World Dominates thoughts and Religious Intellectuals in Iran

Ansar Aminii[1], Mohammad Hassan Najmi[2], Shabnam Shafieie[3]

[1, 2, 3] Islamic Azad University, Department of Politic and International Relations, Central Tehran Branch, Iran

Email: ansar.amini66@yahoo.com, najmi1364@gmail.com, shabnam.sh2002@gmail.com

Abstract

In every period of history and implicitly the twentieth century, the dominant schools of thoughts and ideas have been ruled. Since 1917 and after the Russian Revolution, Marxism transformed its power from theory into practice and until the late 1980s, when the Soviet Marxist regime crumbled, his thought process was continued. It was the shadow of Marxism on religious enlightenment in Iran either (religious enlightenment in Iran as well affected by Marxism); and doctor Ali Shariati as one of the most important religious intellectuals before the revolution in Iran, could not stay away from the dominance over global thinking in his works. But after the demise of Marxism, liberalism developed his constituents around the world more than ever by getting its authority back; meantime, this study analyses the views of Dr. Soroush, alongside with some parameters attempted to determine correlation between his thoughts and ideas that have emerged as the dominant world. So, the question of the present paper will be posed in this way: To what extent religious intellectual, according to the comments from doctor Shariati and doctor Soroush, has been affected by the global dominant thinking? The hypothesis of this article is how global dominant thinking at their time has influenced these two theorists analyzed in two different times. In this study, an analytical method is selected to examine match case study brighter. Data collection instruments are of documental-library type.

Keywords: Marxism, ideology, liberalism, Democratic governance

Introduction

This article revolves around the ideas of two intellectual and religious thinkers and their texts. Doctor Shariati's life and his thoughts became widespread ahead of the 1979 revolution of Iran and doctor Soroush, who after the revolution, developed religious intellectuals. But why in this article religious intellectualism has spread only in two examples? Such a response requires extensive research and emphases of researchers in this field, in comments of doctor Shariati and doctor Soroush. The former can be considered as a leading religious intellectual

before the revolution and the later as a post-Islamic Revolution in Iran.

Due to the subject area and the paper size, at this point, only a few elements in common political Marxism and liberalism (and its compliance with religious intellectuals) have been dealt with. Accordingly, the thoughts of Dr. Shariati and Dr. Soroush as religious intellectuals have been separated and are reliable based on their time and date. Components of ideology, leadership, and looking at democracy have been selected in relation to Marxism and doctor Shariati, and human right, tolerance and toleration have been examined in comments of Dr. Soroush about democracy associated with liberalism to be better understood. In this paper, we are not seeking to divide Marxism into types and trends; rather, we want to assess its impact on both religious enlightenment thinkers so we do not insist on the separation of Marxism and its various trends. In this process, socialism and Marxism have been analyzed in parts in one sense. In relation to the concept of liberalism, expressing a variety of trends has been avoided. Therefore, because of the diversity of Marxist and liberal tendencies, we can examine the totality of these effects in works of the samples of the present study.

Marxism according to Marx classification is traditionally divided into five historical stages: "Initial Commune, Slavery, Bourgeois (Capitalist), socialism is eventually leading to communism" (Ghaderi, 2008) Communism which is the final stage of Marxism took place after the socialist revolution until the ideal classless Marxist society would come into existence. Marxism dominant thought and Leftism around the world can be seen in 1917 to the late 1980s when the Soviet political system broken down. It must be said "Marxism is undoubtedly one of the major intellectual movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries". In general, Marxism by different meanings had a major impact on radicalizing intellectual environment of the twentieth century (Bashirieh, 2008). At that time, also even in the least developed countries, thinkers, politicians, and leaders such as Franz Fanon, Aime Shzr to Kwame Nkrumah, Julius Nyrrh, Kenyatta, Gamal Bdvnasr, Ben Bella and others talked about socialist and Marxist movements slogans "**return to self**" using this revolution. With these qualities, the socialist ideals can be outlined in the totality of thinking process as against oppression, exploitation, inequality, injustice, poverty, class conflict, etc.' (Berki, 1987, as cited in Heywood, 2004) in which each has its own special meaning in the Marxist thinkers' works and philosophy.

