

Political Science Methodology in the Thoughts of Sadra School Commentators

**Seyed Amin Taghavi Far¹, Hamed Ameri Golestani^{*2}, Shiva Jalalpour³,
Hamed Mohagheghnia⁴**

¹Department of Political Sciences, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran
taghavi110@yahoo.com

²Department of Political Sciences, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran
hamed.ameri@gmail.com
(Corresponding Author)

³Department of Political Sciences, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran
shiva-jalalpour@gmail.com

⁴Department of Political Sciences, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran
mohagheghnia7877@gmail.com

Abstract

Among all the theories, Sadra's wisdom has a special place. The breadth of components and multiplicity of concepts in this theory has led to its capability and versatility. In this article, qualitative research method was used. The data were obtained and analyzed through note-taking and descriptive-analytical procedures. The purpose of this article is to present a new methodology based on Sadra's wisdom. Although the choice of one method among other methods is selective and optional, choosing one method for each subject is not correct. The choice cannot be without reason and basis. Therefore, the present study, using the framework of a new meta-methodology, tries to highlight the main concepts of this theory and tends to understand how it is applied in various philosophical, social and political issues. Therefore, Sadra's theory in most cases does not seek to reject other theories but seeks to correct them. What distinguishes this article is the use of the latest views of professors and commentators of the Sadra School such as Shahid Motahari, Ayatollah Mesbah and Ayatollah Javadi, regarding our subject.

Keywords: Methodology, Sadra wisdom, methodology, political science, social sciences

Tob Regul Sci.™ 2022; 8(1): 1283-1299

DOI: doi.org/10.18001/TRS.8.1.102

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

"Transcendent Wisdom is a philosophical movement that started from Mulla Sadra and continues to this day. Therefore, it involves both the part of Greek philosophy, peripatetic, and enlightenment that has been approved by Sadr al-Mutallah, and the thoughts of post-Mulla Sadra philosophers and contemporary Islamic philosophers such as Allameh Tabatabai and his students like Shahid Motahari, Allameh Mesbah Yazdi and Ayatollah Javadi Amoli "(Soroush, 1999: 29).

In scientology and the study of Islamic and religious humanities, two major approaches can be recognized. The first approach is a logical and philosophical approach concerned with providing a reasonable explanation of what science and the process of science production are. In this approach, the indicators of desirable sciences are drawn and doubts and criticisms are answered. It attempts to rationally explain the scientific methods and, as a result, the findings and the way in which the sciences are codified. The second approach, social studies, is the phenomenon of science production and tries to examine the social barriers to science production and the factors affecting the production of science (ibid., pp. 159-160).

Every society, based on its epistemological layers that shape its ontological and anthropological dimensions, firstly, determines and recognizes its problems and needs, and secondly, using the same principles, tries to solve problems and meet its needs. It is through this effort that scientific theories are formed (Parsania, 2009: 244). For this reason, it is necessary to refer to philosophy, responsible for the ontological issues of science. Philosophy, in the face of sophistry, protects the various sciences from the relativity of understanding and truth, provides the thematic principles of logic and other sciences, and, thus, paves the way for the attainment of certainty. Thematic principle and confiscation are two terms having been formed in various sciences based on trust in philosophy and ontology; however, presupposition is an interpretation having been promoted after distrust in metaphysics as well as the presence of Kantian and Neo-Kantian theories. This word instills the a priori term in Kant's philosophy and the term hypothesis in positivist views in the minds and beliefs of those who use it (Parsania, 2004: 128-131).

The thematic principle and confiscation have the potential to be substantiated or refuted. The presuppositions dominating each science also have a position similar to the role of confiscation and the thematic principles in the experimental sciences, with the difference that they neither are part of the axioms nor have the capacity to prove or disprove them. They are unscientific principles having been chosen for cultural, political and social reasons (ibid., P. 129). It is on this basis that presuppositions and paradigm knowledge are effective in theorizing, describing, and producing the existing humanities and social sciences. In these sciences, various paradigms and methods of explanation, interpretation, hermeneutics, criticism, structuralism, and discourse are common.

