The Evolution of Iran's Contemporary Political Thought with Emphasis on the Problem of Modernity

Aref Barkhordari

Department of Political Thought, Center of Higher Studies of the Islamic Revolution,
Tehran University, Tehran, Iran

Abstract: The present study adopts a discursive approach to answer the question "how did modernity cause the birth and evolution of political thought in contemporary Iran? "Iran's traditional discourse, composed of the two Iranian and Islamic cultural strata, encountered with modernity and the principles that were distinct from its own. During the past 150 year, this traditional discourse found modernity "the other" and began to deal with it. It was as part of this confrontation that discourses evolved and thinkers tried to approach problems based on their discursive perceptions of modernity. 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. 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.

Key words: Modernity, tradition, discourse, political thought, Islam

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the Russo-Persian war, the traditional signification 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 'Classical Modersnists' 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 the mores system 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 Khan 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.

THE EVOLUTION OF POLITICAL THOUGHT IN CONTEMPORARY IRAN

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). Such groups facilitated the transmission of the new world thoughts in, by sending pupils to study abroad, through the Iranian diplomats and attaches who visited or worked abroad and left travelogues, through foreign delegates and by the compilation and translation of modern sciences into Persian (Haeri, 2009). 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 'Classical Modernists' introduced the first pro-western discourse of Iran. With central figures like Akhundzade, Talibuv, 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 Adamiat (Adamiyat, 1962), 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.

Akhundzade is one of the 'Classical Modernists' of Iran. 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 nationalism, promotion of the Constitution's principle and the rule of law and representing secularism philosophy (Adamiyat, 1962).

Regarding his definition of nationalism, Akhundzade believes that: "as the time passes, religious devotion loses the entertainmentit 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, 1962). 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, 1962). 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, 1962). 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, 1962). He conceives of the reason for this backwardness to be State oppression and fanaticism (Adamiyat, 1962) and believes it to be initiated by the Arab invasion.

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, 1962). 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, 1962). Such a king does not understand that in all pages of his kingdom book, he has not left a single spot of justice …" (Adamiyat, 1962). 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, 1962). Akhundzade considers the constitutional government as a system based on a customary human, rational, statute constitution (Adamiyat, 1962) 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, 1962). "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, 1962). 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".

Another classical Modernist is Malkom Khan. 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). 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). 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). 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). 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). 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). 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). Malkom, too, thought of two parliaments: the house of the representatives and that of the grandiose (Adamiyat, 1962). He also minded the separation of the executive from the legislative powers in the parliamentary system (Adamiyat, 1962).

Another thinker in the Classic Modernists' circle is Talibuv. 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. 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, 1969, 1979). Under the influence of John Locke, he prescribes the right for people to revolt against the governing body that eschews from its legal duties. 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, 1969, 1979). 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, 1969,

1979) Talibuv considers the constitutional monarchy to be the cause of progress and happiness. In his opinion, in a constitutional monarchy, government in 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, 1969, 1979). He criticizes the absolute autocracy and places the government of Iran under this category (Talibuv, 1906).

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, 1969, 1979). 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, 1969, 1979). 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, 1969, 1979). 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, 1969, 1979). 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, 1969, 1979). Due to his patriotism, he cares about colonialism and attempts to deal with the state of colonialism and plunder of Iran (Talibuv, 1979).

Upon the entrance of modernity and during the propagation of Classical Modernists' thoughts, 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 (Hossein, 1999). Therefore, the Constitutionalists 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 (For further reading, refer to Hossein, 1999). 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 constitutionalism was Mirza Hussein Naini and his "Tanbih al-UmmahwaTanzih al-Millah" (The Awakening of the Community and Refinement of the Nation). 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". He sees the roots of such regimes in the general ignorance and lack of responsibility of the authorities in wrongdoing, calculations and monitoring. He views it in two forms of: political autocracy that rests on the use of force and dominance and begins with the subjugations of bodies and a second form of autocracy that rests on deceit and subreption and begins with subjugation of hearts (Abadian, 2005). 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, 1976). 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, 2009). 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). Naeini calls such a government as restricting, controlling, just, conditional, responsive and imperative (Haeri, 1976). 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". Such a person is not of the privilege to act out of personal whim or ownership. 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 Imamiyah sect is founded upon but with no access to him" (Ajoudani, 2006). 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 Imamat". 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, 1976). 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.

