The Islamic Revolution of Iran and the New Environmental Discourse

Ghulam Haidar Rezaei

Ph.D. in Criminology Law Al Mustafa International University, Qom, Iran

Abstract

Environmental crises are one of the greatest challenges facing humanity in this century. The severity of environmental crises, on the one hand, has forced world leaders to react and make environmental protection a priority in their national and international programs. On the other hand, it has forced environmental Scientists to think of solutions and find scientific solutions for environmental protection, which has led to the creation of numerous discourses for environmental protection. These discourses show the mental, scientific and practical atmosphere prevailing among social and political players in the environmental field. At the same time, they provide legislators and policymakers with a broad and historical perspective on environmental policy-making, enabling them to play a more effective and useful role in the future of environmental policy-making by looking to the past. This research, which was conducted using a descriptive-analytical method, shows that among all global discourses, the environmental discourse of the Islamic Revolution, which was developed and expanded by the leaders, scholars, and experts supporting the revolution, is more effective in preserving the environment and confronting environmental challenges, and therefore this discourse must be developed and expanded in order to contain environmental crises.

Keywords: *Environment; Global Environmental Discourses; Environmental Discourse of the Islamic Revolution*

Introduction

In this Era, the environment is exposed to serious and diverse threats at the local, national and global levels. Global warming, reduction of biodiversity, shortage of natural resources, loss of rare plant and animal species, deforestation or destruction of forests and pastures and various types of pollution, which is a critical issue in most societies and has social, cultural foundations as well as numerous social, cultural, economic and sometimes political consequences (Lester brown, 2012, pp. 13-15; Kalantari Et al, 2013, p. 2). With the increase of these threats over the past five decades, on the one hand, we are faced with a group of thinkers who, with strong commitment and a realistic approach, have given a wake-up call to the world, focusing on the form, severity and objective causes of the problems, have drawn up desirable guidelines for changing the objective situation through appropriate solutions; on the other hand, global threats arising from environmental challenges have also forced the international community to react and respond. The holding of the first international environmental conference in 1972 and the Rio

summit in 1992 under the title of Earth Summit, the holding of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development with the participation of representatives of more than 180 countries with the aim of protecting water, soil, and the Earth's atmosphere, holding dozens of other conferences, and drafting and ratifying various international conventions with the aim of preserving and restoring the environment and preventing environmental threats, indicate the widespread attention of countries in the international arena to the environmental field (Basir, pp. 44-52). This shows that protecting the environment and creating a suitable environment for human life has become one of the most important responsibilities of governments around the world; in such a way that gradually in most countries, even developing and less developed countries, various policies, laws, and regulations related to environmental protection have been enacted. These policies have changed over time and may even be in conflict with each other at the same time. One of the reasons for these conflicts is related to the influence of environmental discourses on policymaking (Salehi Et al, 2014, 82).

Today, environmental sociologists are trying to show that both macro decisions and policies (supply management) and environmental values, behaviors and actions (demand management) are formed in discourse concepts. Basically, the formulation of environmental policies, guidelines, and laws is based on a series of principles and considerations that reflect social conditions, or the desires and ideology of the ruling party, or the desires and needs of the people. These ruling considerations in environmental sociology are identified under the title of environmental discourse analysis. Discourse analysis can provide legislators and policymakers with a macro-level and historical perspective on environmental policymaking. This allows them to play a more effective and useful role in the future of environmental policymaking by looking to the past. Therefore, in recent years, the use of qualitative approaches, and especially discourse analysis methods, to analyze the writing, reception, and strategic application of environmental texts, images, and ideas has increased (Hannigan, 2013, p. 59).

The topic of the current research is to investigate and analyze environmental discourses and the role of the Islamic revolution in creating a new discourse in the field of environmental protection. Iran is one of the countries that has long considered importance and great value for the preservation and improvement of the environment. In this context, the fiftieth article of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran stated: "Protection of the environment, in which the present and future generations must have a growing social life, is considered a public duty; therefore, economic and other activities that are associated with environmental pollution or its irreparable destruction are prohibited." (Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, 2007). In addition to the Constitution and development programs, the Islamic Republic of Iran has also paid attention to the issue of the environment at the global level and has officially accepted 18 international treaties so far. These international treaties, which have been accepted by the Islamic parliament and have also been approved by the Guardian Council of the parliament, gained internal authority, as the result, it is necessary to adhere international principles related to environmental protection in Iran. In this study, we examine the environmental discourse underpinning these efforts and the role of the Islamic Revolution in this regard. The goal is to help legislators and politicians play a more effective and useful role in environmental protection by taking a broad and historical perspective and approach on environmental policymaking.

