The Relationship between Religion and Politics in the political thought of two founders: " State religion" by Thomas Hobbes and "Religious State" by Imam Khomeini

Ali Kamali Nejad[1], Malek Yahya Salahi[2*], Seyed Mostafa Abtahi[3]

[1, 2*, 3]Department of Political Science, Science & Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Abstract:

The discussion on the relationship between religion and politics has a long history in Christianity, spanning several centuries. With the onset of modernity, especially with the theories proposed by Thomas Hobbes, the claim of secularism or the separation of religion from politics was raised and remains a subject of much debate to this day. Thomas Hobbes, in the aftermath of the religious wars in England during the 16th and 17th centuries, attempted to transform worldly power into the ultimate arbiter in the public sphere by separating the foundations of politics from religion, introducing the concept of "state religion." In contrast to the West, Islamic thought has consistently understood politics based on religious foundations. In the 20th century, due to colonization, the debate on the separation of religion from politics entered the Islamic world. With the victory of the Islamic Revolution, this Western claim was challenged, and Imam Khomeini introduced the theory of the "Religious state," presenting the religious nature of political foundations in Islam in a novel way. Based on these foundations, this article aims to explore the relationship between religion and politics in the political thoughts of Thomas Hobbes and Imam Khomeini, both of whom, as founders and initiators of political thought, have presented era-defining views. In doing so, we seek to demonstrate, through an examination of their arguments, the perspectives on the relationship between religion and politics put forth by Imam Khomeini and Hobbes. Through this comparative analysis, we can highlight important points in these two types of thinking. Consequently, by considering the discussions regarding the relationship between religion and politics in Western and Islamic thought, using a descriptive-analytical approach, we pose the following questions: What is the relationship between religion and politics in the political thoughts of Thomas Hobbes and Imam Khomeini? What is the concept of "state religion" according to Thomas Hobbes? What is the concept of the "Religious state" according to Imam Khomeini?

*Corresponding Author's Email: m-salahi@srbiau.ac.ir

Introduction:

A new Western political thought centered around liberalism, as demonstrated by theorists like Carl Schmitt and Reinhart Koselleck (Schmitt, 2018, and Koselleck, 1988), begins with the Englishman Thomas Hobbes. Hobbes, amidst the religious wars in England, laid the foundation for modern absolute government by presenting Leviathan. The crucial point in Hobbes's theorizing, which paved the way for liberalism, was the separation he established between ethics, religion, and politics. By declaring the independence of politics and its foundations from ethics and religion, he confined them to the private sphere and the conscience of the subjects under limited government. Hobbes claimed that citizens, within the private sphere, could have any belief or religion based on the freedom of conscience. However, in the public sphere, as the domain of the state and politics, it is the government that determines the correct religious doctrine. Thus, Hobbes, on one hand, distinguished the foundations of politics and religion, and on the other hand, in the public sphere, made religion and the religious institution, namely the Church, subservient to the state, termed as "state religion." This way, the Christian religious institution, the Church, was placed under the worldly or secular power. However, the conflict between the Christian religious institution and secular power had a long history before Hobbes, known as the "Investiture Controversy," where Pope Gregory VII claimed authority over worldly power in the 11th century. This marked the beginning of theoretical and practical challenges that ultimately concluded with Thomas Hobbes's theorizing on modern absolute government and the triumph of secular power (Kelli, 2019, and

Tierney, 2017). Hobbes's theorizing opened up what is known as political secularism in Western thought, which continues to this day. Although in the 20th century, we witness the entry of theology into the public sphere and politics under the term "Christian political theology" and the Church, an area where the government's jurisdiction is limited, and civil society is established, known as the "post-secular world" (Pia Lara, 2013). Therefore, Thomas Hobbes can be considered the "founder" of modern Western political thought, shaping the post-Hobbesian era with his theories.

In contrast, with the occurrence of the greatest revolution of the 20th century in Iran (1979), known as the "Islamic Revolution," during the same period when the return of religion to the public sphere is observed in the West, the revolution in Iran, with its Islamic nature, and under the leadership of Imam Khomeini, introduced the theory of the "Religious state" in the form of the "Guardianship of the Jurist." In contrast to Western modern thought, the Islamic Revolution in Iran, over the past few decades, presented a revolutionary Islamic political ideology and revived Islamic thought, now serving as a model for political theorizing in Islamic thought. Imam Khomeini established a new connection between religion and politics and reconstructed the relationship between the destroyed realm of religion, the world, reason, and faith. Thus, not only are religion and politics not separate, but Islamic thought is fundamentally political and religious. Therefore, unlike Hobbes, we don't have a "secular government," a government not based on religious foundations; rather, we have a religious government whose foundations are based on Islam. From this

perspective, Imam Khomeini can be considered a "founder" in Islamic thought, providing a clear response to Western claims of separating religion and politics.

