



Philosophical and political components in the opinions of Soroush and Davari

Anoosheh Darbandi¹, AliAkbar Amini^{2*}, Hamed Ameri Golestani³,
Hamed Mohagheghnia⁴

¹Ph.D Student in Political Science, Political Science Department, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran

¹Ph.D Student in Political Science, Political Science Department, Khuzestan Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Ira

^{2*} Department of Political Science, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

^{3,4}Department of Political Science, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran

Received: 28 Jan 2022 ; Accepted: 24 March 2022

Abstract

After the revolution, intellectualism in Iran underwent transformations, which can be considered as a result of attention to European schools of thought. Two schools of analytical and continental philosophy, with their two main thinkers namely Heidegger and Popper, were noticed by Iranian intellectuals. In the meantime, Reza Davari, as a Heidegger-leaning philosopher, and Abdol Karim Soroush, a Popper-leaning philosopher, influenced the intellectual atmosphere of Iran by presenting their opinions. In this article, we intend to compare the philosophical and political components of these two thinkers with regard to these two philosophical schools. Since the foundations of these two philosophies have fundamental differences, the question arises, how was the reflection of the difference in the philosophical components of Soroush's and Davari's opinions in their political opinions? The main results of this research are that Soroush's political opinions with religious interests and influenced by Islamic thought, relying on Popper's philosophy of science, logical and epistemological precisions of analytical philosophy and conscious liberalism, were in pursuit of compatibility with modernity and compatibility of religion with modernity. On the other hand, the political opinions of Davari, again with religious and identity interests, but under the influence of Heidegger and continental philosophy, defend philosophy and oppose rationalism and scientism, apply anti-intellectual presuppositions about society, politics, religion, science, as well as anti-Westernism and stance. religious against modern subjectivity. The judgment showed that the meaning of development cannot be equated with the sudden arrival of modernity and welfare technology in advanced societies. Therefore, his discourse can be seen as the foundation for the emergence of new discourses.

Keywords: Iran, Political ethnicity, Religion, Dialect, Ethnicity

Introduction

Philosophical opinions of Iranian intellectuals have long been influenced by European philosophical currents. Although the early generations of intellectuals paid less attention to philosophical opinions in the strict sense of the word, their last generation, especially after the revolution, helped to create intellectual trends in the intellectual society of Iran by using the components of philosophical schools. After the revolution, religious intellectuals tried to use some components of the two schools of analytical philosophy and continental philosophy to give a philosophical color to what they were following from the religious base in intellectualism, with the basic concepts of these two schools. Reza Davari Ardakani is the main representative of the religious intellectual current following continental philosophy and its representative is Martin Heidegger, and Abdol Karim Soroush is the representative of the followers of analytical philosophy and its representative is Karl Popper.

Although these two have commonalities with each other in the main religious foundations, the main difference between them is their philosophical attitude. Under the influence of continental and analytical philosophical currents, Soroush and Davari created conflicting intellectual discussions. Based on this, Soroush, by adopting a scientific, falsificationist, and critical method, opposes Davari, who approaches fundamental intellectual issues with a history-oriented, philosophical and anti-rationalist method.

These two types of methods and views are not only limited to the field of analytical and continental philosophy and also affect their political opinions. In this article, the question is raised, how was the reflection of the difference between the philosophical components of Soroush and Davari's opinions in their

political opinions? By examining the philosophical opinions of Popper and Heidegger, their reflection on the thought of Soroush and Davari, the difference between the political opinions of these two Iranian religious intellectuals will become clearer, and the purpose of writing this article is a better and somewhat different knowledge from these opinions.

Analytical philosophy and continental philosophy

Continental philosophy refers to a set of intellectual traditions of European philosophers in the 19th and 20th centuries that were used to emphasize traditions outside the analytic movement. Analytical philosophy is also the academic philosophy governing English-speaking universities; Its main founders were Bertrand Russell and Thomas More, who were actually influenced by Frege. Bukhensky writes: "Analytical philosophers are more or less naturalistic, scientists tend to be materialistic, and finally there are rationalists" (Bukhensky, 2000, p. 34). Therefore, they consider science as the only valid knowledge and emphasize the data of the senses. According to them, the only valid beliefs are those that can judge the world, and the reasons for this judgment are observation, testing, and reaching certain experiences. It is obvious that analytical philosophers consider the mind as a passive element that operates under the knowledge of external data and reflecting external laws; Therefore, it does not need to be understood and interpreted, and their emphasis is on scientific language, not value. Therefore, their goal is to study concepts carefully and logically, as well as opposing metaphysical beliefs. But from Critchley's point of view, "continental philosophy is a reality that a huge part of it can

be seen as a reaction to the understanding and acceptance of the crisis in the modern world and an attempt to reach a kind of critical awareness of the present time with the intention of liberation" (Critchley, 2008, p. 106). Also, it emphasizes the element of historicity and the consideration of tradition and the historical nature of philosophy (Critchley, 2008, p. 93). Continental philosophers, anti-scientism and critics of science's conquest of human ways of life are in the world of existence; Based on this, the confrontation between analytical and continental philosophy is actually a clash of ideas between the scientific and hermeneutic views of the world.