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, westernalism, 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. The new formulation persisted, except for the years between 1320-1332, 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, etc. (For further reading refer to Ali (2008)) 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, 2004, 2009). 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 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 defines government in two types: monarchy and republic/constitutional. The constitutional government is the genuine government in Foroughi's understanding. The constitutionality of the government in his opinion lies in: national government and government withdrawal from power. He knows it the duty of constitutional governmentsto 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: being drafted and being implemented. Foroughi believes that the parliamentarian 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. He, then, goes to the concept of constitutional parliament: "the government supplied with it is constrained with legal boundaries". 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 legislatory processes".

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". 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. 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. 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.

Another thinker of Pahlavi discourse is Ahmad Kasravi. 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, 1968). 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 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 . 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, 1968). In terms of historical evolution, Kasravi introduced two forms of government: tyrannical and constitutional (Kasravi, 1968). 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". Constitutionality, in his belief has two dimensions: national awareness and effective participation in government.

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. 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). Meanwhile, freedom of thought is a specific mentality; arts and thoughts are permitted as far as they are consistent with morality (Kasravi, 1968). Therefore, "the thought is permissibleto 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, 1968). Kasravi believes Iran's need to a constitution is inescapable and views the formation of a national State as the onlyway out. The prepositions of realizing a constitution, for him are: to respect constitutionality and the constitution, to motivate people and to glorify it, the correct implementation of law, forming the parliament based on it and to retract any step that was against it,the formation of a grand qualified group to guard the constitution and the State and prevent dictatorship or turbulence and to prepare the nation for the constitutional government. 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. For him, the constituent elements of Nation and nationalism are language, race, religion, history and ideals which he considers as interim principles.

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 westernalization-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 Pahlavis, 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 (Hossein, 1999).

Political Islam was composed of liberal, left and religious jurisprudence courses. The major theorist within the liberal course was Mahdi, 1999 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 (Hossein, 1999). 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' (Hossein, 1999). The course of political, jurisprudent 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, Ulema 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 (Hossein, 1999). Imam Khomeini was the major thinker of political Islam, in general and the course of political-jurisprudent Islam, in specific, with the concept of religious guardianship at the heart of this course. 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). 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 and Ruhollah, 1970, 1964). He divides law into: divine law and common law, arising from the defective human reason. For Imam Khomeini, the ruling law is the common law and citizens haveno obligation to abide it, unless they are compatible with the divine law (Mousavi Khomeini).

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).

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). 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 and Ruhollah, 1970, 1964, 1997). The existing governments are also divided into four groups: democracy, tyrannical, constitutional monarchy and Islamic government. 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 (Mohesn, 2010). In tyrannies, the head of the state is a despotic and self-centered person (Mousavi and Ruhollah, 1970, 1964). 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 and Ruhollah, 1970, 1964). The Islamic

government is the government of laws while the will of Islam and the will of God govern all (Mousavi Khomeini, 1997). 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 and Ruhollah, 1970, 1964).

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).

The other debate by Imam is the rule of the jurisprudents that he speculates based on a series of premises) 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) 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) 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) 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) 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 jurisprudents" (Mousavi Khomeini, The Book of Light).