Definition of the Environment

"Environment" in the idiomatic sense: "A space with all the physical and biological, social, economic, political, etc. conditions that include all living beings and the set of relationships between them" (Fahimi, 2012, 95). in other words, the environment: "A set of natural and human factors and elements that are mutually related to each other and affect the biological balance and quality of life, human health, cultural and historical heritage and landscape" (Shilton, Case, 1389, 40).

Definition of Discourse

The word discourse, according to some sources, dates back to the 14th century AD, is derived from the French word Discourse, meaning conversation, discussion, speech, debate (Bashir, 2006, p. 9). In explaining the meaning of discourse, "Van Dyck" considers it a form of language use, for example in a speech or even more generally, spoken language or a way of speaking (Mirfakhraei, 2004, p. 8-).

Discourse in its conceptual scope, especially in non-technical expression, simply means talk, conversation or conversation, which sometimes implicitly expresses the type of educational and didactic purpose. Hence, oration, sermon, seminar, lecture and treatise can be considered a type of discourse in the general sense of the word. However, in the technical, scientific and linguistic sense, which was first used in the mid-1960s by the French thinker " Émile Benveniste", discourse deals with aspects of language that can only be expressed by referring to the speaker, his/her situation or location in space and time or by referring to other variables that are used to specify the contexts of the thematic context of a dialogue and, according to "Diane McDonell", discourse includes any type of speech, word and writing that takes place in the social process (Forghani, 2003, pp. 60-62).

For environmental data analysis, one of the most appropriate and widely used methods is discourse analysis, which has been in vogue since the second half of the 20th century, influenced by critical linguistics. Discourse analysis is proposed as a method for analyzing how environmental texts, images, and ideas are created, received, and strategically arranged (Hannigan, 2013, 36). Discourse analysis has been used by people committed to other environmental theoretical and research schools and has yielded good results. The most important of these people are critical theorists, political ecologists, and international policy analysts. Of course, not all experts consider discourse analysis to have the same meaning, but there are relatively different definitions of discourse (Ibid.).

For example, Heidegger defines discourse as "a specific set of ideas, concepts, and classifications" that are "produced and reproduced" and transformed into a specific set of practices (customs) through which physical and social realities are given meaning (Heidegger, 1995, 264).

Fairclough, one of the leading figures in the field of critical analysis of discourse, believes that "critical analysis of discourse" is an approach that tries to systematically investigate the often-vague relationships of causality and determination between: a) discourse actions, events and texts; b) broader social and cultural structures, relations, and processes. In fact, discourse helps to construct identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and meaning. Discourse has three functions: identity, relational, and thought, but ultimately, in any analysis, he names two important dimensions of discourse: 1. The communicative event, which is an example of applied language, including what is seen in an article, newspaper, film, and a political interview or speech; 2. Discourse order is the configuration of all discourses that are used within the structure or social realm (Amirmaleki Et al., 2016, 59-62).

In other words, discourse: consists of multiple factors and a system of reasons and shows how a text is constructed and interpreted and gives value and meaning to the social world. It is the discourse that shapes the conventional wisdom of a society and determines what can be said and what should be avoided, making things normal, natural and possible (Khosravi, 2012, 28).

Environmental Discourse and Its Varieties

In recent years, various discourses have been raised in the field of environmental studies, and as a result, various classifications have been made of them. Many books and works have discussed environmental discourse. In a general approach, it is possible to distinguish existing discourses in the field of environment in the form of two approaches: a) anthropocentric and b) ecosystem-centered. The course of historical evolution of environmental discourses shows a kind of movement and transition from anthropocentric to bioecological. Thus, until the middle of the twentieth century, based on the dominant

approach of humanism, this idea prevailed in the field of economic sciences and environmental knowledge that environmental protection is necessary to the extent that human interests are involved. This approach paid less attention to the fundamental values of nature and basically considered nature as a set of resources at the service of humans. Therefore, the efforts made during this period to formulate regulations were directed towards how to use certain living and non-living resources, not the environment itself. Many of them were in the nature of exploiting natural resources (Abbas Basir: 2017, p. 43). However, research by natural and social scientists in the 1960s and the growing concerns about environmental issues around the world led to the development of new ideas and theories about the essence of nature, the environment, and how elements of nature relate to humans and each other. The discursive approach of bio-ecology believes that the sustainable and flourishing of human's life depends on a fundamental transformation in its relationship with the natural world, and the social and political life of humans (Dobson, 1377, p. 10). The philosophy of bio-ecology is based on two basic strategies for achieving sustainable development based on the unity of human and nature: The first strategy is that if economic and social growth has limits, then consumption must also have limits. Therefore, is continuous consumption impossible? The second strategy is that instead of a consumer-based society and the provision of material needs, we should move towards changing motivations and providing spiritual satisfaction. In fact, a sustainable or lasting society should be a place where humans live with spiritual and mental satisfaction (Dobson, 1377, p. 10). It can be said that the environmentalism approach is a kind of intellectual revolution and a new idea for a deeper analysis of the environmental crisis and the search for new solutions to reduce and confront it. Therefore, environmentalism creates a new identity that considers humanity as an element of nature. According to Manuel Castells, this identity transcends national, racial, class, and indigenous boundaries and encompasses a global perspective that emphasizes the common interests and concerns of all humans on Earth. In fact, the discourse of environmentalism is based on four basic concepts: 1) Humans are part of nature; 2) All elements of nature form links in a chain called "life" where the breaking of one link gradually leads to the breaking and loss of other links, resulting in the death and destruction of all nature. 3) Conservation measures must include all elements of nature and the environment; 4) Conservation measures must be global and beyond national and regional boundaries (Salehi et al., 2014, p. 85).