Popper and Heidegger controversy; Two prominent representatives of the school of analytic and continental philosophies

Karl Popper and Heidegger are among the most prominent analytical and continental philosophers. According to Popper, who is considered an analytical philosopher, "we actively try to impose rules on the world without passively waiting for the repetition of events to impose rules on us. We try to discover similarities in the world and explain them according to laws we have invented. Without waiting for preliminaries, we jump to results. We may discard the same result if we find their incorrect observation (Bashiriyeh, 2000, p. 61). Therefore, we should face scientific theories in such a way that we can explain them in a timely manner and based on the logic of proof of theorems in such a way that they can be easily criticized and refuted. Knowledge and science can lead people forward when they themselves can be criticized and refuted. True knowledge and science progress through rejection and criticism, so it is necessary to set the falsification of distinguishing empirical from non-empirical cases and the criterion for distinguishing science from pseudo-

science. In other words, the development of science is not in the confirmation and proof of theories, but the product of their criticism. According to Popper, "scientific approach is critical, it does not seek confirmation; It explores basic experiences. Experiences that may invalidate the tested theory, but can never prove it" (Popper, 2013, p. 47). Based on such a foundation, Popper also presents theories in the field of political thought. He stood up to defend liberalism and democracy with a scientific and philosophical view, and following the principle of uncertainty in philosophy and physics, he emphasized on the idea of the freedom of history from the constraints of laws and the impossibility of predicting the future. In fact, Popper's socio-political theories are derived from his epistemological theory. In his opinion, the principles of rational criticism, as they work for scientific and metaphysical theories, should be equally considered for social and political issues. According to his methodological philosophy, the best way to achieve a better society is to gradually solve the problems that the society is plagued with. Based on this, just as in science we need continuous criticism, in politics and society planning, the realization of growth and development requires freedom in criticism and the possibility of presenting various proposals, solving problems and making changes based on them. Popper believed that the secret of the development of democracy in the West is not in having hardware facilities and access to energy sources, but in the history of the existence of the idea of freedom and the possibility of the emergence of critical attitudes.

But Heidegger's problem, as one of the most prominent thinkers of continental philosophy, is the crisis of Western man in the contemporary world that has crossed metaphysical fields and is on the threshold of a

kind of general and comprehensive nihilism. In his opinion, "being is forgotten, and as long as the truth of being is not thought about, any kind of ontology remains unfounded" (Khatami, 2005, p. 41). Heidegger seeks to find an answer to the question of being by resorting to his phenomenological method. For him, phenomenological interpretation is the concept of returning from the perception of an entity to the understanding of the existence of that entity (Khatami, 2005, p. 42). Therefore, instead of talking about me in relation to the world, we should talk about "being in the world" as a single thing. Heidegger calls this single thing (man) Dasein. (Heidegger, 1389) He considers a person to be a being in crisis that the elements that create modernity add to the scope of this crisis and the expansion of materialistic consumerism pushes it towards absurdity. Therefore, such a crisis is caused by two basic factors; Human homelessness means the separation of man from the world, or in specialized language, the distinction between the human "life world" and the "life world" of humans, and the other is nihilism, which itself arises from the primary factor. He was looking for a solution to face such a crisis; A problem that made the true knowledge of existence the main subject of philosophy. The importance of this solution is that it shows that we should search for a way to save man from the clutches of the image that Cartesian's plan of the new world has drawn. This solution should be found beyond philosophy and new science, in poetry and art. It should be connected with the holy matter.

Heidegger has evaluated a two-stage plan to save man from the fundamental damage of the contemporary world. In the first stage, it is shown that man is inherently cosmopolitan and the only intelligent inhabitant in this world; Basically, it is difficult to assume a

human being without the world. At this stage, the Cartesian plan and various ideas that have been implemented in the new world are seriously criticized and the homelessness/worldlessness of man is moved to the top of philosophical and reflective issues. In the second stage, the effort is to explain the world, which is inherent to man and is created from a point of view in such a way that it is compatible with the biological life and social life of man, in terms of its content, that is, [human] existence. This stage eliminates the second facet of the crisis of nihilism or at least moderates it.

Comparison of the methodology of Soroush and Davari as thinkers of analytical and continental philosophies

In recognizing, introducing, and even creating methodological styles, Soroush and Davari are two thinkers who had a great impact on the knowledge of Iranian intellectuals, especially after the Islamic Revolution, from two analytical and continental schools of thought. What makes it possible to compare these two thinkers is their methodological organization; That is, Soroush's scientific, falsificationist, critical and rational method can be judged against the history-oriented, philosophical and anti-rationalist method. Compared to the old absolutist philosophy, Soroush considers the flexible approach to the new probabilistic science to be more compatible with the principles of politics in society. He considers the possible concept of falsifiability according to Popper as the foundation of new science (Soroush, 1982, p. 132). He believes:

"Among the philosophers of science of the contemporary century, Karl Popper is the one who tried to give a clear and scholarly answer to most of the questions related to the philosophy of science [and the epistemology

of scientific subjects] by giving the "power of falsification" to experience, and based on the principle that he himself is from epistemological philosophy takes the initiative to establish his school in the philosophy of science. Nowadays, there is less discussion in the philosophy of science without reference to Popper's views... and my effort is to explain logically and historically this school principals and describe its accessories and functions and its many applications... and finally, an opening to complete it. (Soroush, 2014, p. 440).

