International Journal for Humanities and Social Sciences (IJHS)

Open-Access Journal

DOI https://doi.org/10.69792/IJHS.24.2.1

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4276-9080

ISSN (Online): 2945-4271

No. 1 | Issue 2| Dec. 2024

Study of political developments in democratic, communist and dictatorial systems and their impact on power, governance and human rights

Assia Hamdi *

University of Mohamed Boudiaf - M'Sila - Algeria

Assiahis9@gmail.com

Abstract:

In the current era, the world is experiencing profound political and economic shifts, marking a departure from the norms that dominated the pre-industrial period. Notably, the dissolution of feudal and communal systems, which were emblematic of an economy rooted in pastoral ideologies, has been underway since the French Revolution. This transformative period has not only reshaped global dynamics but also led to the reconstitution of modern state structures within the context of institutional states.

This research delves into the evolving patterns of political changes and their economic repercussions in the contemporary global landscape. Our study aims to decipher the dynamics of international transformations within the global political arena and explore their interconnections with the emerging world order. Furthermore, we have endeavored to trace the philosophical political roots that underpinned these economic systems, examining their genesis and subsequent influence on political developments across various regimes, with a particular focus on implications for human rights. An analytical methodology underpins our examination of these political transformations. Central to our inquiry is the following pivotal question:

- **What is the impact of developments in political and economic systems in the contemporary world on authority, governance, and human rights?**

To address this question, we deemed it necessary to discuss three topics related to political transformation, presenting an analysis for each of the following axes:

1. Circumstances and history of modern political transformations.
2. Modern political demands, compared to advanced political aspirations.
3. Human rights, between liberal propaganda and democracy.

Our findings reveal that political variables have undergone substantial changes that significantly influence political ideologies, the conceptualization of authority, and human rights considerations. Among these influential factors are:

- **Globalization and Technology:** Technological advancements and the expansion of global communications via the Internet have opened new avenues for political discourse and interaction. This development transcends local boundaries, positioning politics as a globally interconnected phenomenon.
- **Social and Cultural Transformations:** There has been a significant shift in social and cultural paradigms, particularly in the heightened awareness of human rights. This shift has broadened the scope of political thought and necessitated the integration of these issues into both national and international political dialogues.
- **Economic Transformations:** The evolution of economic structures, spurred by technological progress and globalization, has profound implications for political theories concerning the equitable distribution of wealth, economic opportunities, poverty alleviation, and addressing economic disparities.

Keywords: Democracy, Politics, Liberalism, Human Rights, Economy.

Received: 02/03/2024 **Accepted**: 23/07/2024 **Proofreading**: 24/07/2024 **Available online**: 31/12/2024

Introduction

Over recent centuries, the global landscape has witnessed profound transformations across myriad domains. These changes, irrespective of individual moral evaluations, highlight a stark reality: those unable or unwilling to adapt have often faced severe consequences, ranging from societal marginalization to outright dependency.

Today, one of the most significant markers of this evolution is the exponential growth in specialized disciplines. This specialization has reached such a level that individuals not deeply versed in these fields, or those whose circumstances have precluded formal education, might be deemed illiterate, incapable of independently forming opinions or contributing meaningfully to societal discourse.

***Corresponding Author:**| **Email:** , Assiahis9@gmail.com

Copyright©2022 The Author(s): This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License

The distinction that the human mind often makes between different subjects does not reflect the interconnected nature of reality. For example, the geography of a particular area is inherently shaped by its history; yet, for the sake of ease in study and specialization, these subjects are often treated separately. This artificial separation can lead to significant errors. Specialists might overlook crucial historical contexts, and non-specialists, lacking a foundation in scientific thinking, might perpetuate these oversights, thus reinforcing a cycle of misinformation.

The line between unqualified encroachment upon a specialty and the beneficial application of a general scientific understanding is fine yet critical. A layperson, armed with some scientific insight, can transcend complete dependence on specialists and contribute more effectively to discussions, even if they are not experts in the field.

Furthermore, the direct impact of politics on individual lives enhances its significance for everyone, not just professionals in the field. People are naturally inclined to defend their interests, principles, and identities, leading them to form broad, and sometimes naïve, views on political matters.

These perceptions are not limited to direct political engagement but extend to their understanding of history, their analytical skills, and the ideologies they adopt. The danger lies not only in the immediate errors that such insufficiently informed views can cause in political arenas but also in the broader implications for logical reasoning and historical interpretation across various subjects.