The important point of this discussion is that every method leads to a specific type of knowledge and not every knowledge is obtained from one method. Therefore, method is also one of the things that is involved in determining knowledge. Different levels of research require different methods. The methods used in basic research are not the same as the methods used in applied research. (Parsania, 2009: 141). Previously, various research discussed on Sadra's methodology, but, so far, no research has been done on the basics of this method and its adaptation to other methodologies.

We believe in Sadra's methodology because we believe that none of the existing methods can claim to discover all the facts concerning the humanities. Thus, we intend to examine other methods in a meta-methodology based on pure rationality. Therefore, it can be transmitted to non-Muslims as well. In this approach, paradigms and methods are considered comparable, although historically the methods are diverse. This diversity leads us to claim that Sadra's method is distinct from other methods, and by using this purely rational meta-methodology, we show the validity of the Islamic method in epistemology. Of course, methodology is a process, in which religion can play a part. Accordingly, if we present a way of using the tools and resources of ontology and epistemology to produce science in which religion plays a part, we can also speak of religious methodology. Later and naturally, religious science can also be accepted" (Khosropanah and Parsania, 2013: 37).

Main body of the text:

This part of the article is divided into three main parts. The first part is the definition of methodology, the second part is the methodological foundations of Sadra's wisdom, and the third part is related to the comparison of this methodology with other methodologies.

1. Definition of methodology

Each theory, in turn, activates both a domain and a method, so a discussion of method logically precedes methodology. "Method in its broadest sense is a tool for acquiring knowledge. Two types of methods can be distinguished: the method of organizing education and the method of finding new knowledge. What they have in common is moving from the known to the unknown. The concept of method is to take the path to reach the goal in a specific order and sequence. The term method refers both to the method itself and to the rules and means of achieving it" (Haghighat, 2012: 42). "Method is the subject of the first degree" (Sharifi, 2016: 35).

But methodology is a kind of secondary knowledge that arises in terms of epistemological methods (Parsania, 2009: 141). The philosophy and purpose of the research methods as well as the validity of different method paradigms are of the most important methodological topics (Sharifi, 2016: 34 and 35) because the method is the path that the researcher takes in his scientific behavior. Methodology, on the other hand, is the science and knowledge responsible for analyzing and evaluating the success of one way in comparison with alternative ways. So, methodology is the science of setting rules, searching for or achieving facts. Methodology is, in fact, the recognition of the ways knowledge is produced (ibid., P. 35).

"The methodologist, in terms of his philosophical and ontological, as well as epistemological foundations, and based on the theories he has accepted in the domain of a science can identify or recommend a particular method. (Parsania, 2009: 141 and 142).

2.1. Ontology

"To know the epistemological foundations of a theory, knowing its ontology and epistemology is the minimum, because as soon as you enter a science, you have accepted a definition of knowledge and science. Now, the way you interpret this knowledge or pursuing whether this knowledge is only on the basis of proof and refutation are in fact influenced by science and theory" (Khosropanah and Parsania, 2013: 120). In transcendent wisdom, ontology takes precedence over epistemology. The Sadra's ontology is based on existence, and its general and central rules – the originality of existence, the skepticism of existence, and the unity of existence – are derived from Sadra's view that what is real is existence. (Panahi, page 286). One of the results of the originality of existence is the explanation of the stimulus system by assigning forgery to the existence of the response (Panahi Azad, 2015: 123).

2.2. Epistemology

"One of the insights of philosophical precision in theories is that any scientific theory is based on a set of epistemological foundations, having a logical connection between those principles and the theory. There are some general principles from which no theory can be free, such as ontological, epistemological, and anthropological principles. There are some more specific principles that draw on the help of the minor sciences. Some of them are epistemological principles which are the epistemological reserves within science itself and in that science itself is proposed and proved and the premise of proving the next issues is placed" (Khosropanah and Parsania, 2013: 116).