The goal of this article is to provide a comparative analysis of the theory of "State religion" by Thomas Hobbes and the "religious government" of Imam Khomeini in the realm of the relationship between religion and politics. In this way, by examining their arguments, we can demonstrate what kind of framework they have presented for the relationship between religion and politics, each as a "founder" in the new Islamic and Western thought, offering a plan for the post-Hobbesian and post-Khomeini era. Through this approach, we can compare these two types of thinking and highlight important points in them. Consequently, by considering theoretical discussions about the relationship between religion and politics in Western and Islamic thought, we pose these questions:

1. What is the relationship between religion and politics in the political thought of Thomas Hobbes and Imam Khomeini?

2. What is Thomas Hobbes's concept of "State religion"?

3. What is Imam Khomeini's concept of the "religious state"?

2.Theoretical Discussion: Religion and Politics

The institutions of religion and politics have long been two crucial elements in human life, and due to their significance in shaping social life, they have consistently engaged the minds of scholars in the field of social and human sciences. Historically, the entire collective life of humanity, in its various aspects, has been influenced by religious experiences. Religion is devoted to the sacred in contrast to the ordinary and mundane, and the fundamental issue in the relationship between religion and politics revolves around the more fundamental matter of distinguishing the religious domain from the non-religious domain. The notion of the existence of a boundary between these two domains and its limits is a historical concept. Undoubtedly, all religions have made and continue to make various claims about regulating social and political affairs, as every religion, apart from providing means of salvation for believers, must also address the organization of their material lives. Nevertheless, some religions advocate more for involvement in worldly and political matters than others (Bashiryeh, 2006, pp. 222-223).

Based on the historical evolution and teachings of religions, eight strategic relationships can be discerned between political and religious powers, indicating the complexity of the relationship between these two institutions (Urban, 2005, p. 7253-7257). These eight cases are as follows:

1. Religion as politics (synthesis of religion and politics)

2. Political power beyond religious authority

3. Separation of the religious and political domains

4. Retreat of religion from the political sphere

5. Religion in the service of political power (religious nationalism in modern government)

6. Politics as religion (civil religion)

7. Religion in the struggle against political power in the form of revolution, terrorism, and resistance

8. Religious power beyond political authority

Among the above eight cases, the first and third are related to the subject of our discussion, to which we will briefly refer.

2-1. Religion as Politics (Synthesis of Religion and Politics)

Many Islamic scholars believe in the existence of a close and deep relationship between religion and politics in Islamic thought. These theorists and intellectuals present various rational and textual (Quran and Sunnah) arguments to support their views. Figures such as Farabi, Avicenna, Khajeh Nasir, Moskowiyeh, Mawerdi, Ibn Khaldun, Fakhr Razi, Seyed Jamal al-Din Asadabadi, Muhammad Abdoh, Iqbal Lahoori (Motahari, 1992, p. 4-5), Imam Khomeini, and others fall into this group. According to these theorists, regardless of conceptual overlap, the two concepts of religion and politics are fundamentally interconnected. Considering the main teachings of Islam, namely ideology, Sharia, and its own ethical values, this group believes in the deep, fundamental, and inseparable relationship between religion and politics. Based on the content and metaphysical issues of religion and politics, there is no room for doubt that in Islam, the relationship between religion and politics is a logical and metaphysical connection, and these two are essential and mutually inclusive. In other words, this relationship is an undeniable foundational principle in Islamic

thought (Ameed Zanjani, 1996, p. 75). Hence, Imam Khomeini is one of the greatest contemporary Islamic theorists who, by presenting the theory of "Religious state," defines the relationship between religion and politics in Islamic thought, demonstrating that politics is firmly based on religious and Islamic principles. Furthermore, he responds to the claim of separating religion and politics, which we will delve into in the following sections.

2-2. Separation of Religious and Political Spheres

The claim of separating religion and politics began in the heart of the Christian world and from the 17th century in Europe. The medieval centuries of Christian Europe show some clear examples of the relationship between the political and religious spheres, characterized by tension, competition, collaboration, or coexistence. Medieval writers usually perceived social order as a hierarchical organism with three dimensions: clergy, nobility, and commoners. However, there was always a debate about which of the two classes, clergy or nobility, pope or emperor, was at the top of this social hierarchy. The prevailing opinion is that Christianity has two heads: the emperor and the pope, each having authority in their own spheres. Throughout Christian history, these two institutions had various relationships, ranging from competition to cooperation. From the 11th century, with Pope Gregory VII's claim of the supremacy of the religious institution over the secular power, a centuries-long conflict began, ultimately ending with the triumph of secular power.