In this article, we will introduce three typologies of environmental discourses in today's world that are part of the discursive paradigm of ecologism and have been presented by sociologists such as Herndel and Brown, Brulle, and John Hannigan.

A) Herndel and Brown's Typology: One of the fundamental attempts to organize the analysis of environmental discourse was made by Herndel and Brown (1996). Herndel and Brown's "environmental discourse model" is in the form of three circles, each of which is located at the corner of a triangle. At the apex of that triangle is the "disciplinary discourse", which refers to the powerful institutions that carry out environmental decision-making and policy-making. In this discourse, nature is treated as a resource. At the bottom right of the triangle is the "scientific discourse," in which nature is considered as a subject of knowledge, generated through scientific methods. Policymakers often base their decisions here, especially on technical information and expert evidence. Finally, at the exact opposite pole in the left corner is the "poetic discourse," which is based on narratives about nature that emphasize beauty, spirituality, and emotional power. Writing about nature is one such example. Herndel and Brown emphasize that these three powerful environmental discourses are not independent or pure in any case and are often combined. In such cases, it is better to look for dominant orientations (Anbari Et al, 2013, p. 61, quoted by Amir Maleki Et al, 2017, p. 150).

B) Brulle's Typology: Another attempt to classify environmental discourses is Brulle's typology. Based on the literature of environmental philosophy and a careful study of the history of environmentalism in America, Brulle found nine distinct discourses, which are: manifest destiny, wildlife management, environmental protection, conservation, reformist environmentalism, deep ecology, environmental justice, ecofeminism, and environmental theology. Brulle believes that the plurality of

discourses has fragmented the American environmental movement and prevented it from speaking with a single, unified voice to an informed national audience. Proponents of each of these argumentative frameworks speak in a process full of mutual suspicion and misunderstanding. Brulle, like Schneiberg and his followers, concludes that without real structural change, no meaningful environmental action can exist. This is unlikely to happen as long as environmental discourses obscure the social origins of the ecosystem and claim a coherent vision of the environmental common good (Hannigan, 2013, p. 62).

C) Hannigan's Typology: John Hannigan also identifies three environmental discourses: the Arcadian discourse, the ecological discourse, and the discourse of environmental justice. The order of these discourses is not based historically, but each had a leading position at different stages in the history of the environmental movement. The prominent feature that governs them, like the Herndel and Brown's Model, is the motivation and justification of action in the environmental fieldi (ibid, p.63).

Arcadian Discourse: Van Koppen identifies three characteristics of Arcadian discourse: externality, imagery, and complementarity. Externality means that Arcadian nature is constructed as external to human society, or at least removed from everyday urban life. Imagery means that the image of nature in the Arcadian tradition is embedded in cultural memory as visual and stereotypical images. Such landscapes were found centuries ago in English and Dutch paintings; today, they are more closely associated with photographs of pristine wild landscapes such as the Amazon rainforest. Ultimately, the Arcadian tradition can best be understood through a framework of complementarity; in other words, the Arcadian tradition is placed in opposition to urban industrial society and all its associated social and environmental problems (ibid, p.65). With the rapid urbanization of Europe and America in the late nineteenth century, views of nature changed rapidly. In particular, the concept of wildlife or wilderness, long seen as a threat to urbanization, was replaced by a highly romanticized image of nature in which wilderness was valued (Hannigan, ibid.).

