



RESEARCH ARTICLE

POLITICAL THOUGHT OF MODERN ERA IRANIAN THINKERS

*Aref barkhordari

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Thought. University of Tehran, Iran

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 25th September, 2021

Received in revised form

17th October, 2021

Accepted 29th November, 2021

Published online 30th December, 2021

Keywords:

Modernity, Tradition,
Discourse,
Political Thought, Islam.

ABSTRACT

The objective of this article is to study the Political thought of modern era Iranian thinkers according to the historical evolution of political thought in contemporary Iran influenced by modernity based on the theoretical framework of discourse. Iranian political thought continued for centuries (nearly 8 centuries) in the form of Islamic monarchy or just and religious sultan in Iranian society. This thought consisted of two components of Iranian and Islamic culture. This thought changed with the arrival of modern components in Iran in the contemporary period and in fact found modernity as other. During this period, the thinkers of the Iranian society had different attitudes towards modernity and caused the evolution of political thought in the Iranian society and as a result, they had different approaches to it. Some thinkers abandoned modernity entirely, some invited to adopt it wholeheartedly, some discriminated between good and bad elements of modernity, and others tried to provide a novel definition of Islamic-Iranian civilization based on the genuine civilizational backgrounds in each. Based on these approaches, were formed several political thought discourses in Iranian society. Each of these courses formed a tradition in political thought and founded its own discourse. In an evolutionary process, these discourses were born out of one another to perpetuate a tradition in political thought and respond to problems.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to investigate the Political thought of modern era Iranian thinkers according to historical evolution of political thought in contemporary Iran. In fact, the process of transition from traditional political thought and the formation of new political thought influenced by modernity in contemporary Iran is examined. In this article, the works and books of some thinkers who were able to create changes in Iranian political thought will be examined and the thoughts of these thinkers will be expressed. In fact, this article was written for readers unfamiliar with political thought in contemporary Iran and intends to say that traditional political thought in Iranian society changed with the introduction of modern concepts and the starting point of this transformation and the arrival of modern thoughts was the wars between Iran and Russia from 1839 AD onwards. As mentioned earlier, Iranian society had a traditional political thought that consisted of two components, Iranian and Islamic, and continued for centuries in Iranian society. Before entering modernity into Iranian society, the political-cultural structure consisting of two pillars of government (monarchy) and religion (sharia) ruled Iranian society. This discourse has been going on in Iranian society for centuries and more than a thousand years.

The combination of the above components with other components created the cultural and civilizational structure of post-Islamic Iran and continued until the constitutional period. This civilization has gone through a periods during its life and has general and specific characteristics. Numerous dynasties such as Taherians, Dilmians (Al-Ziyar and Al-Buwayh), Saffarids, Samanids, Ghaznavids, Seljuks, Atabaks and Khwarezmshahis, Timurids, Safavids, Afsharians, Zandians and finally the Qajars ruled this country during this period (To study Pirnia and Ashtiani, 2008). Finally, this period leads to the Constitutional Revolution of Iran in (1905)1284 AH. If we want to study the structure of political thought in this period (Iran after Islam to the constitutional period), a political thought has been designed whose main components are a combination of Iranshahri idealistic elements with the political realism of the Iran Islamic period and was designed this political structure by Khajeh Nizam-ol-Molk and except for two transformations in the Safavid and Qajar periods, while maintaining its main elements, this structure of thought in Iran continued until the constitutional period. Khajeh Nizam-ol-Molk is one of the famous figures in the history of Islam and Iran. His most important book is Siyasatnameh (Policy letter), in which Khajeh dedicates the entire book to the institution of monarchy and its promotion. The basis of the Policy letter theory is based on the ideal king of Iranshahr thought. According to this theory, unlike the caliph and the Imam (who is chosen by the previous Imam or through the allegiance of the ummah), the king is the chosen one of God and the holder of the royal light and emblem, and the ideal king with the light and sign of God is the same the sharia and not its executor.

*Corresponding Author: Aref barkhordari,

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Thought. University of Tehran, Iran.

(Tabatabai.1996.p, 131). The first attribute of such a kingdom is justice, which is itself part of the royal symbol. Therefore, order and security exist in the country as long as a just kingdom with a divine sign rules over it, and with the disappearance of a good kingdom, the order and structure of society will completely decline. Khajeh clearly considers the king to have the emblem of kingship and generalizes the theory of Iranshahr to some of the caliphs and Iranian kings of the Islamic period. In the theory of Iranshahr Khajeh, the ideal king, is in a sense the owner of the sharia and even is the same sharia, and the ideal king will be realized when the power of government is combined with justice, religion and wisdom. The *Siyasatnameh* (Policy letter), addresses the sultan to two traditions: In the period of Islamic Iran, that monarch ascended on the throne. On the one hand, he must have a royal emblem, and on the other hand, he must be a person of prayer, pilgrimage, fasting, and frequent alms. But with the passage of time, idealism in Khajeh's political thought gradually diminished in the face his political realism, and the mainstream of political thought of the Policy letters fell in the smooth path of absolute monarchy. However, by writing the Policy letter, Khajeh Nizam-ol-Molk provided the theory of absolute monarchy and a centralized political system, which, according to Javad Tabatabai, lasted for nearly a thousand years until the beginning of the constitutional movement and was the foundation of any system and theory of government in Iran (Tabatabai. 1996. p, 61).

What can be said briefly about the political-cultural structure of Iran from the Islamic period to the constitutional period is that from the end of the Khwarezmshahian period (628-490 AH) the downhill period of this civilization began and up to the era of the ilkhans moghol (736-654 AH). Q) Continues and this decline reaches its peak in the days of the Timurids. What saves this cultural and civilizational structure from complete decline is the emergence and effective presence of the Safavid monarchy. With the advent of the Safavid monarchy and the efforts made by the Buyids before it, with the formalization of the Shiite religion in Iran, a kind of transformation was formed in the sharia pillar of that political and cultural structure. In fact, with the emergence of the Safavid era and the transformation that took place in the Sharia pillar, the Shiite religion became stronger during the Safavid period, and except for a slight change in the Sharia pillar of this discourse in the Qajar period, this political and cultural structure continued until to constitutional Revolution. With the transformation of this political-cultural structure in the pillar of Sharia in the Safavid period, considering that the Shiite religion was declared as the official religion of Iran, the Shiite political theory in Iran was strengthened from then on. Given that according to Shiite political theory the government belongs to the Imam (descendants of Muhammad, the Prophet of Islam and Ali) and since Imam Mahdi is the last Shiite Imam in the period of absence, so a just sultan, who derives his legitimacy from the jurists get the successor of the Infallible Imam, he must rule. Therefore, from the Safavid era in continue with the same just sultan in the previous periods, a system kind of Islamic monarchy (Shiite monarchy) was formed that this just sultan should gain its legitimacy and acceptance from religious jurists (successors of the absent Imam) and this Shiite monarchy until Qajar and the period of the Iranian Constitutional Revolution continued. Before the arrival of the concepts of the new world in Iran, the Iranian society thinkers production the thought influenced by the old political-cultural structure, and most of the intellectual and philosophical

productions were formed in that semantic system. In other words, before the arrival of modern culture and thought in Iranian society, two layers or political-cultural structure ruled the Iranian society, one layer or structure of ancient Iranian culture and civilization and the second layer or structure of Islamic culture, and even the second cultural layer means Islamic culture has been strengthened since the Safavid period in the form of Shiite religion and these two cultural layers themselves have become elements of a traditional structure or semantic system in Iranian society. Consequently, in the form of this traditional semantic system, Iranian thinkers in that intellectual system produced idea and thought and reproduced the constituent elements of the same semantic system. This semantic system ruled Iran until the era of the Qajar kings, but from the time of the Qajar kings, modernity invaded to Iran with its hardware form and attacked to this political-cultural structure. In this attack, the Iranian society political-cultural structure was confronted with components and signs that were distinct and different from the cultural-political components of their traditional discourse. This collision led to this traditional discourse finding another and confronting it. Following the various confrontations that took place during these 150 years with modernity, several discourses were found that the thinkers of each of these discourses identified problems based on their specific components and sought to respond and generate ideas for these problems. Hence, positions and confrontations with this other (modernity) were formed, some of these confrontations followed the acquisition of Western civilization and modernity, some sought to reject it, some sought to select the good components and reject the bad components, and some also sought a new definition of civilization by resorting to the original Islamic-Iranian culture. Accordingly, each of these currents produced political thought and then established a discourse. These discourses have emerged from the entre of each other during a process and based on recognizing the problems from their own perspective, they have sought to answer these issues and problems by their own intellectual production.