The radical form of separation between these two institutions can be observed in the

Enlightenment era as secularism. Secularism, in essence, means that faith and beliefs remain in the private sphere of individuals and have no place in the public sphere. This system takes various forms, including:

a) A system without a religious government, which presents an ideal model of laicism or complete separation.

b) A system based on government support for the principle of equality among all religions.

c) A system based on government support for one dominant religion, but other religions are also recognized and may enjoy government support.

d) A system based on government support for one dominant religion and the denial of other religions (Giannis, 2014, p. 8).

Hobbes's theory mainly focuses on government support for one sect or Christian denomination in the public sphere while recognizing other sects and denominations in the private sphere. Thus, Hobbes identifies a religious government that determines and enforces its rules in the public sphere as the government.

3. The Relationship between Religion and Politics in the Political Thought of Thomas Hobbes

Hobbes's main concern was the nature of political sovereignty and its role in maintaining social order. His work "Leviathan," published in 1650, addressed this concern and aimed to resolve the controversies he wrote about. He believed that these controversies were fueled by individuals who relied on religious beliefs and, more broadly, on the intellectual capacity

shared by both sides (Edwards, 2019, pp. 77-78). Contemporary thinkers of Hobbes were not inclined to accept claims accusing anyone of atheism. This indicates the extent to which religious issues were significant and influential in the early modern centuries, and if we don't say the main factor, we can at least say that one of the main factors in the wars and internal turmoil of the 16th and 17th centuries in Europe was religious issues and religious sects. We refer to these wars as religious, but we should not mistakenly attribute only religion to the responsibility for these massacres. Political, dynastic, and nationalist factors played a clear role in inciting war and its continuation and intensification. Certainly, Machiavellian political techniques added speed to the massacres, but the bias and zeal of those who participated in these wars were to a large extent a manifestation of their religious sentiments. These sentiments were the product of fundamental differences about the nature of God and His relationship with humans (Gillespie, 2019, pp. 239-240). Consequently, Thomas Hobbes, within the spectrum of modern absolute government theorists, sought to find a new foundation for politics that would be distinct from religion and ethics. He aimed to base politics on reason.

3-1. Politics Independent of Religion: Hobbes's religious Position

Carl Schmitt believes that the first step in the emergence of modern absolute government, which led to liberal democracy, took place in the sixteenth century during the religious wars and sectarian conflicts. After a century of religious wars that yielded no results for the parties and sects involved, the necessity of

"finding a neutral territory" amidst these conflicts arises. This territory is one where reaching an understanding or reconciliation for security and order is achieved (Schmitt, 2018, p. 96). Like Schmitt, Reinhart Koselleck argues that the "modern absolute government" takes shape and transforms in response to a "period" – namely, the "religious wars." It also disappears with another "period," the French Revolution. This "classical absolutism" is situated between the two "periods" of religious wars and the French Revolution. Therefore, the "absolute government" was a response to internal religious wars with the aim of preserving peace (Koselleck, 1988, pp. 11-17). During Hobbes's time in England, the country experienced political divisions and civil turmoil. Initially, religious classifications within English society were shattered. Various political factions, formed after religious reformation, were entangled in issues related to the political world. The growing middle class, with existing privileges, clashed with the aristocratic landowners. At the heart of all class, occupational, and religious differences was a profound disagreement about the suitable political system for society. These deep divisions in English society led to a turbulent political era. The seventeenth century witnessed the beheading of one king, the ascension of another to the throne after the fall of Cromwell, and the restriction of another king by the parliament and the people. The "Glorious Revolution," aided by the "Bill of Rights" and the "Toleration Act," ultimately provided a relatively enduring foundation for Britain's political system (Spragens, 2013, pp. 59-60).

There are conflicting interpretations regarding Hobbes's theological positions, making it difficult to definitively assess his stance (Ross, 2019, and Meissner, 2019). Therefore, instead of categorizing him into a particular faction, Hobbes can be perceived as a thinker who, at least in the public sphere, attempted to expel the turmoil of religious absolutism that had ignited domestic warfare. In his view, achieving this was not possible without relegating faith to the private sphere and establishing a state religion in the public sphere, which would be the final arbiter of affairs. Consequently, scholars emphasize, "It appears that although Thomas Hobbes, in practice and opinion, sided with authority, as can be inferred from certain passages in Leviathan... his ultimate goal is the elevation of customary political power, regardless of the individual who holds it" (Tabatabai, 2014, pp. 85-86).