Ecological Discourse or Ecosystem Preservation: The second major discourse that has shaped how nature and the environment are treated is based on the concepts of ecology and ecosystem. Referring to the terminology of Herndel and Brown, it can be said that scientific discourse is the dominant tendency in this discourse. Although in the 1970s this discourse entered the emerging environmental movement with a normative pressure and conflict. By the early 1970s, ecology had become the cornerstone of a new and rapidly spreading concern for the environment. Ecologists stepped beyond their scientific role to make a major contribution to environmental conflicts. A large number of new words were added to the English literature, such as political ecology, ecological disaster and ecological consciousness (Worster, 1977, 341). There are several key factors that explain the centrality of ecosystem ecology in the emergence of environmentalism in the 1970s. First, the language and logic of ecology, which was associated with growing concerns about radioactive and pesticide poisoning, overpopulation, urban pollution, and the desire to construct a comprehensive scientific theory of environmental problems. Ecology changed from a scientific model for understanding plant and animal communities to a kind of organizational weapon that could be used to organize, expand, and morally revive social affairs. In this process, ecology achieved a new composition: more political, more global and more destructive (Sears 1964, Shepard, 1969). While some ecologists reacted negatively to the reconstruction of this concept, others supported it by arguing that the environmental crisis requires a new meaning of social activity from ecological researchers. The second group became influential advocates for a political vision in which the boundaries between nature and society were deliberately ignored (Hannigan, ibid.).

Environmental Justice Discourse: In the 1980s, a new set of discursive forms emerged in the United States that interpreted environmental problems and priorities very differently from the mainstream discourses (Dorceta Taylor, 2000, p. 508-566). Dorceta Taylor argues that the idea of environmental justice has emerged as a major part of environmental discourse and that in its short existence, it has changed the nature of environmental discourse and posed a challenge to the dominance of the modern environmental approach.

Environmental justice is a set of claims related to toxic pollution that are based on the civil rights of those harmed, rather than on the rights of nature. Capek argues that four major components define the framework of environmental justice: the right to information about one's situation, the right to a fair trial when making claims about pollution, the right to compensation from those who have polluted a particular neighborhood, and the right to democratic participation in deciding the future of a polluted community. Each of these components represents a specific claim, semantically expressed in entitlement language (Hannigan, ibid.).

The Environmental Impact of the Islamic Revolution

Despite the extensive efforts that have been made to create an environmental discourse in order to encourage governments and societies to preserve the environment and deal with environmental challenges, all these discourses suffer more or less from a fundamental gap, which is the inability to create a deep connection with the community and create a social culture. Social culture can only be formed in an environment where policy-making and macro-planning have been able to create a network of individual and collective actions for meaning-making systems in the field of the environment, and through this process, they have built an accumulation of understanding and comprehension, and subsequently, environmental action at the community level; otherwise, environmental activities in society will suffer from pure elitism, which will find its social links with the daily lives of the common people severed, and actions at the elite level will remain limited. Although these discourses have collectively been able to lead many environmental social movements, they have never been able to change the way of life. To confront the environmental challenges of today's world, we must change the prevailing patterns of production and consumption and instead promote sustainable consumption and production patterns. Creating such a change is beyond the power of the environmental discourses discussed above. It seems that the environmental discourse of the Islamic Revolution has a very high capacity to carry out such a great mission.

In order to have a clear understanding of the environmental discourse of the Islamic Revolution and its high capacity for creating social culture, we will first briefly refer to the basic and important theories regarding the value of natural beings and their moral dignity and moral rights. Then, we will explain the most important foundations of Islamic environmental ethics, relying on the Holy Quran and the views of Islamic scholars, and based on that, we will outline the framework of the environmental discourse of the Islamic Revolution.

A. Environmental Ethics Theories

The most fundamental question in environmental ethics is whether the value of the environment and its elements is intrinsic or instrumental? In other words; which beings or which groups of beings have intrinsic value and consequently, moral dignity and rights? In response to this fundamental question, various environmental ethics theories and, as a result, various environmental discourses have been formed, which generally arise from two philosophical perspectives: anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric. In anthropocentric philosophy, only humans have a value position and environmental destruction is important to the extent that it affects human interests, while the non-anthropocentric perspective, by rejecting this view, generalizes the value position to other living beings or elements of nature as a whole and believes that the environment is a subject whose elements, regardless of their benefits or harms, are important to humans. This is where we encounter various ethical theories and environmental discourses, the most important of which are briefly mentioned:

a) Anthropocentric Theory: This theory believes that among natural beings, only humans have intrinsic value, and therefore only humans have moral dignity and rights, and other natural beings are either worthless or at most have instrumental value. According to this theory, humans should respect and observe each other's moral rights. But since other natural beings lack value or lack intrinsic value, they lack dignity and moral rights, and there is nothing morally wrong with how humans treat them; Unless

their preservation is necessary and essential for human interests. According to this theory, humans are not responsible and accountable for the actions they take in the field of the environment, unless they cause harm to others.

b) Animal -Oriented Theory: Proponents of animal -oriented theory, in addition to humans, also value animals, and therefore, regard them dignity and ethics. Therefore, they call on people to respect the dignity and rights of animals.

c) Biocentrism Theory: According to the biological perspective, all living things, whether human, animal, and plant, have value and, consequently, have ethical dignity and rights. Therefore, we humans have moral responsibility not only for animals, but also for plants.