"Ideology" is one of the most important concepts in this school which means that the Marxist ideology has historically modified. Marx's own view of ideology is as "false consciousness" and is defined as a mean to exploit the masses, an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie class.

But ideology takes other definitions in the twentieth century. Gramsci calls it the basis for social order. And Althusser deepens this view. In the days of Soviet power also Marxism applied the term ideology to refer all forms of social consciousness. And even theories and awareness that seem to represent a scientific description of the world that are clean of any distortion and mystery were in the category of ideology. In this sense, "one could speak of Marxist and scientific ideology; and that was what Marx and Engels, understanding the meaning of the word, could never do" (Kolafski, 2006, p. 189)

The official ideology that was introduced at the time of the Marxist regimes was in need of "charismatic leadership" to make revolutionary class-consciousness. Consciousness of the

proletariat class is one of the common concepts of Marxism. And indicates that this class must get real consciousness. "False consciousness" is derived from this concept in relation to ideology. In order to convey the society to self-consciousness that is considered by Marxism, Lenin separated it from the body of society. And added the idea of "Vanguard Party" to Marxism in order to determine leadership as a vital ingredient in the process of society guidance and revolution.

Authority on leadership can be found in thoughts and actions of third world socialism leaders such as Gamal Nasser, Tito and so forth. The question that rises here in this paper in order to extend it is: Will be any possibility in this system, with regard to the priorities of ideology and leadership of community structures, for ratings and comments? The answer can be found in Marx's speech on Democracy: "A true democracy returns power to civil society and for this reason removes the community with the government itself" (Gidenz, 2003, p. 104) It can be said that Marx complains of the structural problems of democracy in a socialist society. So that government will bring down if democracy is established in such society and in this case there will be no society to achieve equality and being classless.

Marxism and Shariati

"It might be said that the most notable example to see the relationship between dominant global discourse (left's discourse) and Ali Shariati's works are the dominant idea of the reconstruction of religious thought in Iran" (Ghoreishi, 2005, p. 212). Reviewing doctor Shariati's thoughts, two types of factors must be examined: External, including the international conditions of Marxism and other western schools and social and political developments in Europe on the one hand, and internal factors such as current trends and social movements as well as the situation and position of Iran's intellectual society (Azad Armaki, 1994, p. 16) Accordingly, two impressions on Shariati can be found in relation to Marxism; one is in conjunction with the publication of "human, Muslim and Western schools" after falling in Savak prison which began to attack on Marxism and it must be mentioned that some authors have questioned the authenticity of the document's content by Shariati (Bayat, 1990, pp. 19-41) and the other one is his Marxist tone, basics and understandings due to Islam ideologies. In "Abouzar Ghaffari, Socialist faithful" he showed his relationship with the world's dominant school. In Shariati's works, we can find the influences of Marxism and Socialism on Islamists. For instance, in the history of philosophy, doctor Shariati accepts thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis as the essential bases of dialectic theory analysis. In the history of philosophy, as Marx and Hegel before him believed that the dialectical conflict caused the move, doctor Shariati believes that there mentioned conflict exists. Azad Armaki on Shariati criticism towards Marxism believes that "Criticizing Marxism, Doctor Shariati first of all shows a difference between the ideas of Marx and common schools of Marxist" (Azad Armaki, 1994, p. 16). In analogy, Shariati connects Islam and Communism. Islam and Communism, both speak of man and invite him but communism has tried to bring down a man of God to earth, and on the contrary Islam tries to take him out of the soil toward God (Shariati, 2002, as cited in Sedaghat, 2008).