3-2. Leviathan as the Ultimate Arbiter of Religious and Political Affairs: The State Religion

Hobbes, in the midst of the religious wars in England, attempts to answer the question: How is peace possible? Answering such a question requires laying the groundwork. Hobbes was interested in theoretical questions related to war and peace, but practical issues, and what could practically be done to end the war and turmoil in his environment, were of great importance to him.

3-2-1. Natural State and Political Situation: Individual Authenticity and the Necessity of Establishing the State

To answer the question "How is peace possible?" Hobbes begins his discussion with the "natural state" to demonstrate what must be done to transition to a state of peace. Therefore, by emphasizing the authenticity of the individual, proposing a social contract,

separating the public and private spheres, and divorcing the foundation of politics from religion and ethics, he addresses the concept of Leviathan and the state religion.

3-2-1-1. Natural State

Hobbes initiates his discussion by outlining the "natural state" as a "state of war" and addresses the question of how war occurs. He then demonstrates what must be done to overcome such a crisis. Hobbes's starting point regarding war is that individuals have desires and inclinations. However, the means to satisfy these desires and inclinations are scarce and insufficient, partly due to the nature of the world and partly because some of the things they desire are not shareable. Despite these obstacles, people strive to maximize their power to satisfy their desires as much as possible. Since everyone engages in this pursuit, competition arises. This competition could be moderated if we knew to what extent others are willing to compromise in the pursuit of their desires. However, lacking reliable knowledge and trust about others, we cannot know how much we can trust them to collaborate, reach agreements, and control the pursuit of their desires. Due to this lack of essential knowledge about others, we harbor mistrust towards them. This mistrust leads us to take a defensive stance and even contemplate preventive and preemptive actions. Considering all these factors, conflict and war seem inevitable to Hobbes (Misner, 2019, pp. 55-56). Based on this foundation, the first point in Hobbes's discussion is the concept of the "natural state." The natural state is a condition where no civil authority [political power] exists. Without authority, no one has rights, or in other words, everyone is equally entitled to do anything. Therefore, when two people want

the same thing, they become enemies (Ross, 2019, p. 151). Hobbes attempts to show through this depiction of the natural state that its opposite would be a political society. Thus, Hobbes considers the natural state as the absence of security and authority. Hobbes writes:

"Therefore, what results from a state of war, where everyone is an enemy to everyone else, is a state in which people live without any security unless they have established it through their power and initiative. In such a state, there is no room for the pursuit of work and industry, as profit and benefit are improbable. Consequently, agriculture and cultivation would not be possible; maritime and sea trade would be the same; constructing large buildings, manufacturing transportation tools, and moving things that require a significant workforce would not be feasible; geography, timekeeping, art, literature, and society would also be affected. Worst of all, humans are constantly in fear and the danger of violent aggression, leading to a life that is impoverished, lowly, painful, and short" (Hobbes, 1651, p. 78).

A fundamental point in Hobbes's theory, and his innovation in describing the natural state, is his discussion of the lessons of natural law. Hobbes considers the natural state as a state of war based on three reasons: 1) competition, 2) fear, and 3) the desire for glory and honor. Hobbes places this state in the absence of ethical considerations. In other words, ethics have no meaning in the natural state, and nothing can be unjust because the concepts of right and wrong, justice and injustice, are meaningless in that state (Hobbes, 1651, pp. 78-79). Hobbes considers the existence of ethics and ethical laws (and religion) possible in a political society and asserts that in the natural state

where people are scattered and in a state of war, ethics would be meaningless. In contrast, Hobbes argues that individuals in the natural state have "natural rights" or "natural law." According to the common definition of this term, individuals have a specific set of ethical rights. Violating these natural rights would be incorrect. Conversely, Hobbes defines natural right as the freedom to perform any act necessary for self-preservation. According to this definition, individuals in the natural state "determine for themselves" what is necessary or unnecessary for self-preservation. Therefore, there is no ethical restraint on human behavior in the natural state. Although individuals in the natural state are free, equal, and have natural rights, it can be said that they have no ethical rights in the natural state (Fein, 2019, pp. 101-102).

3-2-2. Separation of Public and Private Sphere: State Religion

A state that emerged in the seventeenth century, stepping onto the stage and encompassing the continent of Europe, is indeed a product of humans and distinct from all types of political entities. The primary manifestation and concept of such a state can be traced back to the theory of Thomas Hobbes. In other words, the roots of liberalism must be sought in Hobbes's theory of the state, a liberalism that emphasizes a kind of neutrality in the political sphere. Hobbes's conception of the state became a fundamental factor in the 400-year process of mechanization [of the state and humanity], a process that, with the help of technological advances, achieved a general neutrality, particularly transforming the state into a technically neutral and impartial tool. The decisive step in this process was taken in the seventeenth century, during times of war and

religious and sectarian conflicts. After a century of religious wars that yielded no results for the parties and sects involved, finding a neutral territory amid these conflicts became necessary – a territory where an understanding or reconciliation leading to security and order could be reached. It was Hobbes's Leviathan that established peace. This kind of post-natural theory, with foundations and concepts clear to everyone and proven with precision through argumentation, always made a clear distinction between moderation and impartiality. Consequently, the primary and most important task of theories was to prevent conflict and disputes with fanatics. In this way, Hobbes, as one of the pioneers of "modern scientific thinking," placed impartiality on the agenda of the state and, in various ways, differentiated it from the previous periods of tolerance. He transformed the state into a colossal and peace-preserving machine.