First Chapter: Circumstance and History

Since the French Revolution, its principles have not merely spread; they have infiltrated and become entrenched in the global psyche, reaching a near-axiomatic status by the 21st century. As Gustave Le Bon articulated in 2020 (p.181), one's sense of freedom emboldens the individual to voice opinions openly. However, the extent of political and social freedom is not uniform and varies significantly across different regions and historical epochs, shaped by their systems, perceptions, axioms, and taken-for-granted truths. Thus, the crucial elements that have transformed are both the circumstance and the historical context.

Living in isolation on a remote island is a rare exception in today's interconnected world, where each individual's existence is deeply rooted in their historical background, the political entity that recognizes them legally, and the societal framework within which they engage. These factors collectively shape their worldview.

The historical milieu profoundly influences what is deemed necessary from one era to the next. In contemporary times, it is nearly inconceivable to imagine life without electricity, a utility that transcends mere convenience to become a fundamental necessity that supports critical aspects of modern life, including medical care, work, transportation, and daily sustenance. What once was a luxury that enhanced life's quality has evolved into an essential lifeline on which both individuals and nations depend.

The political and historical circumstances surrounding an individual play a significant role in shaping their perceptions, often subconsciously. While this influence is widely acknowledged today, many overlook the broader implications of how speeches and policies shape current perceptions.

For instance, nationalist rhetoric in the Arab region has profoundly influenced successive generations, even among those who do not recognize or may openly reject this influence. This phenomenon is similarly observed in religious and ideological discourses, which, despite their varied expressions, tend to adopt a consistent theoretical framework.

Individuals do not exist in isolation but are products of their environments, shaped by prevailing axioms, self-evident truths, and the prevailing discourse, which often includes unquestioned assumptions embedded within the questions posed to them. Responding to such questions often means inadvertently accepting the premises they presuppose, thus perpetuating a particular logic even when merely attempting to provide an answer. This dynamic underscores the widespread impact of framing in discourse, which can overshadow deeper inquiries into efficiency, competency, and other critical aspects of governance.

These dynamics often reduce the actions of states to the persona of their leaders rather than their strategic directions. By accepting the premises of narrowly framed questions, such as the role of a statesman in religion, broader, potentially more critical questions are neglected. Recognizing these patterns reveals that various ideological frameworks, whether Islamic, liberal, secular, or socialist, often propose solutions that, while differing in rhetoric, share underlying theoretical structures and yield similar outcomes.

***Corresponding Author** | **Email-** Assiahis9@gmail.com
Copyright © **2024** The Author(s): This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License.

The inquiry in the form of a question has held significant importance for many thinkers. Karl Popper notably posed the question, "Which is better for governing the state?" (El Kholi, 2021, pp. 305). This question prompted reflections that led to the conceptualization of totalitarian state governance, despite the diversity of responses it elicited. Popper's interrogation essentially leads to the consensus that the best suited for governance are those who are both knowledgeable and trusted by the public, be they the righteous, scholars, the pious, philosophers, or thinkers.

Consequently, the subsequent question arises: "Who is the least harmful in governance?" The responses to this query have evolved over time, acknowledging that while an individual may not embody complete righteousness or profound virtue, they could, in a position of power, initiate and influence actions that are comparatively less detrimental.

This recognition has fostered the idea of the separation of powers to limit authority. Popper advocated for the concept of minimizing harm, suggesting a relinquishment of some authority to prevent the severe misdeeds that could arise from absolute power. If those characterized as virtuous, devout, knowledgeable, or highly patriotic were endowed with extensive powers to achieve governance excellence, they might overreach to the extent of controlling the very liberties of their citizens.

This dialogue opens up an awareness of the significant variances in mental assumptions between different societies. For instance, the mindset of an agrarian society during the feudal era starkly contrasts with that of a contemporary industrial society. Similarly, pastoral societies exhibit distinct thought patterns from those of urban settings, noticeable in the differing perspectives between rural villages and cities.

Feuerbach poignantly noted that individuals residing in shacks perceive the world differently from those in palaces (Marx, Engels, 1900, p. 37), with their mental frameworks heavily influenced by their immediate needs and circumstances. For example, while individuals in less affluent conditions might concern themselves with the adequacy of their food supplies until month's end, those in more privileged settings might focus on the latest literary releases or the ranking of top global universities.