Based on this, he uses the scientific method to adjust ideological policies in the contemporary world, especially in religious societies, and with the belief that there is an unbridgeable gap between science and ideology, he promotes the neutrality of science as a solution for over-reliance. Ideology deals with social sciences, religious studies, mysticism and of course politics. Respecting Popper's opinions, Soroush believes that the method of natural sciences can be applied to humanities and social sciences and defends the scientific nature of humanities. Therefore, he says: "Simply saying that the humanities came from the East or the West, you should not immediately invalidate them" (Soroush, 2001, p. 191). He also believes that Karl Popper's opinions are not well explained in Iran and the reason for this is the youth of philosophy of science as an academic discipline. According to him, many of our religious thinkers think that the belief in the philosophy of science is something like materialism, and anyone who takes a critical side in philosophical matters and scientific judgment in religious propositions, must be a follower of people like Hume and Mach, and will end up with nothing but secularism. This is because even in experimental philosophy, the likes of Hume, Locke, and Barclay remain symbols, not to mention the philosophy of

science, which is scientology, and if the task of experimental philosophy and the foundations of sensualism are to be challenged in one place, it is here (Soroush, 2014, p. 441). Based on this attitude and approach to Popper's views and the possibility of falsification of formal and traditional propositions and theorems, he agreed with science as an interhuman intellectual technology and then extended these ideas to the social sphere and believed: "Science is something that is scientific It is due to its generality. Something that is the product of everyone's criticism and understanding, and the meaning that they give scientific meaning to words in a society's custom, make science" (Soroush, 2001, p. 178).

Based on what was said and also based on the possibility of falsifiability of science and the evolutionary nature of its growth, it deals with concepts such as the right of democracy and the evolution of human understanding of religious propositions. On the other hand, Davari brings criticism to the continental philosophy and following the historical and philosophy-oriented method that he believes in, he says:

"If a person does not know his time and situation and is unfamiliar with a foreign language, he is trapped in the historical situation, even if he considers himself free. But this historical transition is the same as our thoughts, words and actions. Each of us are people living in Medina and we usually think and act in harmony with others and agree with the system of Medina. This coordination and agreement are hawalat" (Davari, 1999 A, p. 5).

Davari is influenced by Heidegger's philosophy, in contrast to Popper and his supporters, and by defending philosophy, considers it a form of thinking. He believes:

"Philosophy could defend itself as long as its existence was certain, but when it took the

form of religious and neo-religious religions and pragmatism, the defense of thinking was almost ruled out. Philosophy reached a point where it gave way to technological science" (Davari, 1987, p. 106 and 107).

He also believes:

"When it is said that science has replaced thinking, it means that we have reached the end of the philosophy of history. That there is philosophy, but there isn't serious philosophical thinking. We have reached a period where all the possibilities that existed at the beginning of Western thought have been realized in the new Western civilization in science and technology" (Davari, 1987, p. 107).

In this way, unlike Soroush, the ruling rejects people who oppose philosophy in the name of philosophy, science, logic and civilization, and writes clearly:

"In order to neutralize these people, one must resort to philosophy, and in order to give the right to the rightful, one must remember that what is called science, civilization, and new logic today, is the child of philosophy in its weak form" (Davari, 1987, pp. 22-24).

By raising doubts about thinkers such as Russell, Carnap and Popper, the judgment presents them as people against philosophy. In his interpretation of Heidegger, he considers the new science to be a form of metaphysics and considers metaphysics to be an all-inclusive concept that has reached its perfection in the form of new science. In other words, Davari believes that the development of new sciences, in itself, confirms all those things whose general form has already been presented in pure philosophy, and all the experimental fields and the possibility of negating and proving them confirm the type of thinking that discusses the totality of existence in philosophy. will be in fact, a kind of generalist, historical and me-

ta-behavioral attitude has taken over the mind and makes it reluctant to accept other examples of thinking.

Religious studies with Soroush and Davari

One of the most important manifestations of the intellectual difference between Soroush and Davari, which is rooted in the fundamental differences between analytical and continental philosophy, is the issue of theology and religious studies. The motivation and intellectual purpose of Soroush and Davari in producing religious texts was how to harmonize Sharia with the needs of a religious state in the new and revolutionary conditions of Iran and solve its problems in the new world.

In this regard, Soroush considers religion to be one of the most important and strongest elements of the old world, which has made its way to the new world, and among thousands of philosophical and experimental theories, it has strongly preserved its main centers; However, in the re-reading of modern narratives from traditional texts and modern readings of religion, new interpretations have been made and in the first philosophy God has become a sacred thing and religious duties have become religious experiences. Influenced by the falsifiability and evolutionary nature of science, as well as the use of natural sciences in line with social and human sciences in Popper's thinking, Soroush deals with theological issues by approaching the logic of linguistic analysis in analytical philosophy and exposes the fundamental components of traditional belief to new interpretations and It gives a new reading. He, who had a special regard for Darwin's evolutionary theory, extended its theoretical dimensions to the field of philosophical discussions and the confrontation of the Greek intellectual tradition with the problems of

the new world. Following Ali Shariati, regarding the separation of religion from theology, he admits that the stability of the former and the transformation of the latter is an admirable matter and worthy of reflection (Sorush, 2004, p. 607).