But what was form the attack of modernity on Iranian society and the initial acquaintance of Iranians with modernity? It should be noted that the political-cultural structure of Iranian society was attacked by the discourse of modernity, with its military form in the Iran-Russia war. In fact, the Iran-Russia war and Iran's defeat of Russia were the starting point for Iranians to become acquainted with modernity and the new Western civilization, or in other words, the starting point for modernity to enter Iranian society. Throughout the Russo-Persian war, this traditional political thought system of Iran was unsettled by modernity. As part of this unsettlement, some Iranians began bustling with the aim of modernizing the society and introducing the new world knowledge system to the Iranian thinkers. The aim was pursued by sending students abroad, and inviting missionaries and the agents of the new education system to Iran. The travelers and students who paid their own foreign visits or education abroad, were also amused by the modern world and became the agents for transporting modernity into Iran. In their zeal for progress, development, law, parliament, separation of powers, etc, they began to produce a body of thoughts. These groups became known as the 'Early moderns of Iran' and their activism provided the pre-requisites for the Constitutional Revolution. The thinkers of Constitutionalism, given the religious atmosphere of the Iranian society, sought to reconcile religion and tradition with modernity, and produced the body of knowledge that

introduced constitutionality as a modern, Islamic, efficient government system. The Constitutional movement failed after a while and Reza shah and the discourse of Pahlavis was born of it. The thinkers who were influenced by modernity in Pahlavi discourse continued the same tradition of producing social and political thought with the aim of modernizing and secularizing the Iranian society. With the exemption of the time span between 1941 and 1953, the discourse persisted through to the 1979 Islamic Revolution. The modern elements were even more embraced in the second phase and the customs, traditions and religious forces were challenged henceforth. The undermining of religious issues, the formation of socio-economic crises from 1978 on, social crackdowns, and the inability to incorporate socio-political forces, provided the bedrock for social reactions against Pahlavi discourse. The very forces began to search for an alternative for this unfavorable atmosphere, and decided that the political Shiite Islam under the leadership of Imam Khomeini is the best alternative. The new formation centered around Imam Khomeini and his theories and, in opposition to modernity, stood against secularism, humanism, Western democracy, etc, and set the beginning for the production of thought and founding of an Islamic State based on Islamic tenets.

METHODS

In this research, library and citation methods are used. That is, the works of some thinkers who have transcended traditional thought and caused a change in political thought in contemporary Iran, as well as the works of other people who have dealt with the thoughts of these thinkers, are examined in this study. On the other hand, the discourse space in which these thinkers have written their works is examined.

Theoretical Framework: This research is reviewed based on the theoretical framework of discourse. According to this theory, the contemporary Iranian society is divided into several periods, in each of these periods a discourse dominates and within each of these discourses a number of thinkers are examined. That is, we raise the issue that the 800-year-old traditional discourse of Iranian society has been challenged by modernity, and then several discourses one after the other, either in opposition to modernity, or in acceptance of modernity, and on the other hand in opposition to each other, formed in Iran Contemporary society. In the following, it is examined that in each of these discourses, thinkers have provided the ground for the formation of new thought and the evolution of political thought in Iran.

Background research: About the background of this research, it should be said that there is no similar book or article about the title of the article and no author has researched on this subject, but about some of the authors who have been examined in this article, they have written books separately. For example, about the thoughts of Akhundzadeh, Malek Khan, Talibov, Naini, Foroughi, Kasravi, Khomeini, works have been written separately in Persian. So far, no research has been done on the title of this article, either in English or in other languages, and the author has presented a new work.

The historical evolution of political thought in contemporary Iran

Early Moderns of Iran Discourse: The Iranian society was incognizant of the modern world and modern sciences until,

following the international changes such as Russo-Persian wars and Iran's ultimate defeats, some Iranians became sober to recognize their country's backwardness and raise Iranians' awareness on modernity and progress (Adamiyat, 1962. P, 37,38). Such groups facilitated the transmission of the new world thoughts in, by sending pupils to study abroad, through the Iranian diplomats and attachés who visited or worked abroad and left travelogues, through foreign delegates, and by the compilation and translation of modern sciences into Persian¹. These factors both produced modern institutions and shaped socio-political thoughts. Individuals, influenced by the modern world that had raised them, assumed the responsibility of producing thought on socio-political systems, knowledge, techniques and industry. A group of thinkers became known as the 'Early Moderns of Iran' introduced the first pro-western discourse of Iran. With central figures like Akhundzade, Talibov, Malkom Khan, and Agha Khan Kermani, Classical Modernists became actively involved in incorporating modernity elements into the Iranian society and constituted a major pillar of the coming Constitutional discourse. They believed in the necessity of obtaining modern world elements and reviewing the indigenous world and traditional cultural norms based on it, so that a modern consciousness is achieved. They attributed Iran's social decay to the general unconsciousness and obscurantism, and deduced that the adoption of western scientific approaches and civilization is the only way out. According to Adamiyat (Adamiyat, 1962: 13), the group put their faith in the dissemination of western civilization as the sole historical fate. They paid attention to the rejection of despotism, formation of the parliament and constitution, progress, freedom, equality, rejection of superstition, citizenry, secularism, ancient nationalism, rationality, scientism, etc (Abrahamian, 1979: 395).

Akhundzade (1812-1878) is one of the Early Moderns of Iran Discourse thinkers. He was from an Iranian family living in the Caucasus. Akhundzadeh was born in the Shaki neighborhoods of the Caucasus in 1228 (1812). He returned to Tabriz with his parents when he was two years old, and after a while he went to Ardabil to live with his uncle. He was raised with the likes of Haji Ali Asghar and Mirza Shafi. Akhundzadeh, whose grandfathers were Iranians, moved to Tbilisi at the age of 22. He acknowledges that he is originally Iranian. His wish was for the Iranians to realize that he is one of the sons of Iran and his homeland is Iran and he is a Shiite of Twelve Imams (Akhundzadeh and mohamadzadeh. 1963. P, 104). Akhundzadeh's sense of pride compelled him to be brave of his Iranian compatriots, who were from the same homeland and had the same language. Akhundzadeh brought several inventions to the Islamic world. He was the first Muslim to write a plays in Turkish in 1266 (1887). His stubborn effort to change the Arabic alphabet is another innovation that has been credited to him. He was apparently the first Muslim to articulate the anti-Islamic aspects of the constitutional democracy in a very clear way. Akhundzadeh was a staunch secularist and a staunch supporter of Western civilization and modernity, proposing a constitutional government that the people themselves achieved with the help of the revolution, not merely from modernist leaders (Haeri. 1976. P, 27). He exclusively believed in the statute law and rational policy, and based his political thought on natural social rights. He is known for his role in underpinning the philosophy of new

¹ -For further reading refer to: Abdul'Hadi Haeri .2009.pp 308,309

nationalism, promotion of the Constitution's principle and the rule of law, and representing secularism philosophy (Adamiyat, 1971: 109). Regarding his definition of nationalism, Akhundzade believes that: "as the time passes, religious devotion loses the entertainment it once promised for the devout people who sacrificed their lives in front of the enemy and contributed to the national power to persist. Thereupon, it is a must for our thinkers to devise policies for [protecting] our national power and deterring aliens' rule. Such a policy lies in promoting knowledge in all walks of life and cultivating patriotism in hearts" (Adamiyat, 1971: 116). He postulates about love of one's country that "as man's mental thirst is quenched by acquiring knowledge and surveying the laws of nature, his spiritual thirst is quenched by love of family and homeland too" (Adamiyat, 1971: 116). Akhundzade realizes the historical roots behind new western nationalism and that nationalism and national unity in the West has been founded on Liberalism following the evolution of new political systems in Europe. On the other hand, his knowledge of nationalism is deep enough to prefer it to foreign influence, despite his fight against despotism: "even though a despot, our king is still one of us and, thanks God, we are not enslaved by aliens" (Adamiyat, 1971: 116). He was seriously interested in ancient Iran and speaks of his contemporary situation with regret: "I wish if I'd not come to Iran and had not seen the condition of these people, my heart bled, oh, Iran! Where is your ancient glory and bliss when the great kings ruled you? ... Your soil is ruined and your people are ignorant and unaware of the world civilization, and deprived of freedom, and your king is a despot" (Adamiyat, 1971: 123). He conceives of the reason for this backwardness to be State oppression and fanaticism (Adamiyat, 1971: 123) and believes it to be initiated by the Arab invasion (Akhundzade, 1979: pp. 21,22).