"Epistemology is more general than methodology because epistemologists are involved in the discussion of contexts and limitations, and in short, the nature of knowledge" (Parsania, 2009: 141). Thus, philosophical knowledge is at the level of meta-paradigm. Accordingly, we believe that the set of paradigms can be compared and analyzed with logic and epistemology and through which their right or wrong can be realized (Khosropanah and Parsania, 2013: 88).

The issue of determining the value and validity of information can be considered as one of the most fundamental issues because it separates the path of realism from idealism or Sufism, and the path of dogmatic philosophy followed by Plato, Aristotle, all the philosophers of the Islamic period, and some other modern European philosophers from the philosophy of the skeptics (Motahari, 154: 2004).

Gaining knowledge in accordance with reality is the Sadra's most important goal. This is the common goal between religion and wisdom. Sadra's philosophy in this field is equipped with two theories. Sadra believes in the theory of "conformity" regarding the issues of nature, the definition of truth, and the theory of cognition. He also uses the theory of "fundamentalism" for proving the truth of knowledge. That is, he considers the axioms that lead to the principles as the basis of the true knowledge of man (Panahi Azad, 2015: 100 and 101). "He considers the origin of knowledge as the principle of transformation of the community of contradictions, which even denying it has no other way but to prove it. All obvious and theoretical theorems lead to this principle." (Ibid., P. 350).

"The pillars of acquiring knowledge and producing theory and analysis in Sadra's wisdom are intellect, intuition and narration. These three are the main elements of the school of Sadra and have a decisive presence in all sides and pillars of Sadra's wisdom." (Panahi Azad, 2015: 317).

In the meantime, Sadra considers absolute sovereignty for revelation and considers reason and intuition valid in the light of the Qur'an (Ibid., P. 323). In Sadra's view, the true wisdom is to rely on the revelation and sayings of the Infallibles (AS), and a science without this feature cannot be considered and trusted (Ibid., P. 324).

One of the important topics in epistemology is the discussion of relativity, followed by the relativity of truth, one of the natural byproducts of considering knowledge as material. The absoluteness of cognition is an evidence of its non-materiality. Relativity of cognition is an error because it leads to skepticism and sophistry (Parsania, 2008: 98).

3.2. Wisdom in Sadra's wisdom

Wisdom is a word that has a value and everyone claims to have it. Therefore, its meaning and application are different among the members of different schools (Javadi Amoli, 2007: 28). But in the most important term, it is the intelligence, ingenuity and instinctive intellect that distinguish man from animal. Reason in theology and ontology means angel. Theoretical intellect is the intellect discussed in the book of the soul and practical intellect is the intellect discussed in ethics (Soroush, 2018: 28 and 29).

Sometimes reason means science or scientific reassurance derived from a purely empirical or abstract argument or a combination of experimental and abstract. In contrast to narration, the authentic meaning of religious texts such as the Qur'an and hadiths, the purpose of philosophical and theological reason is the same as having the power to prove the existence of God and other names of divine beauty, as to prove the existence of revelation, guardianship, infallibility and other teachings. It is powerful. The achievement of reason is reasonable and acceptable and exists in all these religious matters (Javadi Amoli, 2007: 26).

The applications of reason are scattered and separated from each other, so its commonalities are referred to as nominal commonalities. This scattering has caused it to be mentioned in various chapters of wisdom, and it means a pure perceptual force that is free from illusion, imagination, and analogy. Above all, it understands the principle of contradiction well and, within it, fully comprehends obvious propositions, like the invalidity of the sum of two opposites or the sum of two parables, it clarifies other theoretical matters with reference to the obvious. The radius of such a holistic and world-wide theoretical intellect encompasses practical wisdom, because practical wisdom includes ethics, jurisprudence, and law in the category of partial sciences and is under the auspices of general science and high philosophy (ibid., Pp. 30 and 31).

Reason has another meaning not only it is not in conflict with religion, but it is one of the sources of religious rulings. Reason is a force with the help of which we can know the facts and determine the unknowns through the obvious and definite data of other sciences. Obvious propositions are also called natural propositions, the main capital of reason, with the help of which other definite propositions are concluded in the natural, human and social sciences. Reason in this sense is one of the characteristics of man, differentiated from a rationality that has a negative connotation and rejects human beings beyond reason (Mesbah Yazdi, 2007: 66 and 67).