Undoubtedly, such an approach requires its own courage; Especially if we remember that in the 1960s dealing with philosophy in the field was a kind of deviation from jurisprudence and as a result condemned to criticism and rejection. Then, if we keep in mind that even after the Islamic revolution, attention to analytical philosophy was considered a kind of degradation of pure philosophy by the new sciences, and there are still such controversies, then we find out that how difficult and serious was the encounter with religious data is based on analytical philosophy and the approach to Popper's school of thinking. Anyways, Sorush agrees with Popper's opinion that "scientific determinism [meaning the philosophy of science, not pure empirical sciences] is considered the most serious problem in the way of explaining human freedom, creativity and responsibility and defending them" (Bashiriyeh, 2000, pp. 61-66), deals with theological topics such as the evolution of religious understanding, the acquisition and expansion of Sharia law and dynamic jurisprudence and writes:

"No written text repeats its meaning. The mind is a linguist who reads the meaning in him. expressions are desperate meanings, not their conception... Similarly, the meaning of the phenomena of the world is not written on it. One must know the language of the world in order to read and understand them, science and philosophy teach this language to people, and these languages are neither stagnant nor developed, but are in continuous evolution" (Sorush, 2002, p. 192).

Of course, he believes in what he says with a historical dignity and an unbiased touch. So, if he talks about transformation and continuity in this transformation, he actually refers to that knowledge that is the product of the struggle of thoughts in the movement of all humanity. The result is that the perception surrounding a subject or a case is a product of intellectual relations in the religious and civilizational traditions of all people over time; In this sense, every knowledge has a historical identity, and on the other hand, since every knowledge is a product of the philosophy of different people, it has a collective identity. The identity that flows and in its historical continuity, has been refined and has provided various epistemological centers in the pure philosophy, in the philosophy of science, and in experimental and positivist sciences. Maybe it will be given to the future generations with new evaluations and implications, and as we are the inheritors of the past, the future generations will also be the inheritors of the science, philosophy and wisdom of the people of the present age. In this way, the epistemological meaning of Popper and Sorush both has a realist aspect; But not that raw realism that has a clear confrontation with the truth and thinks that reaching the truth is a simple act, but in the sense that reaching the truth, although it is desirable, but the history of knowledge teaches us that the knowledge of the truth is always done from the "sight" and In order to achieve it, one must walk the path and gradually get closer to the truth along this path (Sorush, 2014, pp. 437-438; Popper, 1995, p. 120). So, the most obvious similarity between Sorush and Popper is the belief of both thinkers in the role of prior information in acquiring knowledge. This opinion, which represents the subjectivist view of both thinkers, is one of the most important

principles of their epistemology. On this basis, as we know from Soroush, the prophet's religious experience and prophetic experiences are also considered to be a kind of evolution of knowledge:

"This is a requirement of every experience that gradually becomes more mature. Whenever we talk about experience, it is true to talk about the evolution of experience, whenever we talk about becoming more experienced, it is also correct to talk about becoming more experienced... and this is true in every experience. The religious experience of the Prophet is also undergoing such expansion and evolution. In this regard, it is important to mention that looking at the evolution of knowledge historically is one of the essentials of Popper's epistemological perspective. In Popper's opinion, the history of science and philosophy is not only for recording the mistakes of the past, but as a current society, it raises a series of related issues and their solutions" (Magee, 1980, pp. 87-88).

In Soroush's thinking, the posterior epistemological point of view leads him to a historical approach to religious knowledge, especially in the theory of deduction and extension, and also to religion - in the theory of prophetic experience. He says: "The religion that we know as Islam was not revealed to the Prophet once and for all, but gradually evolved, and a religion that has a gradual evolution will also have movement and life in the future" (Soroush, 2013, p. 16). This is what Soroush meant by what he said about the historical continuity of the knowledge of science and technology. Accordingly, instead of history-oriented in the continental intellectual system and its enthusiasts such as Davari, Soroush believes in that type of knowledge-oriented which has grown in its historical background due to the human need

to solve contemporary and generational issues and due to the continuation of this growth, it gets closer and closer to maturity. In Soroush's intellectual realm, social and human institutions have a fluid existence instead of having a fixed nature. Therefore, he distinguishes between religion and human knowledge of religion. From his point of view, religion is sent by God and it is up to us to understand it; This is where the religious knowledge, which even its ontology and especially its formulation is realized through the presence of man, enters the field of thinking and is exposed to all kinds of philosophical, scientific, ideological and even socio-political considerations. In fact, anthropology is the most important and the first main implication in the epistemological approaches to the category of religion and religious studies. According to Soroush:

"The one who is looking for constant and variable in religion, should know that separating constants from variables and determining their examples belongs to religious knowledge and is subject to some kind of understanding of religion. Constant and variable are not obtained before understanding religion, but are born after that, and we are dealing with religious knowledge everywhere. But it is not itself, and this rule is valid in all human knowledge" (Soroush, 2014, p. 53).