Such a mechanism for the state led to the successful differentiation between internal and external matters. This differentiation in the public sphere reveals its own conflicts with sectarian disputes (Schmidt, 2018, p. 87-113). The issue that emerged as a result of this transformation led to the separation of the public and private sphere. According to Schmidt, the distinction between private and public in "discrimination" between "internal faith" or heartfelt belief and "external confession" or linguistic acknowledgment in the public sphere and the government's domain was established as the custodian of religion. The distinction between private and public, faith, and confession was presented in a way that all other things logically originated from it in that century, ensuring the emergence of the liberal constitutional state. The modern "impartial" state born out of laissez-faire had its roots in

this period, not in the religious biases of Protestant sects (Schmidt, 2018, pp. 113-114). The final judge who dispenses punishments and rewards, according to Hobbes, is the government. It is the government that determines what is just and right in the law concerning justice, and in matters related to religious beliefs, it decides what is real and false.

Therefore, the government determines what citizens should believe in the public sphere. Schmidt believes that when the government took on this duty to preserve peace, it became the custodian of religion (Schmidt, 2018, pp. 109-113), indicating itself as a state religion. The issue that emerged as a result of this transformation led to the separation of the public and private sphere. In the sense that a "distinction" was created between "internal faith" or heartfelt belief and "external confession" or linguistic acknowledgment in the public sphere and the government's domain, serving as the custodian of religion. According to Hobbes, an individual, according to the comprehensive principle of freedom of thought, can believe or not believe, but in matters of religious controversy (such as miracles in Christianity that led to fundamental differences), which are connected to linguistic acknowledgment in the public sphere, the government is the decision-maker.

Therefore, every person can have their internal and heartfelt belief and "judgment" regarding religious matters. Still, when it comes to linguistic acknowledgment in the public sphere and is confronted with conflicting opinions and beliefs, which can ignite religious wars among sects, it is the ruler who decides about the correctness or incorrectness of it. From this point on, heartfelt belief as an internal and private matter falls under the responsibility of the individual, and they can have their judgment on these matters. Still, in the public sphere, the government is the ultimate judge. This is where the private sphere is distinguished from the public sphere (Schmidt, 2018, pp. 113-114).

As a result, the sphere in which the absolute government found its theoretical expression was the domain of raison d'état. The space created was a domain where politics could expand and extend itself regardless of ethical and religious considerations. Hobbes constructed a parallel between the ruler and those governed, such as the king and God. Hobbes played a significant role in establishing the independence of political play, as he eloquently described the nature of sovereignty and partisanship. He enabled each to become a capable process for government affairs based on collective consent.

The Reformation and the rift in religious authority it caused created a space where individuals could examine their consciences separately from others (Koselleck, 1988, pp. 16-17). Therefore, Thomas Hobbes's distinctive achievement was to formulate the principle underlying the emergence of absolutist government: the principle of separating politics from ethics and religion. In other words, private ethics and public politics were perceived as distinct. Hobbes emphasized that the dependence of ethical principles on politics is meaningless when societies are confronted with the dualities of peace and political war; thus, he advocated for the exclusion of "conscience" from the government domain, treating private and public affairs as two separate spheres (Koselleck, 1988, pp. 16-39).

4. The Relationship Between Religion and Politics in the Political Thought of Imam Khomeini

In the political thought of Imam Khomeini, religion serves as the foundation and basis of politics. It provides a textual context for politics and rejects the basis of politics being derived from human experience or the functional outcomes of human activities. According to Imam Khomeini, due to the strong integration of religion and politics, conceptually separating the two is difficult. In practical terms, Imam Khomeini views the government as being in the hands of the religious, provided they meet certain desirable conditions. Otherwise, he does not consider such a government Islamic (Zahmatkesh & Jafari, 2011, p. 773). This position contrasts sharply with the theoretical stance of thinkers like Thomas Hobbes and his liberal followers in the centuries following him. Imam Khomeini, by rejecting the separation of the foundations of politics from religion, recognizes politics as legitimate only when based on Islamic principles. Consequently, the implementation of Islamic goals becomes the focus of politics. This viewpoint has shaped global discussions on the relationship between religion and politics, with the West advocating for the separation of religion from politics.