Muslim thinkers are rationalists, although not Cartesian, and do not consider reason as sufficient and self-sufficient. That is, firstly, they do not deny sensory cognition, and secondly, they base the validity of rational propositions, needing reasoning, on the validity of rational propositions without the need for reasoning, such as refusing contradiction or resolving contradictions, and prioritizing consciences. The validity of obvious rational propositions is considered to be inherent or due to intuitive cognition, which is infallible because there is no mediator. The proposition and reality are both present with us. Secondary axioms are also derived from primary axioms. Therefore, the truth of propositions is achieved either by intuition and improvisation or by logical reasoning based on them. Many of the basic human knowledge, both religious and non-religious, can be understood in the same way (Rahimpour, 2008: 44 and 45).

In this sense, reason is next to quoting the source of knowledge. But this does not mean that abstract, sensory and empirical reason and reasoning are on a par with revelation. Because by narration, we mean human perception and understanding of revelation, not the revelation itself. Because revelation itself is only available to completely innocent people. Therefore, what is in line with religious reason and knowledge is the valid and solid human perception of revelation (Javadi Amoli, 2007: 181).

4.2. Value Issues

One of the important points in relation to Sadra's wisdom is the issue of values and their relation to reality. Value concepts belong to practical propositions. Propositions whose contents are not, dos and don'ts, or good and bad in relation to human voluntary actions. Some of these cases go back to local or ethnic customs that have no real support. But a part, called in the term of credit, has a real support and belong to the real aspects of life, representing the materials and corruptions of this world and the hereafter, and have a real existence outside. Whenever we talk about these issues, using command sentences and grammatical theorems and the like, we are actually referring to the actual results created by doing or leaving these actions; (Mesbah Yazdi, 97: 2006).

Therefore, rulings are subject to interests and corruptions. Thus, social values are not subject to the opinions of the people, if true, the existence discovers fixed values, which we call "intellectual independence." Hence, the criterion for proving a value is reason, if it is not caused by feelings, emotions and delusions. So, values are real and true things, hence, values do not change with changing tastes (Ibid., P. 141).

The phrase, obligatory or not obligatory, refers to the relationship between a verb and its result – a relationship called comparative necessity in logical terms. Obligatory verb is something necessary to be done according to its result. This is something that goes back to a logical analysis. So, real value propositions have the potential to be called human values. Genuine human values are not subject to people's tastes, rather, they are a function of real things. These value concepts belong to at least two areas of human cognition; 1- the field of law and constitution and 2- the field of ethics (Ibid., P. 98).

"Rights are not tangible as material objects nor purely credit. Rather, they are credits that have an external source of abstraction. If there is no interaction between our minds and reality, rights will not make sense. Therefore, the understanding of rights and ethics depends on the human mind, but this entitlement itself is an objective matter, and of course, if it were not for human beings and the human mind, human rights could not be proven. Thus, it is the interaction between the mind and the object that produces the concept of right and responsibility and discovers its application. The human mind must make epistemic contact with the objective facts and real causes related to human happiness and misery in order for perfection and imperfection to be meaningful. This relationship is completely real and non-conventional. That is, the act of immorality really causes cruelty and the act of righteousness causes happiness. Morality, rights and duties seem to be credible, but they really rely on the truth of man and the world (Rahimpour, 2014: pp. 51 and 52).

In between, there are certain values related to social and political affairs, that is, values in the realm of power and law are related to law, and simultaneously they are in the field of politics. (Mesbah Yazdi, 141: 2006). "Rights and duties, like values, are credit, but their origin and their worldly and otherworldly effects are real. Therefore, they are credits reflecting reality. Accordingly, inherent rights become meaningful, human rights are upheld, and all economic, political, and moral rights become arguable and defensible." (Rahimpour, 2014: 52).