According to Imam Khomeini, the jurisprudent must rule and he is a person of scientific thinking faculty, the ability of clear jurisprudential inference and of distinguishing subjects appropriately (Mohsen, 2010). He mentions a number of reasons based on rationality and tradition for this speculation: 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 Imamat is the reason to rule in time ofOccultation" (Mousavi Khomeini, Ketab al-Bie). 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 jurisprudents (Mousavi and

Ruhollah, 1970, 1964) The traditional reasons include: 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 jurisprudents, in a general term as his successors; the hadith by Jabir Ibn Abdullah Ansari refers to the subject (For further reading refer to: Tafsir al-Mizan (vol 4), by Allameh Mohamad Hossein Tabatabaei). 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" (Mohsen, 2010). Based on this narration, Imam believes that verily, the hadith does not include the narrators who are not jurisprudent, 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 and Ruhollah, 1970, 1964).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 jurisprudents must succeed the Prophet just on the basis that the Islamic rules must not be closed down" (Mousavi and Ruhollah, 1970, 1964). The other reasoning provided by Imam are: jurisprudents are the strong bastions (Mousavi Khomeini, Ketab al-Bie'), the trustees (Mousavi Khomeini, Ketab al-Bie'), the administrates of the Prophet and the political leaders (Mohsen, 2010), responsible for the events (Mousavi and Ruhollah, 1970, 1964) and in control of governing matters (Mousavi and Ruhollah, 1970, 1964).

CONCLUSION

The confrontation of Iranians with the modern world 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 is

lamic 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 attemptsforstrengthening their own discourses and otherize the rest. The important problem is that all discourses that adopted modernity to confront the tradition meaning system of the Islamic Iran have eventually been negated due to their incompatibility with the actual realities of Iranian society and the discourse of Islamic-Shiite political Islam under the leadership of Imam Khomeini succeeded them.

REFERENCES

Abadian, H., 2005. The Constitutional Times in Iran. University of Tehran Press, Tehran, Iran,.

Adamiyat, F., 1962. The Idea of Social Democracy in the Constitutional Movement of Iran. Sokhan Publication, Tehran, Iran,.

Ajoudani, M.A., 2006. The Iranian Constitutional Movement. Akhtaran Press, Tehran, Iran,.

Ali, H.M., 2008. Political Islam in Iran. Mofid University Press, Qom, Iran,.

Haeri, A.H., 1976. Shiaism and Constitutionality in Iran. Amir Kabir Press, Tehran, Iran,.

Haeri, A.H., 2009. The Early Intellectual Confrontation of Iran and the Two Western Bourgeois Trends. Amir Kabir Press, Tehran, Iran,.

Haghdar, A.A., 2004. Political Power in Iranian Thought System. Tarh-e No Publishers, Tehran, Iran,.

Haghdar, A.A., 2006. Mohamad Ali Foroughi and the New Civil Structures. Kavir Publisher, Tehran, Iran,.

Haghdar, A.A., 2009. Fereydoon Adamiyat and the History of Modernity in the Constitutional Era. Kavir Publishing, Tehran, Iran,.

Hossein, Z.G., 1999. Rasael Mashrouteh. 2nd Edn., Kavir Press, Tehran, Iran,.

Kasravi, A., 1968. The Constitutional History of Iran. Amir Kabir Press, Tehran, Iran,.

Mahdi, M., 1948. The History of Constitutional Revolution. Vol. 5, IbnSina Press, Tehran, Iran,.

Mohesn, M., 2010. The political thought of Islamic thinkers. Islamic Research Institute for Culture and Thought, Tehran, Iran.

Mousavi, K. and S. Ruhollah, 1964. The Book of Light. Center for the Publication of Imam Khomeini's Book, Iran,.

Mousavi, K. and S. Ruhollah, 1970. Velayat. Amir Kabir Press, Tehran, Iran,.

Mousavi, K. and S. Ruhollah, 1997. Velayat-e Faqih. Amir Kabir Press, Tehran, Iran,.

Talibuv, A.R., 1969. Masalekul-Mohsenin. Jibi Publication, Tehran, Iran,.

Talibuv, A.R., 1979. The Politics of Talebi. Elm Press, Tehran, Iran,.