4-1. Imam Khomeini's Position on the Claim of Separation of Religion and Politics

Imam Khomeini considers the claim of separating religion from politics as a colonial slogan initially formulated by the Umayyads and Abbasids, and in recent centuries, it has been propagated and planned by colonialism. He vehemently denies the resemblance between Islam and Christianity in terms of their relationship with politics and criticizes the view that portrays Islam as having no distinction between the mosque and the church. He argues that, although true Islam and Christianity do not differ significantly in their political aspects, the existing Christianity considers the church a non-political institution, while Islam designates the mosque as the center and axis of the manifestation of the institution of religion (Khajeh Sarvi, 2001, p. 96).

Imam Khomeini emphasizes the unity of religion and politics and asserts that our religion is our politics, and our politics is our religion. He believes that the presence of religion in the political arena reduces corruption, theft, treason, crime, and immorality. By weakening the position of religion and clergy in society, fundamental flaws arise that hundreds of judiciary measures cannot rectify. The implementation of Islamic laws lays the groundwork for civilization because the legislator is a knowledgeable God who is not ignorant of any aspect of human affairs, managing both material and spiritual aspects of life in the best possible way (Fouzi, 2015, p. 113).

Imam Khomeini discusses certain Islamic laws as evidence of the religious nature of politics, such as financial laws (khoms, zakat, jaziyah, etc.), national defense laws, and legal and penal laws. He argues that these laws cannot be implemented without a government and executive institutions. Therefore, the need for an Islamic government becomes apparent. Imam Khomeini expresses that the most important reason for the inseparability of religion from politics is the "comprehensiveness of the Islamic religion." Islam is the most complete and comprehensive religion, influencing all aspects of individual, social, material, spiritual, cultural, political, and military life

(sahife Emam, vol.21, pp. 402-403). Thus, the unity of religion and politics is absolute, meaning that politics flows within religion, and its fundamental principles are derived from Islamic law.

4-2. The political nature of Islam signifies the obligation to establish an Islamic government.

The central theme of Imam Khomeini's political ideology emphasizes the necessity of forming a religious government. The Imam believed that the connection between religion and politics must be realized in the government; hence, Muslims, based on accepting the relationship between religion and politics, should strive to establish a government influenced by Islam. In Imam's view, the set of laws (Sharia) alone is not sufficient for social reform; therefore, alongside it, God has established a government and an executive system. According to Imam Khomeini, laws and social systems require an executive authority. Sharia laws contain various regulations related to a comprehensive social system that plans for all human needs from birth to after death. To execute it, the establishment of a government is necessary, and without creating a vast system for execution and administration, one cannot fulfill the duty of implementing divine laws. Therefore, following the Prophet's example, after his departure, none of the Muslims doubted the need for a government; everyone unanimously agreed on the necessity of forming a government.

4-2-1. Individual or Social Authenticity?

It can be said that Imam Khomeini's perspective on society is closer to the paradigm of order, with the difference that individuals in society have autonomy and awareness, capable of shaping their own destiny. From his viewpoint, society is nothing but individuals, and individuals create the conditions for the formation of an Islamic society. Yet, simultaneously, he advocates for the existence of an independent entity for society, possessing a distinct nature. Imam considers the social nature of humans as the main reason for the formation of society and emphasizes that individuals cannot lead an isolated life in the world. In another analogy, individuals in society are compared to raindrops, and the society itself is likened to rivers, floods, and seas. Each drop, to be meaningful, needs to contribute to a social entity. Thus, Imam holds a synthesis perspective on the authenticity of both society and the individual, stating that while individual authenticity is crucial, individuals are powerless in isolation, and societal existence is necessary to accomplish tasks.

4-2-2. Establishment of an Islamic State

Based on the unity of religion and politics in Islam, Imam endeavors to derive the establishment of an Islamic state from religious texts. In Imam's discourse, Islam, and specifically Shiism, is considered comprehensive and complete, asserting absolute certainty in this regard. Unlike non-monotheistic schools, Islam intervenes and supervises in all aspects of personal, social, material, spiritual, cultural, political, military, and economic affairs. According to Imam, the Prophet has laid the foundation for politics in piety. The ethical principles of Islam are also political, as the Quranic commandment that believers are brothers is not just an ethical but also a social and political directive (Mozaffari, 2008, pp. 16-18)