5.2. The Meaning of Science

There are two main meanings for the word science. In the first sense, it means absolute consciousness, but in the second sense, it is social identity; that is, science is a field of study in which the epistemological findings of researchers are reported, critiqued and reviewed. If we want to study the process of production and consumption of scientific information, we must pay attention to science from the type of codified knowledge and not from the type of consciousness which is a personal matter for the world (Khosropanah and Parsania, 2013: 158). It is necessary to distinguish between the epistemic content and the body of that knowledge. The epistemological content of this knowledge means concepts and classifications, attitudes and views, revised or uncorrected, laws, theories, research problems, problem-solving patterns, etc. The body of that knowledge also means scientific activity, researchers' scientific tools, produced scientific texts and documents, and lectures. In the management and organization of scientific productions, what is at stake is the physical properties of science, but the main purpose is to manage the epistemological content of knowledge to answer scientific questions (ibid., P. 159).

It is clear from what has been said that science finds different definitions based on epistemological foundations and metaphysical foundations, and these definitions affect the meaning and identity of political philosophy, which is synonymous with political science. Political philosophy, having been used in the Islamic world and before, is nothing but political science, because political science is also connected to the political description. (Ibid., P. 115).

After expressing the characteristics of Sadra's wisdom, we adapt it to several other important methods to express its unspoken and hidden angles and to better explain Sadra's methodology.

1.3. Positivism

Positivist views give pivotal roles to sensory observations and experimental tests in the development of scientific theories. Accordingly, the method of modern sciences is purely experimental (Khosropanah and Parsania, 2013: 115). In this view, relying on inductive methods, theory is the result of a set of rules obtained from repeated feelings. The more precise expressions, while paying attention to the active role of the mind in the completion of scientific theories, need to be placed on the scientific nature of the theory in its testable dimension, in order to allow it to be proved or empirically refuted (Parsania, 2009: 244).

Regarding positivism, the most serious problem is paying attention to methodology. While the existing social science method is a combination of experimental method and non-experimental principles and foundations that have led to the existence of different schools in the humanities. So, as a proof, we do not have a general method and the existing field of humanities is diverse. Socialist, liberal, poststructuralist paradigms and dozens of other paradigms testify this claim (Khosropanah and Parsania, 2013: 30).

Although some social science issues are certainly empirical, some of them are abstract and related to the field of theoretical reason. In some cases, they are prescriptive and practical in the field of reason. Sensory and intellectual knowledge must be combined to achieve science; so, science does not come into being without reason, but science is not necessarily just rational. Therefore, depending on the subject, sometimes experience and sometimes reason and, of course, sometimes religious narration are knowledgeable and play a role in organizing science. Therefore, Sadra's scholars paid attention to the science of certainty, and for this reason, they prescribed the deductive-argumentative method, which can be useful for certainty (Khosropanah and Parsania, 2013: 115).

Argument does not necessarily mean rational knowledge. The wise men said that empirical knowledge must also be organized by the method of argument, because sense is not useful by the method of inductive scientific knowledge. Non-argumentative sciences and knowledge are suspicions, and suspicions in science can have authority according to the fatwa of practical reason, but they do not introduce the world to us. That is, we live with them, and there is no problem if we cannot be sure. Because we want the experimental sciences for life and the field of action, and we do not need much certainty there. But in places like metaphysics and mathematics, where we need certainty, it can happen. But in the natural sciences, it is hard and difficult (ibid., P. 116). Therefore, although logical certainty rarely occurs in the field of experimental sciences, if they have gone beyond hypotheses and mere suspicion and reached the disease of scientifically or rationally reassuring, they have the legal authority and permission to refer to the holy Shari'a. This correctness of invoking God causes in cases where the content of the narrated evidences of religion is incompatible with the valid scientific and intellectual perception of human beings, the convincing intellectual and scientific knowledge appears as a specific lip, and the serious meaning which is other than the practical meaning (appearance of the word) is determined according to scientific knowledge (Javadi Amoli, 2007: 117).

