established and which is under the rule of a Muslim sovereign. Its inhabitants are Muslims and also non-Muslims who have submitted to Muslim control and who under certain restrictions and without the possibility of full citizenship are guaranteed their lives and property by the Muslim State. They must, however, be people of Scriptures and may not be idolaters. An Islamic state is in theory perpetually at war with the neighbouring non-Muslim country, which at any time may become *dar-ul-harb*, in which case it is the duty of the Muslims of that country to leave it and to come over to the country of their brethren in faith.

We put this aspect to Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi and reproduce his views

Q[uestion] Is a country on the border of *dar-ul-Islam* always *qua* an Islamic State in the position of *dar-ul-harb*?

A[nswer] No. In the absence of an agreement to the contrary, the Islamic state will be potentially at war with the non-Muslim neighbouring country. The non-Muslim country acquires the status of *dar-ul-harb* only after the Islamic State declares a formal war against it.’
Q[uestion]  Do you call your migration to Pakistan as hijrat in the religious sense?  
A[nswer]  Yes"40

The law relating to prisoners of war is another branch of Islamic law which is bound to come in conflict with International Law. As for instance, in matters relating to the treatment of prisoners of war, we shall have to be governed by Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi’s view, assuming that view is based on the Qur’an and the sunna, which is as follows:41

“Q[uestion]  Is there a law of war in Islam?  
Q[uestion] Does it differ fundamentally from the modern International Law of war?  
A[nswer]  These two systems are based on a fundamental difference.
Q[uestion]  What rights have non-Muslims who are taken prisoners of war in a jihad?  
A[nswer]  The Islamic law on the point is that if the country of which these prisoners are nationals pays ransom, they will be released. An exchange of prisoners is also permitted. If neither of these alternatives is possible, the prisoners will be converted into slaves forever. If any such person makes an offer to pay his ransom out of his own earnings, he will be permitted to collect the money necessary for the fidya (ransom).
Q[uestion] Are you of the view that unless a Government assumes the form of an Islamic Government, any war declared by it is not a jihad?  
A[nswer]  No. A war may be declared to be a jihad if it is declared by a national Government of Muslims in the legitimate interests of the State.” 42

Maulana Abul Hasanat Muhammad Ahmad Qadri’s view on this point is as follows:

Q[uestion]  Is there a law of war in Islam?  
Q[uestion]  Does it differ in fundamentals from the present International Law?  
Q[uestion]  What are the rights of a person taken prisoner in war?  
A[nswer]  He can embrace Islam or ask for aman, in which case he will be treated as a musta’min. If he does not ask for aman, he would be made a slave”.

Similar is the opinion expressed by Mian Tufail Muhammad of Jama’at-i-Islami who says:

Q[uestion]  Is there any law of war in Islamic laws?  
Q[uestion]  If that comes into conflict with International Law, which will you follow?  
A[nswer]  Islamic law.
Q[uestion]  Then please state what will be the status of prisoners of war captured by your forces?  
A[nswer]  I cannot reply to this off hand. I will have to study the point. Of course ghanima (plunder) and khums (one-fifth) if treated as a necessary incident of jihad will be treated by international society as a mere act of brigandage.

40 Ibid, pgs 221-222  
41 Ibid, p 225-227  
42 Ibid, pg 225
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The UN Declaration of Human Rights

Preamble
Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,

Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

Now, Therefore THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY proclaims THIS UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

Article 1.
All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2.
Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3.
Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4.
No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5.
No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6.
Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7.
All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8.
Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9.
No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 10.
Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11.
(1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.
(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

Article 12.
No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13.
(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.
(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14.
(1) Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.
(2) This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15.
(1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.
(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.
Article 16.
(1) Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.
(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.
(3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17.
(1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.
(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18.
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.

Article 19.
Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20.
(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
(2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21.
(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.
(2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.
(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22.
Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23.
(1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.
(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.
(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.
(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24.
Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25.
(1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in
the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26.
(1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

Article 27.
(1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

(2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28.
Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29.
(1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

(3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 30.
Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.