Based on what has been mentioned, Soroush says that an example of religious understanding cannot be considered which is comprehensive and unobstructed in the book and tradition and does not require any external thoughts to understand it. And if such a case is supposedly found as an exception, it still cannot be a rule to confirm the internal understanding of religion from religion itself. On this basis, based on the theory of acquisition and expansion and transformation of under-

standing and religious knowledge, he believes that the distinction between understanding and religious understanding gives Muslims the opportunity to make a distinction between the eternal and sacred on the one hand and the variable and unholy on the other hand. The result will be the revival of Islam and harmony between Islam and the new world. It is this perception that leads Soroush to religious pluralism and makes him believe that "our understanding of religious texts is necessarily diverse and numerous, and this kind of diversity and plurality cannot be delivered to a single understanding, and not only diverse and numerous, but also It is fluid [in the history of thinking and struggle of ideas]" (Soroush, 1998, pp. 2-3). The theoretical foundation of dynamic jurisprudence and continuous *ijtihad* is strengthened in such a view and it gives meaning to the continuous efforts of jurists and *mujtahids* to acquire new knowledge from traditional jurisprudence texts. However, it is necessary to point out an important point, and that is the necessity of continuing and writing religious research on the part of "point of view", but Soroush, who is a Muslim himself who believes in religious texts, sometimes refuses to change epistemological methods, and that is where that instead of "view", the word "point of view" is mentioned. Soroush knows very well that there is only one truth and that God's essence cannot be interpreted, and this issue is true not only about God, but even about the existential dignity and spiritual dimension of man. In other words, the same Soroush who talks about the continuity of religious epistemology in history and its fluidity among human minds and discusses the theory of direct paths, in many places, including mystical affairs, not only does not turn to epistemology, but by avoiding It sets a clear boundary between religious statements and

mystic unspeakable, and it is the defender of that boundary. For example, it says:

"From the point of view of mystics, especially mystics like Rumi, the proximity of nature and the supernatural has created unspeakable things in this world that have cut off the tongues of mystics and closed their mouths. Throughout the *Masnavi*, whenever Rumi warns himself or others that he should take a deep breath, close his mouth, and be silent, it is the place where the connection between nature and the supernatural is discussed, that is, where we reach the border of these two areas. And it is extremely shaky and slippery in this border that "the language is surprised"...

We not only do not know such "secrets", but we cannot know or put them in the form of language. This is the reason why when we enter the field of secrecy, we face a conflict or a practical paradox. Maybe a person has a deep desire to reveal these secrets, but as soon as he tries, he faces disturbances and conflicts that make it impossible" (Soroush, 2013, p. 324).

The result is that when Soroush is faced with the unseen in the limitless frontier of metaphysics, he gives in and accepts the belief like an accepting believer and even an imitator disinterested in research. Even if we consider Heidegger's "Dasein" to be a situation where the being [=human] is separated from the whole existence, but has not yet put on a determined garment and has not appeared in its human body. Maybe Soroush also agrees with Heidegger that neither the ontology nor the epistemology of the Dasein stage [=the soul in the position there] is fundamentally possible, let alone when it is said and approaches its meaning in the form of words. In spiritual cases like these, Soroush is an unconditional believer; As in the works of interpretation and religious effort and

theological formulation of what is revealed in the revelation, a bold researcher who, in his own words, takes courage and becomes a diver in the sea of meanings.

In another example, when Heidegger seeks the solution of such fundamental contradictions and ambiguities in a step beyond philosophy and new science, in poetry and art, and through this path he thinks about the relationship with the sacred (Khatami, 2003, p. 13), undoubtedly Soroush sympathizes with him and follows Molavi, who said, "The blood boils, I am colored by poetry", knows poetry, art, literature and the art of interpreting ambiguous verses better than anything else - even philosophy - in order to be able to understand his purpose from the relationship of the individual human [versus the social human] to express with God; Especially if that person has characteristics like Shams Tabrizi and Molavi.

Therefore, if Soroush goes towards analytical philosophy and believes in continuity, fluidity, historicity and gradualness in acquiring knowledge, but when it comes to what cannot be spoken, he talks about "secret". Based on this, it is appropriate to differentiate between Soroush who believes in the unseen and Soroush who believes in the fluidity of religious studies and to have a special emphasis on his hermeneutic/dialectical aspects in the matter of proportionality that involves the epistemology of affairs.

Distinguishing Soroush from Davari from the perspective of political philosophy

Political philosophy is one of the other topics that distinguish the thoughts of Davari [in continental philosophy] and the thoughts of Soroush [in analytical philosophy]. Political philosophy is a central and multilateral component that includes concepts such as devel-

opment, freedom, civil society, democracy, human rights, and the type of political systems, and the interaction of topics such as politics and philosophy, wisdom and politics or reason and politics, and especially religious democratic government.