The social sciences, including political science, which is also called civil policy and political philosophy, are subject to possible beings, some of which are in the realm of nature. Therefore political philosophy uses its senses and experiences adapted to this part of its subject matter. Possible beings receive a large part of their material from practical reason. Political philosophy or political science, if it does not have a positivist basis or belief in the epistemological value of practical reason, would not be deprived of these epistemological sources and using practical reason could give normative and tactical rules (Parsania, 2009: 117).

2.3. Hermeneutics, interpretation of texts and frequency of readings

The word interpretation sometimes refers to the immaterial truths beyond comprehension. The word interpretation is related to what is called hermeneutics in the West today (Mesbah Yazdi, 2003: 25). Interpretation is a branch of philosophy or epistemology that has several sub-branches. Its primary use was in religious texts. It has then been expanded to include the interpretation of other texts, such as literary, history, etc., and involves the practice of "understanding" (ibid., P. 55).

The interpretation of texts means that a specific meaning cannot be considered valid for a text and said that this word or phrase only gives this meaning (Mesbah Yazdi, 2002: 145). The main problem in interpreting texts is to distinguish between definite and non-definite (ibid., P. 167) because the proponents of this theory believe that we do not have a definite issue and everything is doubtful.

Also, one of the topics closely related to hermeneutics is the issue of multiple readings. Multiplicity of readings means that there is a possibility of different and sometimes contradictory interpretations of a phrase or text, and all of them are correct and acceptable, and none of them can be considered invalid (Mesbah Yazdi, 2003: pp. 13 and 14). For the first time, some tried to solve this problem by raising the issue of the language of religion due to the conflict of scientific discoveries with the teachings of the church. Proponents of multiple readings believe that religious content is inconsistent with scientific content if we consider the language of the Torah and the Bible to be real, while the language of religion, like symbolic and mythical language, is a special language and not for expressing reality (ibid., P. 50).

In general, in the theory of multiplicity of readings, all probabilities and interpretive aspects are considered correct and acceptable, even if they are incompatible with each other and no collective aspects exist among them (Ibid., P. 47).

This view of what science is depicts the separation of the social sciences from the natural sciences, an anti-positivist view of hermeneutics and interpreters, believing that experience and science (science means the experimental sciences) are the understanding of phenomena, by the presuppositions of the scholars, without worrying about discovering the fact. That is, Harmonists do not consider science to be inductive and observational, they see it as an understanding of phenomenon. This view is based on relativism. In the hermeneutic and relativistic view, everyone understands the phenomenon by their own presuppositions; so, we no longer have something called the world of science that scholars can think of together. Here, science, the understanding of the world, is based on the presuppositions of individuals (Khosropanah and Parsania, 2013: 42).

In the methodology of Sadra's wisdom, "although it is not possible for everyone to completely empty their mindsets and prejudices, man can use his effort by relying on obvious rational principles and pondering according to rational principles of dialogue and correct methods of interpretation. The best possible reason for this is the occurrence of the same conversation between us and the proponents of the theory of multiplicity of readings, who have an implicit confession that they understand our words as we also understand their claims" (Mesbah Yazdi, 2003: 65).

One of the arguments for the theory of multiplicity of readings is the change in the word meanings throughout history. Of course, if the theorem means the cause of the general, i.e., the promise to change all meanings, that all the sciences of the past have changed their meanings, and that none of them is understood, it is something that no one believes and no rational person accepts (Mesbah Yazdi, 2007: pp. 46 and 47).

However, if the theorem is presented in detail, it means that only some of the words change. This is something that exists in all languages and words, but there must definitely be a connection between the former and the latter meaning. In this case, sometimes the word is used with the help of evidence in the virtual meaning and sometimes the word is secondary. This change is subject to special conditions and requires evidence from the principles of jurisprudence to answer. Therefore, considering that the principle is "no change", change is proved with the help of evidence. In the conversations of custom and reason, the principle is that words have specific meanings, and sometimes if the meaning of the word changes due to certain factors, it is impossible to change a word from one meaning to another without comparison (ibid., pp. 46-47).