Another part of Akhundzade's political thought is the constitution and the rule of law. He states that the political system of Iran is a despotic regime and considers a despot as a ruler who abides by no law and exercises unlimited control over people's lives and property, while people under his rule are bereft of the right to freedom and humanity (Adamiyat, 1971: 136). He criticizes the Qajar king: "your king is unaware of the progress taking place in the world, has sit in his capital and thinks that throne means wearing sumptuous clothes and eating fine foods, and controlling the lives and property of the serfs and subordinates (Adamiyat, 1971: 136). Such a king does not understand that in all pages of his kingdom book, he has not left a single spot of justice ..." (Adamiyat, 1971: 137). He views the absence of law and knowledge to be the cause for this condition. Therefore, in his opinion, firstly, the political system in Iran should be constructed on the constitution and the restriction of power; and secondly, the will of law should be binding upon the social council, the legalizing agent should be the parliament, the parliament should be formed of the representatives of the serf and the representatives of the noblesse, every law in the kingdom should be signed by the king after it is ratified by these two chambers before it is implemented, and the king should have no power to enforce against such acts (Adamiyat, 1971: 11). Akhundzade considers the constitutional government as a system based on a customary human, rational, statute constitution (Adamiyat, 1971: pp. 140,146) in presence of three rights of freedom, equality, and the shift from the absolute to the conditional or temperate kingdom. He describes the foundation of the conditional kingdom in Europe as the combined result of

rulers' thought and the nationalists, the revolutionary or pansors' motivation (Adamiyat, 1971: 145)." Pansor is the philosopher or the arbiter philosopher who pens in politics as according to his wisdom. A revolution is a condition under which people are frustrated by the despot and oppressive king and congregate to revolt and bring him down and set laws and adopt new styles for themselves under the administration of rationalist philosophers" (Adamiyat, 1971: 146). Akhundzade followed two distinct paths in his political thought that pursued the toppling of despotism; one was *the prince* who became a reference for socio-political reforms, and the other was *the nation* risen up, removed the State from power and brought reforms. Regarding the first path, he considered the previous kings as having had consumed, worn, kicked the bucket, and left nothing behind. He, therefore, states that the prince must follow the path of progress and win his people's hearts by striving for their growth and wellbeing. In the second place, he recommends the nation "Oh, people of Iran! If you knew of the joy of freedom and your human rights, you would have not consented to slavery and cruelty, would have sought knowledge, and opened freemasonry lodges and councils, you are grander in number and power than the despot, you only want unity and uniformity" (Akhundzade, 1979: 61).

Another Early Moderns of Iran Discourse thinkers is Malkum Khan Nazim al doleh (1833-1908) was the son of Mirza Yaqub, an Armenian from Julfa, Isfahan. Malkum was sent to Europe to study at the age of 10. From 1295 AH, he studied at the Armenian School in Paris for several years, took a polytechnic course and studied natural wisdom, political science and engineering. In Paris, in addition to learning the natural wisdom, Malkum studied the works of French sages and leaders of the French Revolution. The ideas of French philosophers had a profound effect on the flourishing of Malcolm's thought, in particular the direct influence of Auguste Comte's Analytical philosophy is evident in Malkum's writings. Later, on a sixteen-year mission to London, he studied the works of English writers and became particularly fascinated by the thoughts of John Stuart Mill, translating parts of his book on freedom into Persian. Malkum Khan held a prominent position among the intellectuals of Nasser al-Din Shah (king of Iran). He held both political and executive positions and was aware of modern ideas and the political and cultural ideas of modernity. (Asil. 1997. P, 17). He had both educated and lived in modernity, and emphasized the importance of changing Iranians' minds and promoting new sciences for the modernization of politico-economic structures. Therefore, he started the reformation of Iranian society with the reformation of its government (Adamiyat, 1962: 126, 127). His command of the differences between the modern West and traditional Iran gave him the central position in changing the political authority and creating civil institutions and law. He conceives of government as that structure within any independent nation that is the agent of order, is necessary for any group that leaves behind savagery, and is either in the form of kingdom or republic (Adamiyat, 1962: 127). Based on this definition, he describes government as composed of two legislative and executive powers, and based on this composition, he divides kingdom into absolute and conditional (Adamiyat, 1962: 128). The absolute monarchy itself takes two forms of regular and irregular. In regular absolute monarchy, the king retains both legislative and executive powers thoroughly; meanwhile he does not take advantage of both, intermittently.

In irregular absolute monarchy, the distinction between the two powers is not recognized and the two are exercised intermittently, while ministers take control over the king. The more separate the two powers are kept in an absolute monarchy, the higher is the power of the king. Monarchies of this characteristic have created two separate systems for enhancing order: enforcement and regulation (Adamiyat, 1962: 129). Malkom describes the difference between the Iranian and western ways of governance as the difference between governing by power and governing by law, and determines that Iran's way to development is in detaching from the former and switching to a government ruled by a parliament of regulation (Adamiyat, 1962: 130). Malkom initially defined the principles of an absolute monarchy for Iran in this way, but later shifted to the discussions of restricting the powers of the king, conditional kingdom, parliament, and the will of people as the source of law (Adamiyat, 1962: 133). On founding a national parliament and setting limits for the king, he states that "the most reverend of the learned, the most accomplished in groups, and the elites of the folks, based on a national compromise, must gather in the grand council to determine the limits of monarchy and the rights of people and the conditions of justice and the means to development and general welfare, as defined by law and divine sources. The enforcement of these sacred laws should be determined and pursued under the protection of the king, guaranteed by ministers and assisted by the parliament" (Adamiyat, 1962: pp. 148,149). Malkom, too, thought of two parliaments: the house of the representatives and that of the grandiose (Adamiyat, 1962: 148, 149). He also minded the separation of the executive from the legislative powers in the parliamentary system (Adamiyat, 1962: 148).

Mirza Abd al-Rahim is another of the Discourse thinkers of early moderns of Iran. Mirza Abd al-Rahim, better known as Talibov, is one of the most popular intellectuals of the constitutional era, who was born in 1250 AH / 1834 AD in a middle-class family in Tabriz and immigrated to Tbilisi as a teenager for business. In that city, he became an apprentice of a contractor, and after a while, he established a Contracting firm and became rich. He studied in new schools in that city, and because he was very interested in learning, he spent much of his time researching new subjects and subjects that had been translated from European languages into Russian (Talibov 1977, p.3). Although he lived in Russia for half a century and his mature thoughts were formed and organized there, but he never forgot his Iranian identity and said that he loves the world first and then Iran and then the clean soil of Tabriz (Haeri. 1976. P, 47). His thought is founded on modern scientific and philosophical discussions. Talibuv referred to the basic principles of modern political thought and discussed such concepts as freedom, natural rights, social contract, law, and governance (Barkhordari, 2021). On the issue of governance, he believes that it belongs to the people who, in turn, concede it to a dynasty under the title of kingdom (Talibuv, 1906 C.: 179, 184). Under the influence of John Locke, he prescribes the right for people to revolt against the governing body that eschews from its legal duties (Adamiyat, 1985: 49). Generally, Talibuv differentiates between government, State, nation, and the society, and believes that "the kingdom or government consists of one or more nation(s) and communities. A nation is the group of human society, community is the homeland or district entity where the mentioned human society occupies and the dean of which takes various titles" (Talibuv, 1906B: 127).