Davari's purpose of paying attention to such concepts in the conditions after the Islamic revolution was to criticize them and the rationality of the new era in relation to politics. Following Heidegger, he considers many of these concepts to be the result of the rationality of the new world and criticizes them. On the other hand, Soroush, following liberal thinkers and of course Popper's opinions, wants to accept the main points of such concepts and reconcile them with the Iranian society that has a religious government.

Davari considers freedom as part of human nature and by separating it from tyranny, he believes that freedom should not be confused with liberalism. He seriously criticizes thinkers like Popper who promote freedom as Monogamy (Davari, 2010, p. 207) and considers the freedom of the new era to be the kind of freedom that, although it was incompatible with the old form of tyranny, is compatible with any type of tyranny. It does not have a certain contradiction and is compatible with some of its forms (Davari, 2010, p. 282).

Davari under the influence of continental philosophy considers freedom to be the same as reaching western reason and obeying it; An intellect with which old tyranny is rejected and new colonialism is considered to serve freedom. From his point of view, a dignity of freedom, which was limited in the Middle Ages, was liberated and became important. But when human nature was dissolved in his existence, freedom was endangered, and from this point of view, human freedom can be considered as a kind of dependence on unrestrainedness, of the kind that must cut all

strings of dependence in order to be able to possess everything in its possession and become the circle of the universe.

Davari believes that western freedom is the manifestation of self-foundation and human subjectivity in the universe, which, due to the acquisition of new technology and giving in to modern political science, has been affected by a kind of selfishness and freedom from slavery. For this reason, he searched for modernity and development in the heart of the history of the world and considers it to be the result of this kind of unrestrained freedom. In fact, it considers development as a process resulting from unconditional freedom, which, in turn, has expanded modernity to the concept of humanity's inadequacy. In other words, Davari considers modernity to be a trend that occurred in the West a few centuries ago, and the concept of development is not a long period of time that emerged in the West, and it means the expansion of life and civilization in the West (Davari, 2005, p. 7).

Regarding the relationship between philosophy and politics, since the beginning of the history of philosophy, Davari considered philosophy and politics to be interdependent; But not at the same level, rather he considers the level of politics as the level of public administration of the people and philosophy in a broader level that asks what things are in the world (Davari, 2004, p. 102). Also, according to Greek philosophers and later Hegel and Heidegger, the political system is a system that was integrated with the help of the world system, but this system collapsed with the arrival of the modern world and created a kind of philosophical discontinuity. Of course, Davari considers philosophy as the basis of politics, but intellectual and theoretical confusions created a situation that can be examined under two

things; First, in the new era, a new relationship between philosophy and politics was established and there was confusion between them. The other is the emergence of chaos in losses, which created grounds for misunderstandings.

He considers people like Popper and Huntington to be the ones who do such actions and, in the end, he believes that philosophy should not be a tool of politics and if it is, not only politics but also science and technology will become unfounded (Davari, 2004, pp. 102-104). In the same way, he considers other related concepts such as religious pluralism, human rights, democracy and political reason to be influenced by the new world and differentiates them from the principle of true thinking and philosophy. For example, he believes that the new pluralism was created based on the new human situation and took the form of an ideology. This had such a destructive aspect for the human being who interprets everything through his intellect that it affected even philosophers and anthropological thinkers (Davari, 1999, p. 125-136).

In contrast to Davari, Soroush, influenced by Popper's liberalism, modern period rationalism and liberal thinkers such as Locke, Rousseau and Isaiah Berlin, accepted many concepts of the modern period and is trying to consciously reconcile these concepts with the main centers of religion. In the discussion of liberalism and in comparison, with the supporters of the continental philosophy who oppose human freedom in the world and criticize human ownership of everything, he divides liberalism into three economic, political and epistemological sides and makes them the constituents of the system of liberal political philosophy in the contemporary world knows. Soroush considers liberalism to be the school of liberation and many of its pillars, such as social contracts, the nation-state rela-

tionship, the accountability of the government, the natural and criminal rights of people, and the principle of competition, etc., which were rejected as concepts in the era before, are the result of the intellectual efforts of thinkers. (Soroush, 2001, p. 90). In epistemological liberalism, it is believed that this type of liberalism is against religious tyranny, and it was the expansion of this part of liberalism that led to liberation or epistemological libertarianism. In detail, economic liberalism is called for the freedom of capital and capitalism and the liberation of society from the evil of feudal aristocracy, political liberalism is called for the legalization of politicians' behavior and their accountability to the people, and people's participation in their destiny or obtaining their rights.