d) Ecological Theory: According to the ecological theory, all beings of the globe are valuable, and consequently have the dignity and moral rights. For this reason, humans are responsible for all earth beings, including other human beings, animals, plants and all inanimate objects.

e) Universal Theory: According to this theory, all beings of the universe are valuable, have the dignity and moral right. As a result, man is responsible for all beings of the universe. As can be seen, these environmental ethics theories extend from the range of low -domain (human -oriented) to upper domain (Universal). (Baird, 2001, 467-470).

f) God -Centered Theory: This theory constitutes the basis of the environmental discourse of the Islamic Revolution. This theory has founded and expanded the basis of new environmental discourse in the field of Islamic philosophy and ethics by the Scholars of the Islamic Revolution and thinkers such as Ayatollah Khamenei, Ayatollah Mohammad Taqi Mesbah Yazdi, Ayatollah Javadi Amoli and other scholars.

From the Islamic perspective, all creatures of the world are valuable, but this value is defined on the basis of God as the creator of the universe. In Islam, the question of what has intrinsic value is presented in terms of God-centeredness. In the sense that the intrinsic value in the universe belongs to God and the value of other creatures can be defined on this basis. As a result, all parts of nature have value because of this relationship and humans has a duty to take care of them. Therefore, it can be said that the standard of moral action in such a perspective is also based on the fulfillment of duties that have been entrusted to humans by theology. Following the God's commands about how to treat the natural environment is one of the clear examples in Islam that humans are obliged to do, and their behavior with nature can be morally evaluated according to these commands.

In the religion of Islam, God's ownership of His creatures and also the fulfillment of God's duties and commands are certain in evaluating human behavior with the natural environment; however, one of the characteristics of the Islamic worldview, in God-centeredness, can be related to the concept of "God's environment being over everything." Explaining the value of the environment based on this concept can provide a more comprehensive approach for the appropriate interaction of humans with the natural environment.

B. Fundamentals of the Environmental Discourse of the Islamic Revolution

a) The Creation and Ownership of the Universe and Nature for God: "This is your God! There is no god but He, the Creator of all things" (An`am: 102; Ghafir: 62); "To God belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on the earth" (Najm: 31); "He is the Creator of all things" (An`am: 101; Furqan: 2); "He is the One who created you from dust" (Al-Mu`minun: 12); "He is the One who created the heavens and the earth with truth" (An`am: 73; Hijr: 85); "And to God belongs the dominion of the heavens and the earth, and God has power over all things" (Imran: 189); "To Him belongs whatever is in the heavens and the earth, and to Him are all obedient" (Al-Baqarah: 116).

In the above verses, the true ownership of all created beings, including humans and nature, is known to belong to God Almighty, and this true ownership of God cannot be transferred to humans. God says in (Surah Al-Isra: 111): "And say: Praise be to God, who has neither chosen a son for himself, nor has a partner in his kingdom, nor has he a supporter and guardian for himself because of weakness and humiliation, and consider him very great."

b) The Interconnectedness of All Parts of the Universe and the Existence of a Harmonious and Balanced System: "You see no disorder or disturbance in the creation of the Most Gracious, so look again, do you see any disorder or disturbance in the system of the universe?" (Al-Malik: 32); "And the earth We spread out and cast therein firm mountains and caused to grow therein of everything in due measure" (Al-Hijr: 19); "It is He who created the night and the day and the sun and the moon, each floating in a sphere" (Al-Anbiya: 33).

c) Existence and Nature in God's Protection and Command: "And God encompasses everything" (Nisa: 126); "(Remember) when We said to you: Your God encompasses mankind completely" (Isra: 60); "God holds the heavens and the earth from breaking apart". "He encompasses mankind completely, and if they break apart, none can hold them together except Him; He is Forbearing, forgiving" (Fatir: 41); "And We have taken it (the sky) as a refuge from every outcasted devil" (Hijr: 17).

d) The Beings of Nature Are Possessing a Kind of Consciousness and Intelligence: "And it was said: O earth, swallow your water, and O sky, be still" (Hud: 44); "Your Lord revealed to the bee" (Nahl: 68); "If We had sent down this Quran on a mountain, you would have seen it trembling and splitting apart from fear of Allah" (Hashr: 21); "We offered this trust to the heavens and the earth and the mountains, but they refused to take it" (Ahzab: 72).

e) The Praise of Nature and the Creatures of the Universe Before God: The creatures of the universe and nature are not only conscious, but also Praising God: "The seven heavens and the earth and all that is in them are engaged in praising God, and there is not a creature in the world but that is not praising the God, but you do not understand their Prayers" (Isra: 44), "Have you not seen that all those in the heavens and the earth pray God, and the birds when they spread their wings in the sky? Each of them knows its prayer and, God is aware of what they do" (An-Nur: 41) These verses clearly point out the fact that all the creatures of the world, even solid objects, are conscious and are engaged in glorifying and praising God. Therefore, he bears witness to the events that occur in this world on the Day of Judgment; if the witness does not have the consciousness of perception, how can he bear witness to anything? (Javadi Amoli, 2009, p. 249).