Therefore, not only the existence of two meanings for a word is possible, but it also occurs. Of course, it means two known meanings based on valid sources. That is, lexicographers must have mentioned these two meanings. Provided that the rule is rational, based on the rules of rational dialogue, with no conflict between the two meanings, it is valid (Mesbah Yazdi, 2002: 77). Therefore, accepting multiple readings does not mean that all rulings are legible and only in cases where there are suspicious reasons, disagreement arises (Ibid., P. 78).

Another important issue is that the criterion for recognizing the apparent meanings of the text is two things: 1- Rational axioms or definite rational contents connected to the word as evidences (in the science of principles they are called lobby evidences), and 2- Principles of rational dialogue, referring to the rules that all rational, in the position of understanding and conveying their intentions through words, consider them valid (Ibid., P. 67).

In general, it is not possible to impose an arbitrary view on the text and call it a new reading. Anyone who comments on a field must know its methodology and be aware of its issues. Like a doctor who specializes in recognizing diseases and treatment, a mujtahid is called a specialist in understanding the rules of Islam. At the same time, differences of opinion are only in matters of suspicion and doubt, not in certainties and necessities (ibid., Pp. 74-76).

However, if several readings emerged based on the principles of rational dialogue and the rules of the language of the text, it does not mean that all of these meanings are acceptable in the position of proof and reality. The multiplicity of meanings can be considered only if it is external, internal, or interpretative without any conflict between them. (Ibid., P. 81).

In conclusion, regarding the subject of words, the topics of different readings, and hermeneutic issues, Sadra's method uses empowerment tools like the principles of jurisprudence. It rejects a theory that considers all knowledge, including religious knowledge, to be evolving and changing, and does not accept stability and permanence in any knowledge (Ibid., P. 66).

3.3. Pluralism

Pluralism literally means the quality of being plural. In contrast, singular means the quality of being alone. In philosophical terms, pluralism is a tendency towards multiple principles and monism is a tendency towards unity (Nabaviyan, 2001: 15 and 16).

Although our topic is political pluralism, but if we consider pluralism as a method, "epistemological and normative pluralism has a production-logical relationship with other types of pluralism" (Zahiri, 2005: 159). That is why we have to understand and enter into the discussion of epistemological and religious pluralism.

Regarding the issue of pluralism, there is a confusion between the legitimacy of multiple understandings and perceptions of a text. That is, the point of discussion is about the legitimacy of multiple perceptions and not in the principle of plurality. Also in pluralism, sometimes the right is equated with being useful, but here the right means the correspondence with reality. So, here we are trying to prove that the statement "everyone is right" is false.

In Sadra's wisdom, the realization of pluralism requires trust in some unscientific propositions, such as the transformation of a community of contradictions, which is not approved. All sciences are a subset of the principle of refusal of contradiction, not against it, and if this principle is removed, the foundation of all sciences will collapse (Javadi Amoli, 2007: 35 and 36).

Another important point of pluralism is the issue of peaceful life, which is more of a socio-political issue. In this regard, we are faced with three groups: 1. those who believe in pluralism, who are pluralistic both in the discussion of legitimacy and in the discussion of salvation. 2- Monopolists who are monopolists in the discussion of legitimacy and salvation, and 3- Those who believe in the Sadra school, monopolists in the discussion of legitimacy, but are pluralists in the discussion of salvation, and consider the majority of the world as saviors.

In general, and since the currents of unity and pluralism have challenges in theory and in practice, the need for alternative theory is serious. Reflection on the theory of Velayat-e-Faqih leads us to such a theory. Therefore, this alternative is referred to as unity while plurality. In fact, political pluralism, like the issue of government structure, is not a priori in the theory of Velayat-e-Faqih, but the conditions and requirements of each era have a great impact on determining it, and this is one of the elements that play a significant role in the political efficiency of Velayat-e-Faqih. In fact, efforts are made to achieve unity and plurality within the selected political structure (Ghorbani, Mehdi, 2013: 96 and 97).

4.3. Feminist Methodology

Feminist theories disrupt every structure and order and depict a situation in which man has no adherence to anything, regard knowledge as relative, and destroy real limitations, natural and intrinsic features. The last fundamental aspect that may create constraints, e.g., being like men or women, is criticized because they believe that these differences may create limitations in social life. In the field of women's studies in general, feminism may be used, but feminists claim to understand science according

to their realm. The claim is not correct and it is not the case that feminist theories are used everywhere (Kachoyan, 2011: 139).