He counts three types of government: absolute autocracy that is itself in two types of absolute autocracy ruled only by the law of the king, or absolute autocracy with no law; constitutional monarchy with a bicameral parliament; and republic (Talibuv, 1906C.: 2; B.: pp. 129:130,191,192; A.: pp. 192, 195) Talibuv considers the constitutional monarchy to be the cause of progress and happiness. In his opinion, in a constitutional monarchy, government is determined by the Constitution and through the higher chamber, the senators, the elites that the king assigns, and the house of representatives whom the people elect (Talibuv, 1906B.: 189). He criticizes the absolute autocracy and places the government of Iran under this category (Talibuv, 1906B: 120,127). Talibuv sees freedom a part of the paradigm of modernity and the major cause behind its progress. By freedom, he means being free from all constraints. In other words, he unifies freedom with equity and a natural right. He mentions six forms of freedom as: identity, beliefs, expression, press, assembly, and election (Talibuv, 1906A.: pp. 79,184). His other concern is the problem of law. Unlike his predecessors, Talibuv sees law as the collective will of the people and divides it into material and spiritual (Talibuv, 1906B: 2; C.: 126). He regards legislation among the prerogatives of people and for their wellbeing. While he does not reject the necessity of the laws brought by religion, he believes such laws are digressed from the worldly life of people and the governing affairs (Talibuv, 1906C.: pp. 179,184). Regards with the constitution, he believes that it sets the rights of the people and the king, it must be determined by the parliament, and that parliament is the system where the definition and implementation of laws take place (Talibuv, 1906C.: pp. 191,192). Of other concern for Talibuv is the problem of nationalism: "my country is my beloved, my country is my idol, real idols don't need to be worshiped, but a country needs its sons to cherish her" (Talibuv, 1906A.: pp. 14,181). Due to his patriotism, he cares about colonialism and attempts to deal with the state of colonialism and plunder of Iran (Talibuv, 1979: 41,42).

Constitutional discourse: Upon the entrance of modernity and during the propagation of Early Moderns of Iran Discoursethoughts, the Iranian society changed gradually and the Constitutional Revolution approached. The constitutional formation considered the Qajar autocracy as its enemy and the cause behind Iran's backwardness; it emphasized the importance of law, the limitation of the kingdom, freedom, equality, separation of powers, parliament, etc. The ambiguity in the initial formulations gave way to the duality of the *Constitutional* and the *Religious Constitutional*. The Religious Constitutional highlighted the contradiction between the Constitutional movement and Islam. Law and legalization, the will of the majority, freedom and equality were the main issues that in belief of the Religious camp stood against religion (Hosseinizade, 2008: 80). Therefore, the Constitutionlists sought to religiously justify constitutionalism and its affiliated concepts. They pointed to the weaknesses and pathology of the ruling dictator system, and introduced constitutionalism as the only solution to all problems.² They praised constitutionalism as an Islamic, modern, efficient system, able to handle problems and crises of Iran. By the way, they remained unsuccessful in proposing a theoretical framework, and the failure brought the clash of tradition/modernity and secular/religious to the fore (Abadian, 2005). Most important among the thinkers who contributed in defense of

² For further reading, refer to Gholam Hossein Zargarinejad, 1999: 323, 527).

constitutionalism was Mirza Hussein Naini and his “Tanbih al-UmmahwaTanzih al-Millah” (The Awakening of the Community and Refinement of the Nation). Mirza Mohammad Hossein Naeini(1860-1936) was born in 1860/ 1239 AH in the city of Naein. He started his primary education in his hometown, and entered the religious school of Isfahan at the age of 17 to continue his education. He lived in Isfahan with Sheikh Mohammad Baqir Isfahani who was one of the influential and tyrannical clergies of that city. The actions of this tyrannical clergy in the city were the first seeds of Naeini attention to category of religious tyranny. Naeini (clergy) later at the time of his intellectual maturity, influenced by Abd al-Rahman Kawakabi in establishing his system of thought and examined the discussion of religious tyranny in parallel and even beyond political tyranny. The occurrence of the constitutional movement, which was in fact the result of social developments in the West and the familiarity of some Iranians with liberalism and its prevalence in Iranian society, was an event that introduced a new form of government. Naeini who was a young religious clergy at the time of the constitution, influenced by his newly learned information and awareness of social reality of Iran, in his political thoughts he tended to parliamentary democracy and constitutional system and compiled the treatise "Tanbih al-Ulama and Tanzih al-Mullah". What shaped Naeini's political thought was his presuppositions and interest which was in form of theological and jurisprudential foundations of his thoughts and considered the legislation and constitution to be a religious matter and a continuation of God's sovereignty. The Naeini was synopsis of two circles of thoughts, On the one hand, he was bearer of a religious tradition whose main manifestations in Naeini personality was a rational thought in principles of jurisprudence and principle of jihad in Shiite jurisprudence On the other hand (Barkhordari, 2020. P 261), the new knowledge that Naeini had gained from liberal and modern intellectuals of Western thoughts, especially in field of governance and politics. Naeini's acquaintance with Jamal al-Din al-Assadabadi who was acquainted with Western thought, and the use of the Book (Nature Of the Tyranny of Kavakebi) as well as his relations with intellectuals and liberals of Nasser al-Din Shah's time, were among factors which indirectly acquainted Naeini with liberal and modern thoughts. Naeini's lack of access to main sources of liberalism and modernity and his adherence to traditional mentality prevented him from achieving an accurate reading of those thoughts. In any case, these two intellectual backgrounds constitute Naeini's presuppositions in his treatise and enabled him to codify a religious perception of constitutional system.

When Naeini decided to write a book about the need to establish a parliamentary and constitutional regime, the authoritarian rule of Mohammad Ali Shah was still in power and literary struggles against the neo-constitutional regime reached to its peak. His book (Tanbih al-Umah and Tanzih al-Mullah) is known as best work written by a Shiite mujtahid on constitutionalism this has attracted the attention of various groups of experts. This book was written four months before the conquest of Tehran and the return of the constitution, after the abolition of the constitution and the closure of the parliament. In this book, discussions about the government, two types of authoritarian and constitutional government, the meaning of freedom, equality, the constitution and the National Assembly were stated. In this book Naeini has established his discussion basis of reason and narration, i.e. logical arguments and Islamic hadiths and narrations.

Naini appreciated parliamentary democracy and constitutionalism, and tried to deliver a religious narrative of constitutionalism. He tried to prove that the constitutional principles pre-existed in the heart of religion. Before anything, he noticed despotism and divided governments into *despotic* and *constitutional*. In the despotic government, the ruler claims ruling as his personal privilege and the country under his rule as his personal property. Naini rejects despotism and calls it usurpatory, absolutist, subjugating, coercive, domineering, and tyrannical. And he names any such ruler “absolutist, tyrant, subjugating, and oppressive with no mercy” (Naeini, 1982: pp. 40,53). He sees the roots of such regimes in the general ignorance and lack of responsibility of the authorities in wrongdoing, calculations and monitoring (Naeini, 1982: pp. 4,17). He views it in two forms of :a) political autocracy that rests on the use of force and dominance, and begins with the subjugations of bodies, and b) a second form of autocracy that rests on deceit and subreption, and begins with subjugation of hearts (Abadian, 1995:81). The Constitution means :“the protectorship of responsibilities in favor of national order and security, not its ownership, while it is trusted for expending national capacities, that is natural capacities, not one’s personal greed. Therefore, the monarch’s power as guardianship is limited, and any attempt to usurp it, either legally or illegally, is trespassing the mentioned conditionality”(Haeri, 1986: 127). He notes the need to restrict the person in power, in order to prevent his greed for autocracy. The best method for preventing a constitutional, restrict and just government from becoming autocratic is relying on the infallibility that the religious Imamiah Sect grounds on the typical protectorship (Vali) (Haeri, 1986: 127). However, as there is no access to such an infallible source, there is a need to establish a constitutional parliament in compliance with religion and restricting the absolute government (Ajoudani, 2006: 57). Naeini calls such a government as restricting, controlling, just, conditional, responsive, and imperative (Haeri, 1986: 260). He argues that “in fact, government is comparative with the trusteeship of endowments in which the trustee is responsible to perform his duties within a framework of laws and rules” (Naeini, 1982: pp. 40,53). Such a person is not of the privilege to act out of personal whim or ownership (Naeini, 1982: pp. 40,53). Naeini sets Islam as his starting point for defining the new government and tries to compromise the modern political organization with various aspects of Islam, especially Shiism, to inform that Shiism has offered the most ideal type of government. He argues that “the highest way to maintain a legal, trustworthy regime, and preventing it from transformation and to preserve it and to prevent rulers from autocracy and tyranny, is the infallibility that the principles of our Imamiah sect is founded upon, but with no access to him ...” (Ajoudani, 2006: 396). The only substitute for that ideal rule of Imam is a constitutional government that can be considered as a variant of the original, despite the paradoxical fact that its implementation may steal the place of Imam ” (Naeini, 1982: 48). In his belief, two steps are necessary for the constitutional regime to take: a constitution to be drafted, and a house of national council to be established (Haeri,1986: 266). He also divides country’s governing body into two branches: the legislative body or parliament, and the administrative body. He has a note on the parliament legalizing powers that we do not point to now.