f) The universe and nature are the manifestation of God's power and signs: "We have made the night and the day two signs of God. We have made the sign of the night dark and the sign of the day bright" (Al-Isra: 12); "We will soon show them Our signs in the horizons and in themselves, so that it may become clear to them that He is the Truth" (Al-Fussilat: 53). God has also considered the growth of plants on the earth as a sign from Him in the Holy Quran (Al-Shu'ara: 7-8), and the life of the honey bee and the use of nectar from flowers to produce honey are considered to be signs for those who reflect (An-Nahl: 68).

g) Subduing and Taming Nature for Man by God: "And He has subjected to you the sun and the moon, constantly moving, and made the night and the day subservient to you" (Ibrahim: 33); "And He has subjected to you the night and the day, and the sun and the moon, and the stars, all subservient to His command" (An-Nahl: 12 and 14); We have given you a place on the earth and made therein your means of livelihood" (Al-A'raf: 10); "It is He who has subjected the earth to you, so move about in its regions" (Al-Malik: 15).

On this basis, the conquest of nature is foreseen for humans throughout their lives. Therefore, it indicates an important legal reality, which is that the use and exploitation of the heavens, the earth and its

creatures is the right of all humans, and any occupation and exploitation of nature should not conflict with the right of exploitation of others. The natural environment is under the occupation of humans, so that they can benefit from the creatures by relying on the right to conquer them. However, exploitation that causes the destruction of various species of living beings and deprives future humans of their use is considered an abuse of the right (Dastghaib, 2016, 58).

h) The Limitation of Human Rights to Benefit from Earth:"Eat and drink, but do not be wasteful. God does not love the wasteful" (Al-A'raf: 31); "He created you from the earth and commissioned you to cultivate it"(Hud: 61); "Do not spread corruption in the earth after it has been set in order" " (Al-A'raf: 56); "Do not seek corruption in the earth, for God does not love the corrupters" (Al-Qasas: 77).

From all that has been said about existence and nature and the relationship between man and nature, the framework of the environmental discourse of the Islamic Revolution can be explained as follows: God created the universe and all phenomena beautiful, perfect and balanced, and we must correct our relationship with them and not destroy and pollute it with our wrong actions and expose society to calamities and disasters. Islam's view of nature and the environment, both animate and inanimate, is emotional, moral, spiritual and guiding, and the enjoyment of natural gifts is also based on solid, just, wise, balanced and constructive principles. The supreme goal of Islam is to provide all generations with divine blessings and to create a healthy society, far from class differences, and capable of growth and prosperity. It has provided religious requirements for maintaining balance and equilibrium in the use of natural resources, avoiding excess use and limiting harm to others (Khamenei: 2016, 13-14).

The system of existence, of which nature and human are parts, is created and owned by God Almighty and is completely preserved and managed by His wise plan. This system, which has a wise and specific goal and purpose, is a harmonious and balanced system. All its parts are interconnected and related to each other based on the unchangeable laws and traditions of God and interact with each other. The components of the system of existence, including nature, all have some kind of consciousness and intelligence, and everything that is in the sky and the earth is praying God. God has complete control over all creatures, and everything is encompassed in God (Mesbah Yazdi, pp. 229 and 262).

In this discourse, humans are the Greatest creature of God in the system of existence and the earth is under his control according to the divine will, but since existence, including nature and humans, is the property of God Almighty, humans must possess and benefit from it with God's consent and permission and in accordance with God's orders and decrees in nature. Therefore, humans cannot treat nature and the environment as he wants and use it as much as he wants, but must possess and use nature according to the rules and to the extent necessary for his survival, growth and true perfection, and must strictly avoid any waste, squandering, destruction and corruption in the use of these resources. In other words, human is God's trustee and nature and its blessings have also been entrusted to man by God in the form of a trust bond, and humans cannot make any use of this trust that is contrary to the consent of the trustee. He must observe the principles of trustworthiness in his dealings with the environment and the use of natural and environmental resources, and behave wisely and faithfully with what has been entrusted to him. Based on the environmental discourse of the Islamic Revolution, the natural environment is the heritage of God Almighty for living beings and humans, so that man, by observing God's traditions, strives to preserve and develop it and protect it from pollution and destruction. In this regard, humans are responsible before God, creatures, and indeed all of creation.