Recalling these foundational inquiries is crucial in forming political perceptions, as one's circumstances profoundly influence their thoughts and assumptions. An individual residing in a desert, for instance, may not fully grasp the complexities of urban life. This extends to the prevailing ideologies of a particular era or personal experience. Someone previously aligned with a specific ideology might find it challenging to detach from it merely by decision. They may transition to another ideology, using the same critical tools without recognizing it, and reinterpret their past experiences in the terms of their new reality without fundamentally altering their thought processes.

Previous ideas often linger beneath contemporary expressions, as exemplified by villagers who may rely on standards they disdain and are unaccustomed to in their various ideological battles, be they religious, national, or revolutionary. In these instances, they often engage in discussions without carefully providing the necessary evidence and reasoning to support their conclusions.

Such individuals might not recognize that their arguments are mere reflections of their ingrained rural perspectives, focusing more on the titles they claim to discuss. For instance, they might speak in the name of Christ without genuinely understanding or hearing His teachings.

The historical context and the nature of ideological and propagandistic discourses prevalent at a specific time and place are crucial in understanding the mindset of those operating within such frameworks. A notable example involves some writers who continue to reference the book *[Protocols of the Elders of Zion]* as a credible source in their political analyses. This text was introduced to Arab readers during the mid-20th century Arab nationalist era, a period that echoed many European nationalist narratives.

Introduced by Al-Aqqad, who failed to provide any substantial proof of the book's authenticity, he nevertheless managed to captivate his audience with its content, leveraging his well-established credibility among readers. Originally, the book surfaced in Tsarist Russia, a regime that used it to frame Russian Jews as scapegoats during internal crises, thus garnering support for the Church, which was anxious about the potential erosion of its interests and traditions under Tsarist rule (Nuweihed, 2016, p. 39). The book served as a counter-narrative to the communist propaganda prevalent at the time, which ultimately contributed to the 1917 Revolution and the formation of the Soviet Union.

Recalling these historical contexts is vital for understanding how certain discourses infiltrate and become accepted by their apparent adversaries. For example, these protocols became foundational in a

***Corresponding Author** | **Email-** Assiahis9@gmail.com
Copyright © 2024 The Author(s): This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License.

discourse that professed to oppose Arab nationalist propaganda, yet those who propagated these ideas often failed to recognize that they were influenced by the very nationalist rhetoric they purported to oppose. This unawareness is not uncommon, as it is evident in individuals who continue to echo nationalist slogans or reanalyze events using sources like *Pawns in the Game* by William Guy Carr, which, in reality, aligns closely with the ideological underpinnings of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and similar works.

These protocols, initially crafted to resonate with the naive, religiously fervent peasant audiences in Russia, were subsequently exploited by various European right-wing parties. Over time, these narratives penetrated the Arab region through nationalist propaganda and were later echoed by Islamist factions. Notably, El-Messiri's efforts to debunk the authenticity of these protocols highlight a critical aspect of myth-busting, yet this endeavor also demands caution.

While many readers dismissed these protocols as inauthentic, trusting in El-Messiri's [Islamic] orientations, this scenario underscores a deeper issue: readers often remain stubborn against all facts and evidence until a writer they trust, because of their ideological orientations, stances, or beliefs, prompts them to change their views.

Without such interventions, many continue to embrace unfounded beliefs, a testament to the problem of imitation without rationale or evidence. This pattern limits readers to books written by authors they trust, rather than the evidence those books may present, leading to a proliferation of imitators who consider themselves cultured yet lack a critical and discerning perspective, even when confronted with opposing views. Conspiracy theories exemplify this dynamic, as they can be manipulated to include any contrary evidence as part of the conspiracy itself, often without substantive proof. This naive form of conspiracy theorizing echoes the mythological thinking that once dominated societies unable to scientifically explain phenomena, attributing unusual natural events to superstitions, like a lunar eclipse caused by a dragon swallowing the moon, or a meteor as a sign of divine wrath.

Discussing the dissemination of the protocols illuminates broader issues. For instance, even if readers accept El-Messiri's refutation of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, this may not dismantle the overarching conspiracy mindset that interprets global events as orchestrated by secretive, powerful groups. This distorted perception persists, often unaffected by the denial or proof of specific conspiracy theories.

This entrenched mindset extends beyond politics into historical interpretations, potentially attributing, for example, early conflicts among the Companions to conspiratorial external influences, or asserting that the development of the science of kalam was instigated for ulterior motives.

The possibilities for misinterpretation are boundless, and unless individuals cultivate a balanced and critical approach, they risk conflating issues, perhaps even denying historical events associated with Jews, like the incidents involving Banu Qurayza and Banu Nadir, due to their skepticism of the protocols.