About pluralism, contrary to Davari who considers it a kind of political exploitation that allows disrespect to religion, Soroush considers the existence of plurality and diversity to be natural and inevitable, and the world is a world of impurity. In this context, he considers the world of nature, law, individual and society to be impure, and he thinks that the head of this impurity is the humanization of religion, and he believes that when the rain of religion falls from the sky of revelation on the soil of human inspiration, that is when minds and intellects become clear to understand religion. They take it as an illusion, mix their possessions with it and darken it (Soroush, 1998, pp. 37-38). Nevertheless, Soroush believes that regarding religious pluralism and theoretical-practical pluralism, this does not mean that someone should give up his opinion, but it means that the essence of religion should not be limited to a few limited doctrines and only consider yourself the savior of humanity and others. considered misguided. In his opinion, the members of each sect are allowed to remain

in their own ways; The intention is not to negate one's own way, but to know one's own way better (Soroush, 1998, p. 2). Regarding the civil society, Soroush finds its roots and interprets the ritual of Shahryari according to modern politics. Following Locke and Rousseau, he examined the civil society and considered the transition of people from the primitive society to the civil society as a kind of cover for the naked man. According to Soroush, civil society is a society that can monitor the ruler and the affairs of governance, and this supervision is done with different tools according to the times (Soroush, 2000, p. 64). About human rights, unlike the followers of continental philosophy, who consider human rights as a set of principles governing civil relations and belonging to renewed history, according to the discussion, rights and legal duties are examined under the title of human rights and against duties. Soroush considers the new world to be a right-oriented world and prefers it to the previous world which was duty-oriented and believes: "In the past, as soon as people became aware, they asked themselves what is the duty?" But in the new world, after birth, they ask: do we have rights and to what extent are we allowed to occupy the human world based on our intellect and ability" (Soroush, 2005, p. 127). Especially creating differences in means has affected successful differences and exposed it to fundamental changes; As in the new world, four new categories have appeared, which are concepts, our perceptions of the world, means and ends (Soroush, 2005, p. 559). All these things are new and therefore the new world is a world of novelty and freshness and the resumption of a new way of thinking in parallel with other nations and in a single organism of global organs. The new world is not like a river that you can sit beside it and learn a lesson, but it

is a deep ocean that must bravely break its waves and to reach the "depth" of the sea, it is better to go to its "middles"! In Soroush's modern view of the world, the conceptual centers of revelation such as monotheism, the certainty of resurrection, and the Prophet's mission are still valid; Only what remains are the ways of explanation and *ijtihad* in drawing its geometries based on new knowledge. In the same context, in the understanding of modern political thought, the goals of political philosophy have an almost fixed view, which should be identified by means of "measured" and reasonable semiotics. According to him, modern man is someone who says:

"I want to enter the field of action and intervene in the scene of life. Remember Marx's sentence, which said: Philosophers have interpreted the world so far, but it is time to change it. This definition and explanation of the two eras that have passed over humanity is a smart definition and explanation" (Soroush, 2005, p. 563).

It is that Soroush's opinions about freedom can be considered a prescription for humans. A person who, by understanding the sides and folds of social life, respects the dignity of others and without going near the borders of abomination, gives his freedom to the welfare of his fellow man. Therefore, he examines freedom in the form of three headings, i.e., freedom, maximum freedom and freedom as a method, and like any other blessing, he considers it to have many dimensions and does not avoid imposing restrictions that do not divert the direction of freedom towards anarchy. He considers political freedom a part of justice; In the sense that freedom is the only thing that, while liberating man from political subjugation and liberating him from a biomass [in the words of Nietzsche's herd] and overcoming the shepherding of the element of power, obliges

a person to observe limits that both himself and others. It warns against anarchic and obscene harms. Soroush divides freedom into two types, positive and negative. He considers freedom from political oppression to be a kind of liberation and human freedom from the shackles of totalitarians and becoming one's own master, and then by resorting to metaphorical literature, he compares it to mysticism in which mystics, when they talk about inner freedom, have the same meaning. It means that we have emptying first, then arranging (Soroush, 2000, p. 219). In the discussion of freedom as a method, Soroush considers freedom as a way to know, recognize and learn, and the more knowledgeable a person is, the more alive he is (Soroush, 2000, p. 221).

Faith plays an important role in Soroush's political discourse, especially in the religious democratic government. But not the faith that appears as ideology and divides the human world into groups of insiders and enemies in a Schmitt technology, but the faith that gives individual human nature and human temperament and helps him on the way to reach the sacred. This faith is the inner messenger of the believer, and a believer who is not free in his social context, must be an imitative revisionist who is always at the service of the authority of ideological powers and unwittingly provides a tool for the expansion of oppression. It is with this interpretation that Soroush differentiates between religious and liberal democracy. He considers the foundation of liberal democracy to be based on the plurality and proliferation of irreligion; While for religious democracy, reflection on the freedom of a united person and a believer in God (Soroush, without date, p. 21).

Conclusion

The 1978 revolution was more than the overthrow of the previous regime; Because in addition to creating a new system in govern-

ance, by politicizing society, it also changed the intellectual composition of Iranian society forever. The developments and events that we witnessed after the revolution also gave a new direction and dimension to the intellectual debates of religious and non-religious intellectuals. In fact, the revolution raised many new and serious questions for Islamic ideologues; Questions for which each of the ideologues had different answers, and these answers set a different intellectual-ideological policy in the intellectual society.