Two points are critical for the discussion in connection with the Marxist ideology and how

Shariati deals with it; first, Marx's false understanding of ideological awareness and introduction of religion as ideology and second, changing this definition and employing it to achieve a classless society of Marxist thinkers of the twentieth century. But Shariati was attending to convert religion to ideology; so he chose a middle way that is an incomplete fusion of Marx's theories with the ideologies of the twentieth century thinkers. Therefore the ideology of "false consciousness" turned to "real consciousness". In this sense, "ideology became a goal, a clear-sighted consciousness" (Shariati, 1998, as cited in Sedaghat, 2008), and religion was the real consciousness. This conversion and integration of Marxism paved Shariati's way to the next axis. Obtaining "Shia Alawi" movements of the religion of Islam, and assuming the revolution, he tried to articulate the concept of "revolution" in his theory of religion, and it was here that the newly constructed meaning of ideology (the real consciousness) became necessary. Shariati considered ideology and culture as symbols of movement or dynamics and static, respectively. He wanted to change and mutate and revolution is necessary for transformation. There is a permanent Revolution thesis that is to show how a society that forcibly falls in a silence and defensive condition can be lead artificially and intentionally and stry in a permanent revolution and will always be renewed in successive revolutions and in this manner prevents defensive curve fall and renew it constantly (Nejadiran, 2006). In the example of Shariati, one can readily remember "permanent revolution" thesis of Trotsky and the Marxist revolutionary forces in the twentieth century.

There are two other elements which doctor Shariati involves in constructing his ideal society. The first is "leadership" and second is the approach to "democratic governance". He thinks both the individual and society are bound to obey the leader due to the occurring of revelation, and of course, he defines commitment to leadership as the responsibility of the intended society. "A person is a member of the community once he believes and submits the society leadership and community is committed to the ideology or "belief" too, and ideology is also committed to achieving the ideal" (Shariati,1995, as cited in Soroush, 2000). Accordingly, the order can be placed in that Shariati recognizes ideology, leadership, and the following both, the nation and the people in his own society diagram. He believes that the leader is the people's guide. Therefore, there is least possibility for the meaning of democracy and people's right to vote. In fact, Shariati thinks that until society is not well trained and people are not able to understand the concept of "Understanding Prosperity", it is imperative that the vote of people be ignored. Strong condemnation of democracy and defense of ideologically committed leadership which I am speaking of for years and despite the dominant spirit of intellectuals and liberals that I have officially announced, democracy is a counter-revolutionary regime and is inconsistent with the ideological society's leadership. He believes that the state or a political group that take the leadership of society are committed not to abandon the fate of revelation to democracy, worthless and bought votes, and a toy for ignorance and superstition (Soroush, 2001). Indeed, Shariati is in a structural contradiction with democracy, a perspective seen in Marxism as well. Dialectical relationship also can be attached in. He considers ideology as a symbol of movement and revelation. And his fear of revolution aftermath and deviation comes from that and warns that "an intellectual revolution shall not be allowed to turn to a cultural and scientific discipline. Rather, civilization and

science should serve ideology. In fact, he put the ideology movement against the system and institution. And the previous one is considered to be superior. According to what was said, he could not agree with democracy, which is a characteristic of civilization (but he considers it as a ''stop'' or '' Stagnation'' mode) and it takes shape during reforming of society and solves different ideas and opinions.

Liberalism:

After the collapse of left communism camp in the late 1980s, the political - intellectual system after the World War II was divided into two poles, and liberalism called it World Intellectual owner and extended its presence more than ever. Many articles and books have been written on this such as Francis Fukuyama's famous essay called "The End of History and the Last Man" in stabilizing the global dominance of liberalism as a global thought which became important on other views. Fukuyama in 1989 with the writing of this article, expressed the ascendancy of liberalism on other ideas (Fukuyama, 1992) and other scholars such as Toffler and Huntington acknowledged it as well. However, today there are few countries that did not take advantage of liberalism components as discussed in liberalism including human rights, democracy, tolerance, secularism, supporting the rule of law in their slogans and policies.