It is crucial for those engaged in political discourse to shed these deeply held delusions and move beyond merely repeating what they perceive as incontrovertible truths, which often reach them through unreliable hearsay or readings.

The trust placed in the medium, whether a book or another source, often lacks rigorous justification. A common refrain, "I read this in a historical or political book," typically suffices for acceptance by others, irrespective of the book's content, the author's qualifications, or the robustness of the methodologies employed in examining its claims and the diversity of viewpoints on its validity.

Second Chapter: Liberal Demands within Democratic Systems

As the term suggests, illiberal democracy represents a governance system that deliberately departs from liberal principles. The term first surfaced in a 1997 article by American journalist Fareed Zakaria (Abu Omra, 2023, p.47).

However, it only truly gained prominence as a distinct concept during the refugee crisis of 2014, notably through a speech by Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, who positioned Hungary as an illiberal state intent on preserving its national identity. Nations often categorized under the umbrella of illiberal democracies include Singapore, Turkey, Poland, and Russia.

Proponents of illiberal democracy advocate for a form of democracy that seeks to restore the sovereignty of peoples without the constraints imposed by liberal national and international principles and institutions. In this view, the populace's decisions are neither inherently good nor bad; they simply are sovereign choices. Consequently, critics from the liberal camp might label

***Corresponding Author** | **Email-** Assiahis9@gmail.com
Copyright © **2024** The Author(s): This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License.

such democracy as populist, inauthentic, partial, or manipulated.

While liberalism as a concept of political freedom or economic doctrine might have emerged around the same time as democracy, it was never inherently linked to its practice. Liberalism represents a political ideology and governance system underpinned by representative democracy, guided by principles such as natural equality, minority protection, and the primacy of legal frameworks over political and social matters.

Democracy, derived from the Greek words *Demos* meaning "the people" and *Kratia* meaning "rule" – thus "rule of the people" – is fundamentally about the sovereignty of politically equal members who transfer authority through elections based on majority rule (El Zibari, 2012, p.195).

The relationship between liberalism and democracy is fraught with inherent tensions and contradictions. Liberalism primarily focuses on minority interests and individual rights, advocating for law and natural equality. In contrast, democracy emphasizes the sovereignty of the people, the rule of the majority, and political equality, often manifesting as conditional citizenship. This dichotomy is something liberalism struggles to reconcile, as it fundamentally rejects any sovereignty that supersedes that of the individual.

A well-known liberal critique of pure democracy is that it inherently leads to the tyranny of the majority and the despotism of the political. However, this argument can be inverted to suggest that liberalism favors the tyranny of the minority or the individual, a notion that has become increasingly evident in contemporary discourse.

Democracy was originally conceived as a solution to this problem, positing that the tyranny of the majority, so to speak, is less severe than that of the minority, akin to the argument that the death of one is less grievous than the death of ten. For instance, in ancient Greek democracies, representatives from cities adjacent to enemy territories were excluded from discussions about war and peace, prioritizing the interests and survival of the majority over those of a directly impacted minority.

Despite these philosophical standoffs, liberals are often compelled to coexist with democracy, viewing it as the lesser of two evils and the only system malleable enough to convince the sovereign (the people) that certain undemocratic institutions, practices, and concepts are essential to democracy. This coexistence, however, often reduces the actual influence of the people to nominal changes, leaving the core liberal ideology of the governing system largely unaffected.

Liberal propaganda fundamentally contends that a true democracy is untenable without what is known as the "rule of law." This principle, originating in the 19th century and gaining prominence post-World War II, is defined by the United Nations as the cornerstone upon which states and political systems are built, grounded firmly in legal frameworks that ostensibly confine political maneuvers.

This legalistic foundation posits that fairness and legitimacy are inherently legal constructs, thus placing the law on a pedestal above all else, including the citizenry. In a democratic context, this is paradoxical as the people are deemed the ultimate bearers of authority and law.

Yet, this discussion, albeit theoretical, does not fully capture the inherent contradictions between the rule of law and the essence of democracy. A pragmatic return to real-world implications is essential for understanding the challenges posed by the rule of law.

In every state governed by the rule of law, legal texts and references are held sacrosanct, immutable under any circumstances, whether by the populace or their political representatives. Modern embodiments of these texts are human rights charters and similar documents, which are the bedrock of liberal democratic states and, to a lesser extent, in nominal democracies (Abderrazak, 2009, p.31).