In the environmental discourse of the Iranian Revolution, all of nature belongs to humans. Of course, it does not specify a particular generation or group of humans; rather, all humans in all generations must know that what they are entrusted with and share in the ownership of this divine gift and blessing that belongs to all generations (because, humans will live on this planet for thousands of years).

Therefore, everyone must preserve this gift in a trustworthy manner. Whoever destroys nature must know that he has betrayed all human generations that will come after him (Khamenei: Ibid., 12).

As can be seen, the environmental discourse of the Islamic Revolution is a realistic, rational, moderate discourse based on well-founded principles and teachings. On the one hand, this discourse considers all beings and creatures of the world to be valuable, and on the other hand, it considers value, right, and moral responsibility to be the exclusive property of humans. This discourse is not like the anthropocentric theory that considers only humans valuable and other creatures to be worthless and leaves human's hand completely free in any occupation of nature, nor is it like the ecological or world-oriented theory that considers all creatures in the world having moral rights and responsibilities. If it considers man to be the most noble of creatures, it also considers him responsible to all beings.

In an article, Patrick Doble shows the advantages of religious discourse over discourses based on material and naturalistic approaches in improving the environmental situation, and says: "The unique service of Christian ecology to the planet is to emphasize the fact that we can coexist on reasonable harmony with our world. We can love and respect our environment without eliminating all moral and technological distinctions and denying that we must use the earth cautiously but continuously for the benefit of all humanity. All this is done in the shadow of practicing the teachings of Christianity, which considers God the owner of the earth and natural beings and recognizes the role of divine trusteeship for humanity. The requirement of the role of trusteeship is that human, with methodical efficiency, works towards the development and flourishing of nature and the environment. "Life should strive to be as its original owner (God) intended" (Loui P. Pojman, 2003, pp. 49, 129).

Such a perspective has been emphasized and confirmed in a more sublime way by Islamic teachings. According to these teachings, the divine caliphate and the succession of God on earth are considered the culmination of the progress and exaltation of the moral and behavioral character of man, and the most important element of the divine caliphate, after the acquisition of religious knowledge, is to develop the earth and save it from all kinds of destruction and darkness. The earth is the extent of human existence, which includes from the depths of the sea to the top of mountain peaks and the sky. Environmental culture is mixed with the glorious position of the succession of God. He who pollutes the air instead of purifying it, destroys the land instead of restoring it, cuts down trees instead of planting saplings, and does not hesitate to pollute the world and the desert instead of restoring it, is in fact polluting and plundering the glorious title of Caliphate, just like the environment, and falsely considers himself the successor of God.

The mission of human as the vicegerent of God is to build and develop the earth, and the purpose of building the earth is to provide the principles of environmental life for human life; a life that transcends the boundaries of plant and animal life and reaches a growth that encompasses all plant and animal stages, and under its shadow, both the environment is protected from the danger of destruction and human life is protected from moral harm. As a result, both the body and soul benefit from the healthy nature and blessings of merciful guidance (Javadi Amoli, 2011, 40).

According to the explanations given, it seems that the environmental discourse of the Islamic Revolution has a very high capacity to change the current culture of production and consumption in society; because if man feels that the elements of nature, including animals and plants, are the manifestation and mirror of God's beauty and power, and God has displayed His beauty, glory, power and greatness by creating a huge number of animal and plant creatures; if man knows that the creatures of existence and the elements of nature are conscious and intelligent and always praise their Lord morning and evening; if people understand that the elements of the environment, including animals and plants, are nations like humans that are governed by special divine laws and traditions; If mankind comes to the understanding that man, as the best of creations, while having the privileges to take advantage of natural gifts, is also responsible for taking care of it, then he will never engage in wanton and unbridled

destruction of the earth, and not he will resort to the destruction of animals, forests, pastures, and pollution of water, air, and soil, which are clear examples of corruption in the earth.

Accordingly, the environmental discourse of the Islamic Revolution, unlike other environmental discourses, is able to establish a deep connection with society and create a new social culture in which the living and non-living elements of nature are respected and each individual feels responsible for what is happening to the environment.

Conclusion

Although development in various sectors has brought about human well-being throughout the world, it has also left behind serious harms. One of these harms is the increasing destruction of the environment.

Global environmental threats, on the one hand, have forced the international community to react and take action, and on the other hand, have forced environmental scholars to create numerous discourses for environmental protection, which are generally derived from two philosophical perspectives: human-centered and non-human-centered. These discourses reflect the mental, scientific, and practical atmosphere that governs social and political actors in the environmental field.

Despite extensive efforts to create an environmental discourse to encourage governments and societies to protect the environment and address environmental challenges, all of these discourses suffer from a fundamental gap, namely the inability to create a deep connection with society and create a social culture. Until there is a change in the culture of life of societies, efforts to protect the environment will be either fruitless or ineffective, and none of these discourses are capable of changing the social culture. Therefore, it is necessary to create a new discourse that can help create a new social culture and change the way people live.