Generally it can be argued that today democracy is defined in terms of Liberalism. However, democracy can be considered a natural extension of liberalism. Provided that the meaning of democracy is not the ideal and egalitarian aspects of that, its features as standard or a political way are also desired and that is exactly popular sovereignty; "The popular sovereignty is effective only when the majority of citizens enjoy the common direct and indirect rights over the collective decisions in; or in other words the enjoyment of political rights to vote as everyone - women and men - is extended, a right that will only be limited on the minimum age requirement. (Usually is legal age)" (Bobio, 1997, pp. 51-52)

To protect the rights of individuals and minorities and supporting democracy, limiting dominant power has a great importance for liberalism. These rights are known as "civil liberties", "natural rights" and "human rights". "In fact, human rights' position in the theory of International liberalism is based on Immanuel Kant's moral theory which is on the identification that moral actors make practical reason to accept human rights moral principle" (Brey, 1973, p. 85). To develop their thinking on human rights having an interventionist direction, liberals became one of the major supporters of the above-mentioned idea of the twentieth century. Today, all have accepted this principle that no one shall be tortured, or receiving inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. (Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 7 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights and paragraph 2 of the American Convention on Human Rights (Mosaffa, 2008).

What is clear is the emphasis on individual rights, not as someone with a particular creed, but as individual human, someone who can be of any faith or religion. This idea makes sense in the shade of tolerance and respect for each other. "Tolerance is one of the tasks of government, society, or person whereby should not be involved in activities or beliefs of others, though it's not desirable or approved as far as these ideas and activities do not

interfere in the equal rights of how to apply the ideas and opinions". (Arblaster, 1998, p. 99) Civil liberties that is foundation of liberal-democratic political system; Freedom of expression, freedom of association and assembly, freedom of religion, and so on, all of them are actually guarantor of tolerance.

Soroush and Liberalism

It seems that Soroush defends democracy in his views. He considered democracy as the best type of government although not without fault. "Democracy is a way to limit the power of rulers and rationalize their measures and policies to lower error in their policy" (Soroush, 1991)

Through Shariati's ideological discourse, Soroush brought an alternative after his death called "religious democracy governance." In fact, religious democratic society means a society "where people freely choose their faith and actions. After faith in this community, comes moral and then the act" (Soroush, 1991).

He applies political pluralism and religious pluralism in religious democratic society and like the definition of democracy in liberal systems, believes in tolerance and toleration of different beliefs in dealing with others. "In Epistemological – democratic discourse, more emphasis is on religious experience. Religious experience is also a pluralistic affair; it means that experiences are diverse in nature, and there is not collective experience. The experience is always personal. We love, alone. We die lonely and experience alone too. These are matters that belong to person only considering himself and do not take plural form (Soroush, 1997, p. 52)

Soroush on religious democratic government says that religious government should start from human rights, justice, and limiting powers which are all para-religious discussions and make their religious understanding more harmonious (Soroush, 2001). Soroush considers human rights incompatible with jurisprudence and religious duties in Islam but he is not discouraging it and in fact, he recommends its contemplation and reflection. There is no doubt that there are many contradictions between present (Bill) human rights and religious duties, especially jurisprudence assignments in present readings. Inequality between men and women, inequality between Muslims and non-Muslims' rights, not equal rights between slave and master, which means servant and master are certainties of the Islamic jurisprudence and there is no difference between shi'e and suni. These three inequalities, is considered incompatible with human rights (Soroush, 2001). But If Islam is incompatible with human rights, how can religious intellectual be reconciled with it? That's where Soroush should divide it into essentials and accidental split and can change "naturalities" and "offers". Soroush divides Islam religion's offers into eight parts: **1.**Arabic language **2.**Arab culture **3.**Imaginations and confirmed theories applied by legislator **4.**Historical events in the Book and the Sunnah **5.**Religious and jurisprudence laws **6.**Falsification, distortions, and input laws that opponents made on religion **7.**Broad potential of believers **8.**Believers' questions and opponents' answers on (Sharifi, 2009, 158).

So he says "legal inequalities in Islam arises from Offers and therefore, by definition could be otherwise. Generally all the legal system of Islam is a component of Offers. Legislator's destination shall not be considered the same as the path to the destination" (Soroush, 2001, p.