To grasp the extent of the contradiction among proponents of melding democracy with a rule-of-law state, it is crucial to recognize that the essence of a rule-of-law state mirrors that of a theocratic state, albeit in a secular guise. The key distinction lies in the source of legitimacy, secular states claim legitimacy through democratic rule (albeit often superficially), while theocratic states derive their authority from a deity.

Fundamentally, there is no difference between advocates of a rule-of-law state and those of a theocratic state. Proponents of the latter prioritize sacred texts over popular or political will, a stance not dissimilar to that of rule-of-law advocates, who, however, often do not acknowledge this alignment with theocratic principles.

Similarly, certain religions maintain religious institutions and clerics who protect their doctrines within the state framework. Should their authority surpass that of secular leaders, the state veers towards theocracy. Analogously, the rule-of-law state has its own quasi-religious institutions and clerical figures, courts, constitutional

***Corresponding Author** | **Email-** Assiahis9@gmail.com
Copyright © **2024** The Author(s): This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License.

councils, and supreme courts complemented by judges, legal scholars, and attorneys, many of whom emerge from law schools with deeply ingrained ideological leanings.

These institutions, responding to contemporary shifts, strive to exert their ideological dominance over the political sphere, a dynamic termed "government by judges" (Abdelli, 2017, p.26) or judicial activism. They challenge the decisions of elected officials by invoking human rights and public freedoms rooted in established texts. In the absence of explicit legal provisions, they resort to judicial discretion and reinterpretation of foundational laws, such as the constitution, which invariably includes clauses on equality.

Liberalism's extensive empowerment of judges often leads them to engage in resolving political disputes. A striking instance occurred in France in 2013 during the "Wall of Fools" scandal. A journalist covertly recorded inside the headquarters of a judges' union, capturing images of a wall adorned with photos of politicians and public figures, predominantly of a specific political leaning, depicted as if they were criminals sought by justice.

Despite the scandal exposing the judges' deviation from the neutrality they profess, no substantial measures were taken in response to the widespread public outrage. This inaction underscores the judiciary's self-perception as a sovereign entity within the state, insisting on absolute autonomy and rejecting external accountability under the pretext of separation of powers, a stance devoid of any democratic validation to assert such independence.

For proponents of liberalism, the civil rule-of-law state represents an aspiration to institutionalize an ideologically stringent entity immune to democratic influence. This model positions judicial figures as the epitome of integrity, ostensibly because of their role and assumed independence, deemed essential for the dispensation of justice.

This narrative suggests that any judicial corruption stems not from the judges themselves but from their purported dependence on legitimate political institutions. The vaunted principle of separation of powers is selectively invoked to shield the judiciary, yet when it comes to augmenting judicial authority against all other institutions, liberals advocate for granting unrestrained judicial power.

Third Chapter: Between Action and Results

The relationship between politics and medicine can be elucidated by their common objectives: just as medicine aims to heal individuals and combat diseases, politics seeks to mend societal ailments and remove obstacles to national progress. The scenario of a physician who, constrained by ethical principles, fails to perform a necessary examination on a patient, thereby allowing the patient to perish, mirrors political failures.

Such ethical hesitations, when they result in loss of life, are morally indefensible. The physician's primary duty should be to save lives, prioritizing pragmatic action over rigid adherence to personal moral codes.

Similarly, politicians are equipped with a myriad of strategies and must choose the approach that is most likely to succeed in fulfilling their responsibilities, rather than strictly adhering to isolated principles that may not realistically impact outcomes or the actual evaluation of benefits versus harms. Within this framework, even contentious decisions like engaging in warfare are considered, highlighting the priority of effective governance over theoretical ideals.

Some ideologies perceive war as a crucible for societal evolution, positing that conflict inherently weeds out the weak, while those who are resilient, exemplified by traits such as courage and boldness, will endure. This perspective is an offshoot of social Darwinism, where war is not merely seen as a political tool to be deployed when necessary, but as an almost sacred act that elevates it to a level beyond mere political strategy.

Yet, proponents of this ideology may advocate for war not out of situational necessity but as a doctrinal imperative. This underscores the critical need for political accountability in decision-making. For these ideologues, war transforms from being one of many options to the only option, driven by deep-seated beliefs aligned with their ideological principles rather than by pragmatic political needs.

Drawing a parallel with medical practice, such an extreme stance in politics would be akin to a physician deciding on limb amputation not based on clinical necessity but guided by a personal adherence to an overarching theory. This approach risks turning flexible political strategies into inflexible dogmas, detached from the realistic outcomes that guide sound political decisions.