The difference in answering questions such as "Does Islamic jurisprudence have the ability to respond to new social and scientific challenges?", "Are technology, nationalism and parliamentary democracy compatible with Islam?", "What position should the Islamic Republic take towards the world?" » Along with the previously unanswered question, that is, how to face the West, they joined hands to fuel new conflicts and fronts. From the heart of these controversies, due to the continuous confrontation between tradition and modernity, two competing discourses centered on the followers of Heidegger and Karl Popper, in the form of the thinking of Reza Davari Ardakani and Abdol Karim Soroush, found an opportunity to emerge; Two discourses that in fact formed the demarcation of post-revolutionary thinking. Soroush's discourse with religious interests and influenced by Islamic experience and thoughts, relying on Popper's philosophy of science, the logical and epistemological precisions of analytical philosophy and conscious liberalism, sought to adapt to modernity, and on the other hand, the discourse of arbitration, again with religious and identity interests, but Influenced by Heidegger and continental philosophy, he defends philosophy and opposes rationalism and scientism, and by using the presuppositions of Western anti-enlightenment towards society, politics, religion, science, as well as religious

stance against modern human reason, he interprets anti-modernism.

Under the influence of continental and analytical philosophical currents, Davari and Soroush were able to launch conflicting intellectual discussions in Iranian society. Influenced by Heidegger and continental philosophy, Davari fueled religious and identity interests and, with the most prominent tradition, remembered that one cannot be completely immersed in the ideas of the West and a world devoid of contemporary metaphysics and lose heart from one's own civilizational traditions. With his oppositions in the field of rationalism, scientism and the use of anti-intellectual presuppositions about society, politics, religion, science, as well as anti-Westernism and religious stance against subjectivity or modern reason, he showed that the meaning of development cannot be found in the sudden arrival of modernity and technology. Prosperity in advanced societies is a given. Of course, there are criticisms on his opinions, but because what he says is not just about power recognition and giving formality to ideological hegemony, then his speech can be considered as the basis for the emergence of new discourses. On the other hand, Soroush, keeping the religious and mystical belongings and influenced by Islamic experiences and thoughts, addressed Popper and through logical reflections, evaluation of the data of the modern era, epistemology of analytical philosophy and liberalism, consciously and knowingly, in pursuit of the harmony of religion with Modernity emerged.

Each of them raised many topics about concepts such as science, philosophy, religion, society, development, human rights, civil society, freedom, Western pluralism and natural pluralism, political and governance issues, etc. Of course, from some points of view, these ideological confrontations are still going on.

References

- Bashiriyeh, Hossein (2000). Liberalism and Conservatism, Tehran: Ney Publishing.
- Bukhensky, M. (2010). Contemporary European Philosophy, translated by Sharafuddin Khorasani, Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publications.
- Davari Ardakani, Reza (1987). Defense of Philosophy, Tehran: Research Office of the Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance.
- Davari Ardakani, Reza (1999). Culture and Wisdom of Azadi, Tehran: Saqi Publications.
- Davari Ardakani, Reza (1999). What is Philosophy, Tehran: Research Institute of Human Sciences.
- Davari Ardakani, Reza (2004). Philosophy and Contemporary Man, Tehran: Humanities Research and Development Institute.
- Davari Ardakani, Reza (2005). Treatise on Tradition and Modernity, Tehran: Saqi Publications.
- Davari Ardakani, Reza (2010). Philosophy in the Trap of Ideology, Tehran: International Publishing
- Heidegger, Martin (2010). Being and Time: Ontological Precedence and Ontic Precedence of the Question of Existence, translated by Abdul Karim Rashidian, Tehran: Ney Publishing.
- Khatami, Mahmoud (2005). The World in Heidegger's Thought, Tehran: Fekr-e Moaser Publications.
- Magee, Brian (1980). Popper, translated by Manouchehr Bozorgmehr, Tehran: Kharazmi Publications.
- Popper, Karl (1984). Conjectures and Refutations, translated by Ahmad Aram, Tehran: Kharazmi Publications.
- Popper, Karl (1995). objective knowledge, complete perception, translated by Ahmad Aram, Tehran: Publishing Company.
- Soroush, Abdol Kareem (2013). Expansion of Prophetic Experience, Tehran: Serat Publications.
- Soroush, Abdol Kareem (2014). Theoretic Bill and Expansion of Sharia: The Theory of Religious Evolution, Tehran: Serat Publications.
- Soroush, Abdol Karim (1982). A criticism and a commentary on dialectical contradictions, Tehran: University Complex Publications.
- Soroush, Abdol Karim (1998). Straight Paths, Tehran: Serat Publications.
- Soroush, Abdol Karim (2000). love gambling, Tehran: Toloo Azadi Publications.
- Soroush, Abdol Karim (2000). The Story of Arbab-e Marefat (first office: Ghazali and Molavi), Tehran: Aghaz Publications.
- Soroush, Abdol Karim (2001). Ethics of Gods, Tehran: Tarh-e no Publications.
- Soroush, Abdol Karim (2012). Tradition and Secularism: Speeches of Soroush, Shabestari, Malekyan, Kadivar, Tehran: Serat Publications.
- Soroush, Abdol Karim, "Where is the meeting place for thinking?", Work and Development Journal, No. 1, (without date)
- Soroush, Abdol Karim, (2005). Religion in the mirror (a review of the theological views of Abdul Karim Soroush), Tehran: Serat Cultural Institute.