Imam Khomeini's perspective on the establishment of the government is based on the discourse of "Imamate and Guardianship." He derives this discourse from monotheism to prophet hood, then to Imamate and guardianship, and finally concludes the necessity of establishing an Islamic government from guardianship. Therefore, the following statements can be inferred: those who believe in guardianship, the appointment of duties by the Holy Prophet (PBUH), and God permitting him to appoint a caliph and the leader of the Muslims must believe in the necessity of establishing an Islamic government. According to Imam, the struggle for the establishment of an Islamic government necessitates belief in guardianship, and it is essential based on religious and rational grounds. Just as during the life of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) and Imam Ali (AS), a government and an executive system were necessary, they are still required in our time (Mozaffari, 2008, p. 14)

Imam Khomeini explained the necessity of defending the establishment of an Islamic government during the occultation, outlining the reasons for the imperative of founding a government as follows:

1. Insufficiency of the law (Sharia) for reforming society

2. The establishment of an Islamic government as a model set by the Prophet (PBUH) for Muslims

3. Emphasis of narrations on the necessity of forming an Islamic government

4. The need for many Islamic laws to be implemented through the government

5. Quranic emphasis on rejecting tyrants and non-divine systems

6. The necessity of continuing the implementation of Islamic laws (Mousavi Khomeini, 1989).

4-2-2-1. People's Satisfaction

After accepting the necessity of social life for humans, the necessity of social order arises because social life without order will not only be beneficial to humanity but also have irreparable losses. This order is implemented through the laws of government, which has two sides: the people's right over the government and the government's right over the people. In the political thoughts of Imam Khomeini, the people are considered one of the fundamental pillars of the Islamic government. The Imam emphasizes the government's reliance on the people, not imposing on them, people's satisfaction, people's supervision, and so on. The position of the people in his political ideology manifests in their defense of the "Islamic Republic" system, as the term "republic" emphasizes the role of the people in the Islamic government. Imam Khomeini sought to create a suitable connection between Islam and republicanism in his desired Islamic system. According to Imam Khomeini, all humans are equal, and none has the right to political leadership and guardianship over others; only God has inherent sovereignty. From the Islamic perspective, human beings are creatures with intellect and the power of choice, and this right is manifested in their political and social participation, meaning the right of individuals to determine the fate of society. In the Islamic government system, all individuals have control over their destinies and are authorized to manage their affairs,

except in specific matters prohibited by God. It should be noted that in Islamic political thought (especially Shia), acting against the will of the people in determining the political and social fate of society (through force and domination) without their consent is considered unjust and illegitimate.

4-2-2-2. Goals of the Islamic Government

The establishment of an Islamic government, according to Imam Khomeini, serves as a means to achieve goals that can provide a suitable life for humans, promoting material and spiritual growth, and quickly leading them on the path of happiness. He describes the most important goals of the Islamic system as follows:

1) A religious government should strive to strengthen legitimate freedom and God's sovereignty over humans to create a ground for the development of their potentials.

2) All orientations should contribute to the realization of justice and the creation of a secure and just environment for the life, growth, and prosperity of humans (social justice).

3) Orientations should lead to the establishment of an independent political system free from foreign interventions, making decisions based on current Islamic interests (comprehensive independence).

4) Plans should be made for the growth and progress of the Islamic society in various dimensions and actualize Islamic civilization.

5) These orientations should contribute to the revival of religious and Islamic identity in society (Lakzayi, 2017, pp. 189-191).

5. Conclusion

Modern political thought begins with Thomas Hobbes, who introduced the separation of religion and politics. Hobbes proposed a powerful government that, by changing the foundations from religion to reason, could silence religious wars and control religion and religious institutions, placing worldly power above all powers and controlling the country and society. In this way, worldly power has the right to determine which religion, laws, and beliefs are correct and citizens in the public sphere must obey the government's orders. In contrast, Imam Khomeini presented a theory rooted in Islamic principles and the tradition of the Prophet (PBUH) and Shia Imams. He denied the separation of religion from politics, presenting politics as part of religion and a practical mechanism to achieve Islamic goals. In the Islamic society, believers establish a religious government to cover Islamic goals and enforce the rules of the Islamic law in the public sphere. On this basis, politics takes its foundations from religion and cannot be independent of it. Therefore, these two theories have influenced a trend in Western and Islamic political thought, upon which subsequent theories have been based. Hence, we can compare the important and prominent points of Hobbes and Imam Khomeini's ideologies in a comparative manner:

Thomas Hobbes	Imam Khomeini
Separating the foundations of politics from religion: Reason is the foundation of politics	Establishing the foundations of politics in religion: Religion is the foundation of politics
Originality is with the individual	Hybrid approach: collective and individual
Establishing nature of the government	Establishing nature of the government
The special task of the government is to maintain peace and security	The role of the government is to implement the laws of Sharia and establish justice
The worldly power is the guardian of religion and the institution of religion is in the public domain	The government is formed based on religious principles and is religious
The rights of citizens have been transferred to worldly power	The religious government protects the rights of citizens

References

Amid-Zanjani, Abbasali, (1996), "The Relationship between Religion and Politics," Philosophy, Kalam va Erfan Journal.