This disconnection is mirrored in medicine but often romanticized in politics through narratives that glorify the noble sacrifices of heroes, celebrated in poetry or tales of knights who prefer death over dishonor. Such

***Corresponding Author** | **Email-** Assiahis9@gmail.com
Copyright © **2024** The Author(s): This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License.

imagery, while evocative and suited to epic or elegiac poetry, is not conducive to pragmatic political leadership. Modern politicians are not, nor should they be, encumbered by such antiquated notions of honor that could jeopardize the broader political agenda. Their primary role should be to leverage all national resources toward tangible accomplishments. These achievements are often quantifiable, contrasting sharply with the literary depictions more apt for dramatic narratives than effective governance.

When UNESCO initiated efforts in 1947 to draft a new Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it embarked on an ambitious project, spearheaded by Eleanor Roosevelt. The organization convened an international committee tasked with gathering insights from a select group of "moral authorities," comprising approximately 150 intellectuals from diverse backgrounds, to deliberate on the philosophical foundations of the proposed rights charter.

This extensive consultation aimed to forge a theoretical consensus on human rights. However, the initiative stumbled as it became apparent that unanimous theoretical agreement was unattainable. The discordant views on the fundamental nature of the rights to be enshrined led to a decision not to publicize the divergent opinions. Consequently, the drafters of the Universal Declaration opted for a consensus approach that, while pragmatic, sidestepped the foundational philosophical debates.

The declaration, therefore, was adopted under the premise of universal agreement, predicated on the condition that the philosophical justifications for the rights asserted were not scrutinized or contested. This approach essentially imposed the declaration by authority rather than through genuine global consensus, illustrating the complex interplay between ideological aspirations and the pragmatic exigencies of international diplomacy.

The doctrine of human rights, while profound in its legislative expressions, exhibits a palpable reticence in fully embracing cultural diversity. This hesitance is twofold: firstly, due to its inherently individualistic core and the abstract notion of a subject proclaiming its rights, and secondly, because of its deep-rooted historical associations with Western culture, or at least, with one of the many traditions that this culture comprises.

A poignant illustration of this was observed during the French Revolution, which posited the controversial notion that Jews should be stripped of all communal identities yet afforded full individual rights. This effectively tethered the emancipation of Jews to the disintegration of their communal bonds.

Consequently, the discourse surrounding human rights has perennially grappled with the challenge of accommodating the rich tapestry of human diversity, as reflected in the myriad of political systems, religious traditions, and cultural values. This raises pivotal questions: Is the discourse on human rights inherently destructive to diverse societal frameworks, or does it possess the capacity to integrate without losing its essence? Can it truly harmonize with these variances, or is it destined to eradicate them?

These probing inquiries have ignited extensive debates, ultimately presenting a stark dichotomy: either we assert that the principles underpinning human rights ideology, despite their Western origins, hold universal applicability, necessitating robust proof of this claim, or we relinquish their claim to universality, which would effectively dismantle their foundational structure. Indeed, if the concept of human rights is intrinsically Western, then its global propagation could be perceived as nothing more than an external imposition, subtly echoing the dynamics of colonialism and control.

Friedrich Nietzsche, who famously depicted humanity as "god-makers," is predominantly recognized as a vehement critic of idolatry, which manifests in various forms, not limited to religion alone. According to Nietzsche, Christianity has orchestrated its own demise through the inherent contradictions between its moral uprights and doctrinal tenets.

The eventual dissolution of Christianity, from Nietzsche's perspective, is neither a cause for celebration nor comfort. However, the enduring relevance of Nietzsche's critique lies in its capacity to open future possibilities, including the "revival of the god."

In contemporary discourse, reducing Nietzsche's philosophy to simplistic interpretations that align him with the notion of the "death of God" and the rise of a liberated, autonomous human, devoid of naive or comforting beliefs, would be a significant oversight.

Despite the prevalent myths of a mature and emancipated humanity free from delusions, the reality of persistent and sometimes perilous religious expressions cannot be ignored. Hence, if Nietzsche continues to hold our interest, it is not because his thoughts align with mundane interpretations or because they cater to the diluted expectations of certain theologians.

***Corresponding Author** | **Email-** Assiahis9@gmail.com
Copyright © **2024** The Author(s): This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License.

Rather, his philosophical contributions compel us to reconsider our fundamental religious conditions, offering insights that challenge superficial understandings and encouraging a deeper engagement with the philosophical underpinnings of human existence.