103). In this discussion, Soroush provides religious intellectual or generally who that cares for religion and calls for human rights with selection of opportunity and gives superiority human rights as a liberalism distinctive to religion's offers. Soroush believes in "religion modernizing" and due to posing naturalities (intrinsic) and offers, believes that offers undergoes through changes according the changes in the world. Due to this logic, he is advocating tolerance in civil society and deals with different ideas. Therefore, tolerance that arises from justice and fairness, like a shadow observes the law and like a spirit covers its body. Which means that he writes the law by observing this principle. "What you do not do to yourself, do not do to others". So rejecting tolerance, is just like rejecting the fair law, and law regardless of the tolerance, means nothing" (Soroush, 2000, p. 419).

Soroush puts tolerance as a subset of law, because in a civil society, a person acts with discipline and calmness only under the protection of the law. Thus, by accepting this humanitarian law, regardless of any views, ideas and religions, people live together. Soroush considers tolerance necessary in politics too. "In politics, we also practice the principle of tolerance and since we are not going to overthrow our own political party, we will not do that to our rivals too. And as we desire to be taken seriously, we take others seriously and since we do not like armed people break into our house at night we do not do this to anybody and as we want to be heard from lectures delivering on each Friday prayer, we will make it possible for others to be heard from there" (Soroush, 2000, p. 420)

Conclusion

In this paper, the influences of the dominant intellectual discourses on the global market of ideas were discussed and the views of Dr. Ali Shariati and Dr. Abdolkarim Soroush have been focused on. What we got according to selected components of Marxism was employing these parameters in texts and words of Dr. Shariati. He replaced true consciousness according to the concept of ideology that was understood as false consciousness in Marxism, in order to get his important goal which is religious ideologizing. He needed a strong leadership to continue Islam's ideologizing process and sparking the revolution that was a considerable manifestation and was conducted as "Pioneer Party" or other titles and placed it in his circle of ideas. Except for applying Marxist skepticism over democracy that Shariati was also associated with it, leftist orientation would mean nothing to achieve revolution, true consciousness and ideal society in this sense. But after 1980s, the world has changed and liberalism was considered. Freedom, justice, human rights, humanity rights, etc. were common topics in thought meetings. At the same time, Soroush, as one of the most important religious intellectuals, changed the claimed discussion as liberalism idea was raised in the late twentieth-century. He appreciated democracy confirming dominance of the above-mentioned thought, and emphasized human rights and validated freedom, and tried to adopt himself to the new world. Therefore, he put tolerance and toleration in his conceptual framework.

References:

Arblaster, A. (1998). *The rise and decline of western liberalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Azad Armaki, T. (1994). Shariati and Marxism. *Culture of Development, 4*, 16-28.

Bashiriye, H. (2008). The history of political ideologies in 20th century (liberalism and conservationalism). Tehran: Ney Publication.

Bayat, A. (1990). Karl Marx and Ali Shariati. *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics, 9*, 19-41.

Bobbio, N. (1998). *Liberalism and democracy*. London: Verso Press.

Brey. J. F. (1973). *Social philosophy*. New Jersey: Cprentice Hall.

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and last man*. London: Hamish Hailton.

Ghaderi, H. (2008). Political ideologies in 20th century. Tehran: Samt publication.

GHoreishi, F. (2005). The reconstruction of religious ideology in Iran. Tehran: Qaside sar publication.

Giddens, A (2003). *The progressive manifesto: New ideas for the center-left*. Cambridge: Polity.

Heywood, A. (2004). Political ideologies: An Introduction. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kolafski, L. (2006). Main movements in Marxism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mosafa, N. (2008). The position of human right in international relations. Politics Journal; Journal of Faculty of Law and Politics, 4, 38-52.

Nejadiran, M. (2006). Religious enlightenment and modernity in Iran. Unpublished M.A. thesis, faculty of political science, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran.

Sedaghat, P. (2008). *Neoliberal ideology*. Tehran: Agah publication

Sharifi, A. (2009). Sharia and rationality in the third movement of religious intellectualism in Iran. Tehran: Game no publication.

Soroush, A. (1991). *Theoretical Contraction and Expansion of Shari'a*. Tehran: Serat Publication.

Soroush, A. (1997). *Tolerance and management.* Tehran: Serat publication

Soroush, A. (2000). Mirror of law and religion. Tehran: Serat publication

Soroush, A. (2001). Direct path. Tehran: Cultural Institute of Path.