The environmental discourse of the Islamic Revolution has a very high capacity to carry out such a great mission. And it can establish a deep bond with society. In this discourse, the axis of the universe is God, and all beings gain their value due to the connection and relationship they establish with Him. Although human is considered the noblest of creatures and the earth is under his control according to divine providence; but since existence, including nature and man, is the property of God Almighty, man must possess and benefit from nature with God's consent and permission and in accordance with divine orders and decrees. Therefore, man cannot treat nature and the environment as he wants and use it as much as he wants, but must possess and use nature according to the rules and to the extent necessary for his survival, growth and true perfection, and in using these resources, he must strictly avoid any waste, squandering, destruction and corruption.

References

1- Maleki, Amir & Salehi, Sadegh & Rabiei, Ali & Yazerloo, Reza Applying the Fairclough Model in the Typology of Iranian Environmental Discourses (Discourses of Justice, Conservation, Risk and Renovation) (2016). Quarterly Journal of Environmental Education and Sustainable Development, Volume 6, Number 2, Winter.

2- Brown, Lester. Saving the Environment (2012) (Plan B4.0). Mashhad, Jahad Daneshgahi.

3- Bashir, H. Discourse Analysis: A Window to Discover the Unsaid (2006). Tehran, Imam Sadeq University, Fourth Edition.

4- Basir, Abbas. Comprehensive Environmental Management from the Perspective of International Law (2017). Kabul, Kateb University Press.

5- Bloor, Meriel and Thomas. An Introduction to Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis (2011). (Translated by Ali Rahimi and Amir Hossein Shah Bala), Tehran, Jangal; Javdaneh.

6- Botkin, Daniel & Keller, Edward. Environmental Science: Earth as a Living Planet (1999). (Translated by Abdolhossein Vahabzadeh). Tehran, Museum of Nature and Wildlife of Iran.

7- Pojman, Louie P. Environmental Ethics (2003). (Translated by Mohsen Salasi [and others]), Towseeh Publishing, Tehran.

8- Javadi Amoli, Abdullah. Islam and the Environment (Summer 2011). researched by Abbas Rahimian, Israa Publishing Center, Qom, 6th edition.

9- Khamenei, Seyyed Ali. Environmental Protection Movement (2016). Tehran, Islamic Revolution Publications, 2nd edition.

10- Khosravi, Alireza. Imam Khomeini's School of Security (2012). Tehran, Abrar Contemporary International Studies and Research Institute, Tehran.

11- Dobson, Andrew. Green Political Thought (1998). (Translated by Mohsen Salasi), Tehran: Agah Publishing House.

12- Dast Ghayb, Seyyed Ahmad Reza and Seyyed Mohammad Hassan. Environment in Islam and International Law (2016). Tehran, Sociologists' Publications.

13- Soltani, Seyyed Ali Asghar. Power, Discourse and Language: Mechanisms of Power Flow in the Islamic Republic of Iran (2013). Ney house Publishing.

14- Shilton, Dina; Kiss, Alexander. Judicial Handbook of Environmental Law (2010). (Translated by Mohsen Abdollahi), Tehran, Khorsandi.

15- Salehi, Sadegh & Firouzjaeian, Ali Asghar & Gholamrezadeh, Fatemeh. Environmental Discourse Analysis of the Economic and Social Development Programs of the Islamic Republic of Iran (2014). Quarterly Journal of Welfare Planning and Social Development, No. 21.

16- Forghani, M. The Long Road (2003). Tehran, Culture and Thought First Edition.

17- Fahimi, Azizollah. Civil Liability for Environmental Destruction in Iranian Jurisprudence and Law (2012). Qom, Islamic Science and Culture Research Institute.

18- Kalantari, Abdolhossein & Talebi, Mahshid & Momen, Alireza. A Review of Theoretical Frameworks of Environmental Sociology (2013). Bija.

19- Mesbah Yazdi, Mohammad Taghi. Quranic Studies 2 (Cosmology) (2007), Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute.

20- Mirfakharai, Teja. The Process of Discourse Analysis (2004), Tehran, Media Studies and Research Center.

21- Hannigan, John. Environmental Sociology (2013). (Translated by Musa Anbari). Tehran, Tehran University Press.

22- Hajer M. A. The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and Policy Process (1995). Oxford, Clarendon Press.

23- J. Baird Callicott. Environmental Ethics (2001), In Lawrence C. Becker and Charlotte. Becker, Encyclopedia of Ethics, second edition, vo.I. p. 470-467. Routledge publication.

24- Taylor, D.E. The Rise of the Environmental Justice Paradigm (2000). American Behavioral Scientist, 43 (4).

25- Worster, D. Natures Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas (1977). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Copyrights