Bashiryeh, Hossein, (2006), Political Sociology, Ney Publishing.

Edwards, Lester, (2019), "Hobbes (1588-1679)" in New Interpretations on Modern Political Philosophers from Machiavelli to Marx, edited by Lester Edwards and Jules Townshend, translated by Khashayar Deyhimi, Ney, Tehran.

Fein, Stephen J., (2019), Hobbes, Guide for the Perplexed, translated by Mohammad Mosahefi, Scientific and Cultural Publications.

Fouzi, Yahya, (2015), Political Thoughts of Imam Khomeini, Qom: Office of the Supreme Leader's Representative in Universities, Knowledge Dissemination Office.

Giannis, Konstantinos D. Religion and Politics: Debating secular and post- secular theories in: http://users.auth.gr/kourebe/Religion%20and%20Politics. %20Debating%20secular%20and%20post-secular%20theories. %20publish%20 (2).pdf.

Gillespie, Michael Allen, (2019), The Roots of Modern Theological Modernity,

translated by Zanyar Ebrahimi, Pegah Rozgar No, Tehran.

Hobbes, Thomas, (1651), Leviathan or the Matter, Forme, & Power of a Common-wealth Ecclesiastical and Civil. Prepared for the McMaster University Archive of the History of Economic Thought, by Rod Hay.

Imam Khomeini, (1999), Sahife Imam, Volume 21, Institute for the Compilation and Publication of Imam Khomeini's Works.

Imam Khomeini, (1999), Sahife Imam, Volume 3, Institute for the Compilation and Publication of Imam Khomeini's Works.

Jamshidi, Mohammad Hossein, (2005), Rokh-e-Andisheh, Book One, Kolbe Marefat.

Kelli, John, (2019), A Brief History of Legal Theory in the West, translated by Mohammad Rasekh, Ney, Tehran.

Khajeh Sarvi, Gholamreza, (2001), "The Unity of Religion and Politics in the Thought of Imam Khomeini," Journal of Political Science, No. 16.

Lakzayi, Najaf, (2017), Political Thought of Imam Khomeini, Research Institute of Islamic Sciences and Culture (Affiliated with the Office of Islamic Propagation), Baqer Al-Ulum University.

Misner, Marshall, (2019), Hobbes Philosophy, translated by Khashayar Deyhimi, Farhang Nashr-e No.

Moosavi Khomeini, Seyyed Ruhollah, (1987), Affairs and Powers of the Supreme Leader, Translation of Vilayat-e Faqih from the book Al-Bay'ah, Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance.

Motahari, Morteza, (1992), Islamic Movements in the Last Hundred Years, Sadra Publishing.

Mozaffari, Ayat (2008), "The Contradictory View of the Relationship between Religion and Politics in the Point of view of Abdul Razzagh Mesri and Imam Khomeini," Journal of Islamic Revolution Studies, Fourth Year, No. 15.

Naghibzadeh, Ahmad and Amir Mohammad Izadi, (2015), "The Relationship between Religion and Politics in the 'Post-Secular' Era," Political Science Research Journal, Tenth Year, No. 4.

Pia Lara, Maria, (2013), The disclosure of politics: struggles over the semantics of secularization, Columbia University Press New York.

Ross, George MacDonald, (2019), Hobbes, translated by Seyyed Masoud Azar Fam, Qoqnoos Publications.

Schmidt, Carl, (2018), Leviathan in the Theory of Thomas Hobbes, Meaning and Failure of a Political Symbol, translated by Shervin Moghimi Zanjani, Pegah Rozgar No.

Tabatabai, Javad, (2014), New Political Thought in Europe, Volume One: From Birth to the French Revolution 1500-1789, Third Chapter: Innovative

Systems in Political Thought, Minoo-ye Kherad, Tehran.

Tierney, Brian, (2017), Religion, Law, and the Emergence of Constitutional Thought, translated by Hossein Badamchi and Mohammad Rasekh, Negah Moaser, Tehran.

Urban, Hugh (2005), "Politics and Religion: An Overview", In: Encyclopedia of Religion, Lindsay Jones, Vol. 11, New York: Macmillan Reference.

Zahmatkesh, Mehdi and Ali Jafari, (2011) "The Relationship between Religion and Politics in Islam," Foreign Policy Quarterly, Twenty-fifth Year, No. 3, Autumn 2011.