Pahlavi discourse: The constitution theory did not manage to reform the Iranian society.

Some of the religious scholars renounced it and some had died; this, diminished constitutionality and its legitimacy on one hand, and on the other, the intellectuals who were disillusioned by constitutionality, adapted new thoughts and paved the way for the emergence of new political thoughts. They emphasized the adaptation of modernity and western secularity, and rejected any involvement by the clergy in politics. Their fundamental concepts included secularism, nationalism, monarchism, westernism, archaicism and gratefulness towards literary figures, and the national language. These groups were called Iranian Nationalists or Iranian Arianists, and were the continuation of Classical Modernists. Their aim was to build a new conceptual ground for a renewed identity for Iranians. The characteristic of this new discourse was the critique of religious and historical identification, modernization, progress, and renovation of Iran's lost ancient glory. In this discourse, Arabs were otherized, while the West was the ideal goal of human civilization and another form of the self (Cottam, 1964: pp. 26,29). The new formulation persisted, except for the years between 1320 to 1332, during the first Pahlavi regime in the writings and activities of the like of Kasravi, Foroughi, TaghiZade, Hedayat, etc. and during the second, in the writings of Amini, Safa, Hoveida, Hossein A'la, Khaje Nouri, Adamiyat, etc³.

Mohammad Ali Foroughi(1877-1942) is one of the thinkers of the Pahlavi discourse. Hewas born in 1877. He began his education at the age of five with his father and spent seven years teaching Persian, Arabic and French, and also learned new sciences such as mathematics, physics, chemistry and physics. Foroughi entered the Dar al-Fonun school in 1931 to continue his education, where he studied literature, philosophy and medicine. He entered government service in 1933 and was employed by the Ministry of publication. At the same time, he taught as a teacher in religious schools and Dar al-Fonun. Foroughi worked as an editor, translator and writer in 1935 with the establishment of Tarbiat letter weekly by his father. With the founding of the School of Political Science, he translated books on the wealth of nations and the Orient nation's history and taught history and literature. In the second parliamentary elections, Foroughi was elected as a representative from Tehran and sometime later he was elected as the Speaker of the National Assembly; Foroughi was also elected a teacher of Ahmad Shah monarch. From then on, he entered the period of his political activity and for several terms became a member of parliament, minister, prime minister and even representative of Iran in the Paris Peace Conference. Foroughi can be called a pragmatic intellectual; In addition to modernist writing and research in various cultural fields, some of which were first published in Persian, He was also involved in executive activities and political, and with his perseverance and support scientific and intellectual , he was able to establish and launch some modern institutions in Iran. He died at the end of his life, in December 1942, while being appointed Iran's ambassador to the United States. Mohamad Ali Foroughi sought the glory of ancient Iran and offered an idealist sketch for the progress of new Iran. He made two attempts for the purpose: first, he related archaicism to the Iranian nationalism and took benefit from both as the pillars of authority in Reza Shah's modern nation-state; and second, he also related his archaist ideas to the new global issues and cultural exchanges among countries, and tourism, to conclude the importance of

the protection of ancient heritage and maintaining the nationalist spirit as the source of pride for modern Iran (Haghdar, 2006. p 93,95). He wrote "Thesis on Fundamental Rights: Namely the Etiquette of Constitutional Government" that is an essay in which he expresses his modern political ideas and his concerns towards humanity in modernity. He considers social contract to be the base for governments. Foroughi views law and the constitution as the outcome of human thought, the human that has departed from traditional, metaphysical obligations and has welcomed natural rights. According to this theory, people established States for the sake of social order, and the State defined the constitution to protect the rights of the people (Foroughi, 2004: 28). Foroughi divides governments in terms of compliance and non-compliance with laws, and also based on the shape and style of government. "The government that is bound with the determined limits of the ruler and the providence of people's rights, is constitutional and genuine, and the one in which the State's power and the people's rights is not respected, is the unfounded "(Foroughi, 2004: 29). Foroughi defines government in two types: monarchy and republic/constitutional (Foroughi, 2004: 32). The constitutional government is the genuine government in Foroughi's understanding. The constitutionality of the government in his opinion lies in :a) national government, and b) government withdrawal from power (Foroughi, 2004: 32). He knows it the duty of constitutional governments to preserve the rights of its people.

The government, in his opinion, is not capable of fulfilling this duty, unless it acts based on law, and the law is not created unless it is lasting through :a) being drafted, and b) being implemented (Foroughi, 2004: 35). Foroughi believes that the parliamentary system is the most rational method for the realization of this goal, and defines parliament as the council that bears the responsibility of defining laws and are representatives of people; he also believes in the separation of the legislative and administrative bodies (Foroughi, 2004: 36). He, then, goes to the concept of constitutional parliament: "the government supplied with it, is constrained with legal boundaries "(Foroughi, 2004: 37). He considers the principle of the separation of powers and the duties of each branch in this system: "the right to set the laws is conferred to a council that is called the parliament, its members are the representatives of the people, while the person of the king or the president participate in legislative processes" (Foroughi, 2004: pp.43,59). After that, he goes to the administrative branch and believes:" the head of the government has certain duties, and has no power outside of those defined by the constitution"(Foroughi, 2004: pp. 88,117). For a government to be constitutional he gives another criterion; that of compliance with the rights or public rights that any government is expected to observe (Foroughi, 2004: pp. 88,117). He sets these rights based on two general principles: freedom and equality. Freedom is related to granting some rights: the right to ones own life, property, shelter, occupation, beliefs, community, education, and reputation (Foroughi, 2004: pp. 88,117). And equality means that the law must be equally applied to all and discrimination, if any, must be for the sake of common good. Equality is also of four types: in front of the law, in front of the court, in occupation and positions, and in taxation.

³ For further reading refer to Mohamad Ali Hosseinizade, 2008, pp 105-120); Shahryar Zarshenas, 2007, vol 2, pp. 63-143.