The paradigm of power is undergoing a significant evolution, as observed in the alterations in governance practices. Modern governance now emphasizes the importance of dialogues and consultations with citizens, which are increasingly integrated into the policy-making process. This democratization of governance reflects a broader trend towards transparency and participation, ensuring that the exercise of power is not only more inclusive but also more accountable to the public.

It is crucial to underscore that Friedrich Nietzsche, while critical of traditional religious constructs, did not primarily focus on the future of religion per se in his general discourse. Rather, his skepticism was aimed at the trivial aspects often associated with religious sentiments.

Nietzsche's profound insight into the human propensity to create and adhere to idols is vividly expressed in his declaration that "There are more idols in the world than realities." This statement from the preface of *Twilight of the Idols* highlights the intrinsic human tendency to generate myths and gods, underscoring an ongoing cycle of idolatry that transcends the weakening of traditional religions like Christianity.

Despite the decline of certain religious forms, Nietzsche recognized the undiminished human desire to believe, a psychological drive towards embracing certainties that provide existential support. His observations extend to the modern idols of "progressivism," "scientism," "spreading happiness for all," "socialism," and "human rights," which he regarded as contemporary manifestations of this idol-making impulse. Nietzsche's critique in *The Genealogy of Morals* suggests that even atheism is a sophisticated form of this urge, representing a covert pursuit of truth at any cost, thus aligning with the deep-seated desire to believe.

Fourth Chapter: The Institution of Power and Its Influence by Contemporary Political Changes and Transformations

The landscape of global politics is markedly shaped by ongoing political transformations, reflecting profound shifts in economic, social, and cultural domains. These transformations are not merely adjustments in the administrative structures but are pivotal changes that redefine power itself, influencing global political dynamics and informing public policy directions. The key transformations impacting the institution of power in the modern era include:

1. **Transformation in Governance Systems:** The modern world has experienced significant changes in forms of governance, with a spread of democratic systems and a rise of popular governance in many countries, while authoritarian and totalitarian regimes have collapsed in some cases. This shift reflects radical changes in the understanding and practice of power, where civil participation, the necessity of fair representation, and respect for human rights have become central pillars in governance formation.
2. **Influence of Technology:** Technology has revolutionized the exercise of power, with social media and information and communication technologies becoming tools for political influence and organizing social movements. This presents new challenges to traditional power structures and contributes to the activation of inclusive democracy and civil participation.
3. **Shifts in Global Power:** With changes in the global balance of power among Russia, China, and the United States, the dynamics of international power are shifting. New powers emerge and others fade, creating multipolarity that affects the distribution of global power and the formation of alliances and geopolitical conflicts.

As for the impact of these transformations, the following are noteworthy:

1. **Change in the Concept of Power:** This transformation contributes to redefining power and what it should embody, with increasing focus on concepts such as transparency, accountability, and legitimacy, rather than exclusively on actual force.
2. **Transformation in Governance Practices:** This shift changes the methods of governance, where dialogue and consultation with citizens become more crucial, and governance tools evolve to meet new challenges.
3. **Increase in Transparency and Accountability:** Due to public and civil society

***Corresponding Author** | **Email-** Assiahis9@gmail.com
Copyright © **2024** The Author(s): This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License.

pressure, there is an increased focus on transparency and accountability in the performance of power, which enhances democracy and reduces corruption.