Another thinker of Pahlavi discourse is Ahmad Kasravi (1890-1945). He was born in 1890 in Tabriz (Kasravi, 1976, P, 5). He went to school at the age of six. Kasravi's age of sixteen coincided with the beginning of the Constitutional Revolution. Kasravi enthusiastically learned new knowledge and ideas in 1911 (Kasravi, 1976, P, 44). Kasravi taught at the American School in Tabriz in 1914. In 1916, he went to the Caucasus to find work and lived for a time in Tbilisi, where he met Russian and Armenian intellectuals. He became acquainted with Georgian and Turkish and read books and magazines that were new to him. From 1920 to 1930 he was in office for 10 years. He then practiced attorney from 1930 and continued until 1945, the year of his death. This period of his life was the most fertile period of Kasravi's life for 15 years, and it was during this period that most of his critical works in the field of social, economic, political, etc. were written (Asil, 2536, p, 12). He made a lot of noise with the publication of the book of religion in which he raised the issue of Westernization. He published Peyman magazine for 9 years, in which he discussed and criticized religious, philosophical, political, economic, and literary issues, as well as issues affecting Iranian society. From 1941 to 1945, he published daily flag magazines, weekly flags, half-moon flags, and later a magazine called Monthly. In addition to the above magazines, published many works by him, including Sufism, Shiism, what will be the fate of Iran, ideas, messages to European and American scientists, purity, etc (www.ketabesabz.com). Kasravi was eventually taken to court by the Ministry of Culture for publishing immoral and religious books, and in the last interrogation session on March 11, 1945 by Nawab Safavid; clergy, founder and leader of the fundamentalist organization Fadaiyan-e-Islam was killed.

In his thinking, everything is judged by rationality; and wisdom, knowledge and morality are the judges of actions and the guides of social and individual life. First of all, he goes to the concept of government, its origin, end and necessity. He posits that government is the result of the need for social life as a way of conducting common affairs (Kasravi, 1970 A.: 39). On the origin of government, he points to a kind of social contract that, even if not made formally, it must be taken for granted and respected as an expression of patriotism (Kasravi, 1958 B.:8, 9) Following Hobbes, Kasravi considers the state of primitiveness of individuals and of the community equal with the state of anarchy and lawlessness and believes that the emancipation from primitiveness depends on the development of society in the political sense (Kasravi, 1933: pp. 65,66). Due to his notion of government as a means of satisfying social needs, Kasravi regards its ends to be cherishing the masses and managing the society: "the government is to maintain social prosperity, therefore, authorities should prioritize social interest to their personal interests" (Kasravi, 1970A.p, 143). In terms of historical evolution, Kasravi introduced two forms of government: a) tyrannical and b) constitutional (Kasravi, 1970A. p, 139). The diagnosis criterion for constitutionality, as the best form of government in his belief, is people's eligibility for managing the country. For him, constitutionality does not simply require a constitution and a parliament; rather, it requires that a nation find the quality to take over its destiny" (Kasravi, 1955. p, 4,5). Constitutionality, in his belief, has two dimensions: national awareness, and effective participation in government (Kasravi, 1955: 5). Kasravi situates the difference between tyranny and constitutionality in *dominion* and *responsibility*. People under tyrannies have no will and dominion; concludingly, they shoulder no responsibilities

about their country; there is no will for the mass. This is while, in constitutional regimes, people are free and dominant on their own fate (Kasravi, 1955: 6, 7). His other debate on constitutionalism is about freedom and its boundaries. In his view, freedom of thought is inevitable and it must not face any constraint (Kasravi, 1962: 43). Meanwhile, freedom of thought is a specific mentality; arts and thoughts are permitted as far as they are consistent with morality (Kasravi, 1970A.: 175). Therefore, "the thought is permissible to be free that is other than illusion ... is the transgression from the unknown to the known. And those are permissible for the free expression of thought, who hold the canon of knowledge" (Kasravi, 1970A.: 176). Kasravi believes Iran's need to a constitution is inescapable and views the formation of a national State as the only way out. The prepositions of realizing a constitution, for him, are: a) to respect constitutionality and the constitution, to motivate people, and to glorify it, b) the correct implementation of law, forming the parliament based on it, and to retract any step that was against it, c) the formation of a grand qualified group to guard the constitution and the State and prevent dictatorship or turbulence, and d) to prepare the nation for the constitutional government (Kasravi, 1958B.: 2, 5). Nationalism and the love for Iran are bold in Kasravi's thought. In his nationalist thoughts, he is for the global State that preserves national sovereignty. He thinks on universal and humanistic standards, but remains a nationalist and patriot Iranian for whom devotion to Iran's independence and defending its integrity is the prime goal (Kasravi, Ed., 1942: 38). For him, the constituent elements of Nation and nationalism are language, race, religion, history, and ideals, which he considers as interim principles (Kasravi, Ed., 1940).

Political Islam discourse: Finally, the Pahlavi discourse banished the other discourse in the second Pahlavi regime. Despite all efforts, it failed to integrate social forces and new classes, and resorted to the use of force and crackdown. This approach inflamed by westernization -inherently negating the clergy and religion- provided the grounds for the articulation of a new Islam under the leadership of Imam Khomeini. This new articulation emphasized the inseparability of Islam and politics and claimed that Islam affords a thorough theoretical background about government and politics that rivals other human-based theories due to its resting on revelation. This formulation taken shape in the otherness of the western and secular discourses and as a result of the authoritarian and repressive secularism of Pahlavi's, added by the reconstruction of religious discourse in the 19th century, carried a form of criticism of the West and modernity in its very initiation. In this discourse, the return to Islam and the formation of an Islamic government was considered as the only solution to the contemporary social crises (Hosseinzadeh, 2008: 18). Political Islam discourse was composed of liberal, left, and religious jurisprudence courses. The major theorist within the *liberal course* was Mahdi Bazargan. His main concern was to clarify the conformity between religion and science, religious values and modern life, and the want of modern man for religion. In politics, he tried to offer an Iranian, democratic reading of Islam based on his belief in the political achievements of the West (Hosseinzadeh, 2008: pp. 195-204). The main figure in the *leftist political Islam* was Ali Shariati. His concern was that all contemporary ideals are inspired by the wealthy Islamic-Shiite heritage, and that Islam defines human ideals above all western ideologies. He proposed overtly new definitions of religious concepts and customs and tried to project a modern image of Islam via a general reconstruction of Islamic, Iranian

heritage. His motto was 'return to oneself' (Hosseinizadeh, 2008: pp. 207-218). The course of *political, jurisprudential Islam* under Imam Khomeini interconnected religion and politics and sought the revival of religious politics and the formation of the Islamic government. The structure of the discourse circled around concepts and tokens such as Fiqh, Islamic shariah, Islamic guardianship, jurisprudence, imitation, clerics supervision, the clergy, hijab, Islamization, obligation, knowledge and universities, Islamic republic, cultural revolution, religious consideration, freedom within the boundaries of religion, implementation of religious sentences and verdicts, Islamic Ummah-centrism, defense of the oppressed and liberating movements, defense of Palestine and the export of the revolution (Hosseinizadeh, 2008: 273). Imam Khomeini was the major thinker of political Islam, in general, and the course of political-jurisprudential Islam, in specific, with the concept of religious guardianship at the heart of this course. Ruhollah Mousavi Khomeini (1902-1989) is the most important thinker of the discourse of political Islam and jurisprudential political Islam. He was born in 1902. After spending his primary education with various professors in Arak, he studied Islamic sciences at the age of 15 and after that he was sent to Isfahan seminary and 2 years later he went to Qom and settled in Dar Al-Shifa School. Imam was engaged in writing and writing throughout his life. His works include sermons, letters, mystical writings, interpretation of the Holy Quran, defense of Islam, jurisprudence, principles, poetry and the like. Apart from the book *Forty Hadiths*, the discussion of *Velayat-e Faqih* was undoubtedly the most effective book of Imam Khomeini. He began this work in 1960 and intended to lay the foundations of an Islamic state. Among the many works of the Imam, his most important and prominent work is his treatise, which was a collection of his lessons in Najaf, written by his students under the name of *Velayat-e-Faqih* or *Islamic Government*. Imam Khomeini wrote the book *Kashf al-Asrar* in contrast to Ali Akbar Hakmizadeh's book *The Secrets of a Thousand Years*, and in it he drew the lines in order to establish the Islamic government. In the field of political thought, the most important ideas of Imam Khomeini are focused on the issue of the system of *Velayat-e-Faqih*, which means *Velayat-e-Faqih* and Islamic rules on the Muslim community. He was the leader of the Islamic Revolution of Iran in 1979 and was the leader of the Islamic government in Iran for 10 years and died in 1989.

Imam Khomeini concerned the theory of religious guardianship, government theories, the source and end of governments, freedom, etc. He introduced justice, law, and freedom for the origin and end of governments. In his opinion, justice is the main condition for achieving peace, security, welfare, independence, and equality, and any government has no ends but these. Imam believed that "justice should be sought after wherever it is applied, because justice corresponds no specified implication realm; therefore, bravery and wisdom are considered forms of justice. Erudite is one of the principles and pillars of good morals and temperate mode as against both excess and wastage in impetuosity and cowardice. Wisdom is the middle ground between the two vices of stupidity (or impetuosity) and folly (or ignorance). Also, chastity and generosity that is the middle ground between the vice of senility, profusion, and avarice" (Mousavi Khomeini, vol 13: 391). Another source of government for Imam Khomeini is law. In his opinion, the rule of Islam is the rule of law, and the law itself is the ruler. All are under the protection of law. All are under the protection of Islam ... (Mousavi Khomeini,

1997: 80, 81). He divides law into: a) divine law, and b) common law, arising from the defective human reason. For Imam Khomeini, the ruling law is the common law and citizens have no obligation to abide it, unless they are compatible with the divine law (Mousavi Khomeini, vol 3: 8). Freedom is another source of government in Imam's view. Imam's definition of freedom is the 157th verse of 7th Chapter: "... and relieves them of their burden and the shackles which were upon them ..." (Quran). According to this verse, Imam defines freedom as follows: we are responsible to detract the filth of paganism from the Muslim society and the lives of Muslims and for the purpose, we are demanded to provide the proper conditions for the training of devout believers.... Imam considers freedom as one of the basic human rights of which all humans are consciously aware, but people are as far free, within the socio-political affairs, as they do not violate the freedom of other(s) and do not disturb the rights of others. Accordingly, freedom is defined within the legal boundaries of any nation (Mousavi Khomeini, vol 7: 18).

Imam divides governments from two perspectives based on conceptual and existing governments. According to the conceptual division, governments are either Islamic or evil (tending to define common law) (Mousavi Khomeini, vol 7: 234). The central difference between Islamic government and monarchical constitutions or republics is that the representatives of people or the king in the latter initiate legislation, whereas, legislation and canonization in Islam is the right of God (Mousavi Khomeini, 1997: 53). The existing governments are also divided into four groups: democracy, tyrannical, constitutional monarchy, and Islamic government (Barkhordari, 2021). Democracy is of two types: inherent democracy, with centrality of religious pluralism, State secularism, individualism, utilitarianism, instrumental rationality, etc; versus formal democracy with a belief in freedom of will, expression, press, religion, and parties within the realm of law, equality in front of law, the rule of the majority, the absence of extreme repression, and observance of minority rights (Mohajernia, 2010: 360). In tyrannies, the head of the state is a despotic and self-centered person (Mousavi Khomeini, 1997: 52). And the constitutional monarchy that, in Imam's view, there has little or no difference with inherent democracy or despotic regimes. He believed that constitutionalism in its actual meaning is the ratification of law by individuals and the majority, with the role of king preserved in legislation. This is while in the Islamic government, the right and power to legislate devotes to God (Mousavi Khomeini, 1997: 53). The Islamic government is the government of laws, while the will of Islam and the will of God govern all (Mousavi Khomeini, 1997: pp. 53,54). Therefore, it is a form of constitutional government due to the compatibility of the rulers with the conditions stated in the Holy Quran and the tradition of Prophet (Mousavi Khomeini, 1997: pp. 52,53). In the end, Imam Khomeini believes that the difference between governments lies on to whom the supreme power is attributed. Whoever obtains the supreme power will practice it in accordance with the divine law, otherwise, we face a tyrannical government (Mousavi Khomeini, *The Book of Light*, vol 4: pp. 166,167). The other debate by Imam is the rule of the jurists that he speculates based on a series of premises: 1) the Wise God is in the meantime the Creator of the world, the Lord, the Grower, and the Guider of creatures, all human beings must obey Him and not any other human being, unless his obedience is in line with obedience of God (Mousavi Khomeini, *The Book of Light*, vol 4: pp. 166,167).

2) Human governance of one's own action and behavior is the logical result of the belief in the freedom of will and a semi-formative rule of oneself; he is, according to the will of God, created free and the master of his own fate, and is thus bestowed the inherent dignity and the divine caliphate. 3) Instead of ruling by force, the God applies a sort of indirect and guiding rule upon humans, according to which, the obedience of anyone except for Him, is heresy. 4) From the beginning of Islam, the nature and content of its political thinking required movement, strife, and jihad, and the first such step was taken by Prophet with the foundation of an Islamic government (Mousavi Khomeini, *The Book of Light*, vol 4: 32). 5) In Imam's view, the Prophet's political movement must have continued by his successors." He has had specified his successors up until the Major Occultation. He did not abandon the *Nation* up to itself; he assigned Imams who were replaced by the jurists (Mousavi Khomeini, *The Book of Light*, vol 10: 174).

According to Imam Khomeini, the jurist must rule and he is a person of scientific thinking faculty, the ability of clear jurisprudential inference, and of distinguishing subjects appropriately (Mohajernia, 2010: 373). He mentions a number of reasons based on rationality and tradition for this speculation: A) the rational reasoning: in Imam's opinion "the issue of jurisprudence is an issue which the imagination necessitates the acceptance and therefore, does not require argumentation; the same reason for Imam is the reason to rule in time of Occultation" (Mousavi Khomeini, *Ketab al-Bie'* Vol 2: 463). He emphasizes that the rule of Islam is the rule of law, so that to conclude that the jurists and the religious scholars must be the custodians and for the reason, he reduces the religious scholars to the jurists (Mousavi Khomeini, 1997: 93). B) The traditional reasons include: 1) the general assignment by the Prophet: during his lifetime, the Prophet not only assigned the immaculate Imams as his successors, in specific, but also assigned the jurists, in a general term, as his successors; the hadith by Jabir Ibn Abdullah Ansari refers to the subject⁴. Regarding the general assignment, Imam begins with Sadugh hadith narrating from the Prophet where the Prophet defines one of the important attributes of his successors as: "my successors are those who narrate my hadiths and traditions after my death and teach them to people" (Mohajernia, 2010: 377). Based on this narration, Imam believes that verily, the hadith does not include the narrators who are not jurist, because the divine traditions are called the Prophet's tradition on the ground that they are revealed to him, thus, the one who wishes to distribute the Prophet's tradition, must be competent in all traditions of God (Mousavi Khomeini, 1997: 76, 78). Imam Khomeini rejects the application of this hadith only to the Immaculate Imams and believes "the caliphate of the Prophet is neither restricted to any boundaries, nor to any specific person; nonetheless, the jurists must succeed the Prophet just on the basis that the Islamic rules must not be closed down" (Mousavi Khomeini, 1997: 76, 78). The other reasoning provided by Imam are: jurists are the strong bastions (Mousavi Khomeini, *Ketab al-Bie'*, Vol 2: pp.472,473), the trustees (Mousavi Khomeini, *Ketab al-Bie'*, Vol 2: 93), the administrators of the Prophet and the political leaders (Mohajernia, 2010: 379), responsible for the events (Mousavi

Khomeini, 1997: 106, 107), and in control of governing matters (Mousavi Khomeini, 1997: pp. 116-123).