4. **Transformations in National and Cultural Identity:** Political transformations often accompany shifts in national and cultural identity. Countries undergoing radical political transformations may experience changes in national and nationalist predispositions, affecting the concept and practice of power. For example, countries undergoing secessionist processes may witness significant transformations in identity and political allegiances, affecting the distribution and exercise of power as seen with Ukraine regarding the Donbas region, unlike countries that maintain their territorial integrity.
5. **Economic and Social Challenges:** Political transformations may be accompanied by economic and social challenges, such as unemployment, rising poverty rates, and deterioration of public services. These challenges can significantly affect the concept and practice of power, as countries may experience protests and revolutions aimed at changing governance systems and redistributing power.
6. **Regional and International Impact:** Political transformations cannot be separated from regional and international influences. For instance, political transformations in certain countries may be a source of disturbances in neighboring countries, affecting regional stability and posing new challenges to power structures. Moreover, major powers can exploit political transformations in other countries to achieve their strategic interests, impacting the distribution of power at the international level.
7. **Religious and Ideological Transformations:** Political transformations may be accompanied by shifts in religious beliefs and ideologies, affecting the concept and practice of power. For example, some religious groups may use political transformations to enhance their influence and expand their power base, leading to changes in power distribution and governance dynamics.
8. **Transformations in Political and Social Identity:** Political transformations can lead to shifts in the political and social identities of individuals and communities. For example, democratic transformations may lead to changes in power distribution and open opportunities for new segments of society to participate in governance, leading to shifts in their political identity and the exercise of power. Additionally, political transformations can change social relationships and accepted social values, leading to shifts in the role of the individual and the community in exercising power and making political decisions.
9. **Transformations in the Relationship Between the State and the Citizen:** Political transformations affect the relationship between the state and the citizen, potentially leading to changes in the balance between power and the citizen according to political developments. Transformations towards democracy may enhance the citizen's role as a participant in the decision-making process and the exercise of power, while shifts towards authoritarianism may undermine the citizen's rights and restrict their freedoms.
10. **Cultural and Educational Transformations:** Political transformations can influence cultural and educational shifts. Democratic changes may enhance values such as freedom, human rights, and equality in society, whereas authoritarian shifts may undermine these values and promote oppressive and intolerant beliefs. Furthermore, political shifts can impact the education system and its orientations, affecting the shaping and steering of society and the concept of authority within it.
11. **Changes in International Relations:** Political transformations can cause shifts in international relations and global power dynamics. Changes in a country's policy can affect its relations with other nations, alliances, and international conflicts. Democratic transformations in one country can strengthen relations with other democracies and form new alliances, while authoritarian shifts can exacerbate conflicts and tensions internationally.
12. **Shifts in the Role of International Institutions**: The impact of political changes on

***Corresponding Author** | **Email-** Assiahis9@gmail.com
Copyright © 2024 The Author(s): This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License.

the role of international institutions cannot be overlooked. For instance, moves towards democracy might lead to increased support for international organizations that promote human rights and address issues of social and economic justice. Conversely, authoritarian shifts might undermine these institutions and oppose their principles and objectives.

13. **Changes in Global Governance**: Political changes influence international relations and the global distribution of power, leading to shifts in global governance. The spread of democracy worldwide might support governance systems that reflect democratic values, human rights, and social justice. On the other hand, setbacks in democracy might weaken these systems and diminish their effectiveness.
14. **Shifts in the Economic System**: Political transformations cannot be separated from changes in the economic system, as they can influence economic policy directions and the distribution of wealth and income. The spread of democracy might increase opportunities for economic participation and fair distribution of wealth, whereas authoritarian shifts could reduce individual economic rights and increase inequality in wealth distribution.
15. **Changes in International Security and Stability**: Political changes can impact international security and stability. Negative transformations, such as civil wars and state collapses, might threaten regional and global security, while positive developments, like the strengthening of democracy, can enhance stability and peace.

Conclusion:

The ramifications of developments within political and economic systems on authority, governance, and human rights are intricate and multi-layered. Shifts in political frameworks often precipitate changes in power distribution and the essence of governance, which in turn have direct and indirect repercussions on human rights.

Furthermore, economic advancements are pivotal in shaping governmental capacities to deliver welfare and essential services, critically influencing the stability of authority and the observance of human rights. To fully grasp these impacts, it is imperative to undertake a comprehensive analysis that accounts for both local and global contexts.

References:

- Abdelli, S. (2017). *Guarantees of Judicial Independence between Algeria and France*. Noor Library.
- Abderrazak, J. (2009). *The Political Process in Iraq and Problems of Reaching a State of Law*. Baghdad: Iraq Center for Studies.
- Abu Omra, R. (2023). *Brazil, Chile, and Ecuador: Experiences in Democratic Consolidation*. Cairo: Al-Arabi for Publishing and Distribution.
- El Kholi, Y. T. (2021). *Philosophy of Karl Popper*. Cairo: Hindawi Foundation.
- El Zibari, I. K. I. (2012). *The Peaceful Transfer of Power*. Cairo: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyah.
- Le Bon, G. (2020). *The Spirit of Revolutions and the French Revolution* (A. Zaatar, Trans.). Beirut: Dar Al-Qalam for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1900). *Selections from Marx and Engels*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Nietzsche, F. (2003). *Beyond Good and Evil, Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future* (G. V. Hajar, Trans.; M. Wahbeh, Ed.). Beirut: Dar Al-Farabi. (Original work published 1886)
- Nuweihed, A. (2016). *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Palestine: Dar Al-Jalil for Publishing and Studies.
- Supreme Court Rulings on Same-Sex Marriage in the United States. (n.d.).

***Corresponding Author** | **Email-** Assiahis9@gmail.com
Copyright © **2024** The Author(s): This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License.