Conclusion

The objective of this article was to study the Political thought of modern era Iranian thinkers according to the historical evolution of political thought in contemporary Iran influenced by modernity. In this article, library and citation methods were used. The theoretical framework used in this paper was discourse theory. The result of this article is that the 800-year-old traditional Iranian political discourse influenced by modernity (in the form of the Iran-Russia war) was challenged. This confrontation and challenge created the thinking, philosophical and political crises in the Iranian society. In its turn, it led to the establishment of numerous discourses. Each discourse produced its own set of thought having faced with modernity and, on the other hand, paved the way for the replacing discourse. In general, these discourses have either produced thought in rejection of modernity and the West, or in agreement with it, or in form of Occidentalism. Some have recommended the wholehearted imitation of the West, some have advised for the rejection of whatever smacks of western, some have divided the West into the its civilization and colonialism and have appreciated the adoption of the western civilization and the aversion from colonialism, and there are those who made attempts, by pointing to the genuine religious and cultural Iranian, Islamic traditions, to suggest a new definition of civilization that comes from an Islamic-Iranian past. Accordingly, the thinkers of each course tried to pose their discourse in front of the West and produce thoughts either in confrontation of the Western or its precedent discourse. However, they made the situation worse for their discourse and provided the grounds for the birth of the new one, due to the attempts for strengthening their own discourses and otherize the rest. The main point and conclusion is that despite the fact that the traditional Iranian discourse became tense and new discourses were formed in Iran, and each of these discourses caused the evolution of political thought and the formation of a new political thought in Iran, But these discourses did not become strong due to incompatibility with the realities of Iranian society, and the traditional discourse of Iranian society rebuilt itself after 150 years of challenge in the form of Shiite political Islam discourse, and since 1979, the Iranian revolution, has dominated Iranian society. Meanwhile, Iranian society is evolving and a new discourse may emerge in the future.

REFERENCES

- Adamiyat, F.(1962). *The Idea of Social Democracy in the Constitutional Movement of Iran*. Sokhan Publication.
- Adamiyat, F.(1971). *The Thoughts of Mirza Fath-Ali Akhondzade*.
- Adamiyat, F.(1985). *The Thoughts of Mirza Talibuv Tabrizi*.
- Abadian, H. (2005). *The Constitutional Times in Iran*. Tehran, Political Studies and Research Institute press.
- Ajoudani, M. (2006). *The Iranian Constitutional Movement*. Tehran, Akhtaran Press.
- Abrahamian, E. (1979). *The Causes of the Constitutional Revolution in Iran*. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. 10(3), 381-414.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S002074380000179>

⁴For further reading refer to: *Tafsir al-Mizan* (vol 4), by Allameh Mohamad Hossein Tabatabaei.

- Akhundzadeh, MFA.(1963). The New Alphabet and Writings. Hamid Mohamadzade and Hamed Ersali (Eds). Baku, the Academy of Sciences of the USSR
- Akhundzadeh, MFA. (1971). Tamsilat. Trans. MohamadJafarGharachedaghi. Tehran, Kharazmi.
- Akhundzadeh, MFA.(1979). The Writings of Kamalul-Douleh.Iranian National Library.
- Akhundzadeh, MFA (n.d.).Molhaghat.Iranian National Library.
- Asil, H.(2536 Imperial Iran).An Introduction to the Thoughts of Ahmad Kasravi. Tehran, Amir Kabir Press.
- Asil H. (1997). Life and Thought of Mirza Malkum Khan Nazim Al-Doleh, Tehran, First Edition.
- Bashiriye, H.(2002). An Introduction to Political Sociology of Iran. Tehran, Negah-e Moaser press.
- Bashiriye, H.(2003). Reason in Politics. Tehran, Negah-e Moaser press.
- Barkhordari, A.(2021). *Constitutional Political Economy*. A short history of liberalism in contemporary Iran. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10602-021-09343-9>
- Barkhordari, A. (2020). International Journal of Social Sciences and Management. The Structure and Nature of Political Philosophy in the Thought of Muslim Philosophers of the Islamic Period of Iran. v 7(4). 256-265. DOI: 10.3126/ijssm.v7i4.32485
- Cottem, R. (1964). Nationalism in Iran.Trans. Ahmad Tadayon. Tehran, Iran press.
- Haeri, A’H.(1976). Shia’ism and Constitutionality in Iran. Tehran, Amir Kabir press.
- Haeri, A’H.(2009). The Early Intellectual Confrontation of Iran and the Two Western Bourgeois Trends. Tehran, Amir Kabir press.
- Hosseinzadeh, M A. (2008). Political Islam in Iran.Qom, Mofid University press.
- Haghdar, A, A.(2004). Political Power in Iranian Thought System.Tehran, Tarh-e No press.
- Haghdar, A, A.(2009). Fereydoon Adamiyat and the History of Modernity in the Constitutional Era. Tehran, Kavir press.
- Haghdar, A, A.(2006). Mohamad Ali Foroughi and the New Civil Structures. Tehran, Kavir press.
- Homayoun K, M A. (2000). State and Society in Iran.Trans. Hassan Fesharaki. Tehran, Markaz press.
- Zargarnejad, G H .(1999). RasaanMashrouteh (2nded.). Tehran, Kavir press.
- Tabatabaei, J.(2007). The School of Tabriz and the Beginning of Constitutionality (1sted.). Tehran. Sotoodeh press.
- Tabatabai, J. (1996). Khaje Nizam al-Mulk. Tehran. Tarhe no publication.
- Tabatabai S J. (1996). The Decline of Political Thought in Iran. Tehran. Kavir publication.
- Talibuv, A’R .(1969). Masalek-al-Mohsenin. Tehran. Jibi Publication.
- Talibuv, A’R.(1906). A. Masael-al-Hayat (Collected Works).
- Talibuv, A’R.(1906). B. The Book of Ahmad (Collected Works) (Vol 2).
- Talibuv, A’R. (1906). C. Masaelul-HayatvaMasalekul-Mohsenin (Collected Works).
- Talibuv, A’R.(1979). The Politics of Talebi.RahimRaеisi Dana (Ed). Tehran, Elm press.
- Foroughi, M A .(1975). Why to Love Iran.
- Foroughi, M A.(1930). Why to Love Iran.
- Foroughi, M A.(2004). Constitutional Etiquette. Ali AsgharHaghdar (Ed). Tehran, Kavir press.
- The Holy Quran*. Verse of 157 of Surah A’raf.
- Pirnia, H. Ashtiani, A, I. (2008). The history of Iran from the beginning to the extinction of Qajar, second edition, Baran Andisheh publication.
- Kasravi, A.1968. The Constitutional History of Iran. Tehran, Amir Kabir press.
- Kasravi, A. (1958).A. On Wisdom.2.
- Kasravi, A. (1970).A. VarjavandBonyad.Tehran, Nashr-o-Pakhsh-eKetab.
- Kasravi, A. (1976). My Life. Tehran. Bonyad publication.
- Kasravi, A. (1958).B. What to Do for Today.
- Kasravi, A. (1970).B. Politics and Religion. Tehran.
- Kasravi, A. (1933). Ordinance. Tehran, Armaghan.
- Kasravi, A. (1962). On the Way to Politics.
- Kasravi, A. (1955). Constitution Is the Best Form of Government and the Utmost Thought of Man.
- Mousavi khomeini, R. (1964, 2000).The Book of Light (Vol 1.Pp. 1-21) Center for the Publication of Imam Khomeini’s Book.
- Mousavi khomeini, R.(1970). Velayat. Tehran, Amir Kabir Press.
- Mousavi khomeini, R.(1997). Velayat-e Faqih. Tehran. Amir Kabir Press.
- Mousavi khomeini, R. (n.d.). Ketab al-Bie’ (Vol. 2). Qom, Esmailian.
- Mohajernia, M .(2010). The Political Thought of Islamic Thinkers (Vol. 3). Tehran, Islamic Research Institute for Culture and Thought.
- Malekzadeh, M. (1948). The History of Constitutional Revolution (Vol. 5). Tehran, IbnSina press.
- Naeini, MH. (1982). Tanbihul-UmmahvaTanzihul-Millah (8thed.). Introduction by MahmoudTaleghani. Tehran.
- Mollaei, T, A R. (2002). Constitution and Republic: The Roots of Anarchy in Democratic Order in Iran. Tehran, Gostareh press.
- Vahdat, F.(2004). Iran’s Intellectual Encounter with Modernity. Trans, Haghhighatkah. Tehran, Ghoghnoos press.
- Laclau, E & M, C .(1985). Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Toward a Radical Democratic Politics. London, Verso.
- Laclau, E & M, C. (1990). New Reflection on the Revolution of Our Time. London, Verso.
- Kasravi, A (ed). (1942). Peyman.1320(Sep 1936; Feb 1940; Jul 1932).