One of the principles of feminists is emphasizing the right of humanity. Of course, there are rights belonging to humanity, like the right to self-defense or the right to live etc. but it is not the case that because men and women are couples in humanity, they should be equal in all rights. Because there are many mental and physical differences between men and women that cause differences in rights, and it is possible that the characteristics of one sex lead to the assignment of certain rights to that sex. For example, a woman has a device that can feed a pregnant woman and a child, but a man lacks it. The same physical difference can make a difference in salary. Therefore, the God who equipped the woman with these devices has set special rights for her, and these physical and mental differences cause differences in rights. Therefore, some rights are due to being a man or a woman (Mesbah Yazdi, 2007: 34).

5.3. Discourse

Discourse theory analyzes the way in which systems of meanings or discourses shape people's understanding of their roles in society and influence their political activities. Discourses are not the ideologies in the traditional sense of the word, a set of ideas by which social actors explain and justify their organized social action. The concept of discourse includes various political and social behaviors as well as institutions and organizations (Marsh and Stoker, 2013: 195).

Discourse theory is inspired by interpretive sciences such as hermeneutics, phenomenology, constructivism, and deconstruction. These sciences are organized either around the interpretation of literary and philosophical texts or around the analysis of the way in which subjects and experiences are formed and find meaning. The discourse approach, being in such a tradition of thought, bears similarities to Marx-Weber's way of understanding. The difference is that the discourse analyst examines the ways in which semantic structures make a particular mode of action possible. To do this, the analyst tries to understand how the discourses that construct the activities of social agents are produced, function, and evolve. In trying to understand these research topics, the discourse analyst prioritizes political concepts such as opposition, agency, power, and domination. (Ibid., P. 196).

"Discourse theory contrasts with sociological theories that can be tested in a variety of contexts" (Habibi, Fawad, Bi Ta: Bi Ja). By adopting such a post-structuralist view, Laclau and Moff have tried to oppose all essentialist and fundamentalist views. By denying the possibility and conditionality of all identities and social phenomena, they have rejected any objectivism and certainty arising from positivist, rationalist and transcendental views. In this case, the social world can only be understood in the form of discourses, and there is no fundamental and comprehensible truth outside the realm of discourse. "It is discourses that produce true and false propositions and oblige social actors and institutions to act on them" (Soltanifar, Ali Asghar: 2003: 156). The main concern of discourse theory is how people understand in their communities and how

they act in their communities. Therefore, the question of social agency and individuality is very important. (Ibid. 207).

According to Sadra's methodology, "if we consider the theory of discourse valid in the third world (social and intersubjective world), it will not differ much from Sadra's philosophy, but if the theory of discourse is to be transmitted to the first world (Nafs-e al-Amr), yet, this issue will contradict the axioms of Islamic philosophy. It is explained that the first world is the self or the external reality independent of the human mind. The second world is a reading that takes place in the human mind of an a priori reality, and the third world is the intersubjective perception of the people of a society about a specific subject" (Qomshian, Meysam, <https://www.ricac.ac.ir>: 2015).

One of the most important meanings of discourse is discourse as a method. In discourse, meaning our method, we are faced with a new method of analysis in the field of social and political sciences that seeks to retell and show the hidden meanings of the text and the context of the text. At this level of dealing with the subject of discourse, readings, interpretations, and representations of a reality in the media are discovered and deciphered. This issue does not in principle contradict the religious foundations (Qomshian, Meysam, <https://www.ricac.ac.ir>: 2016).

In Sadra's philosophy, it is possible for man to ascend from the stage of understanding nature to understanding the principle of existence. Examples of essences include concepts such as discourse, history, language, and so on. Therefore, man can achieve a science that is not bound by discourse, language and time, and therefore beyond the discourse, achieve the truth of existence. Man's attainment of this transcendental truth should be sought in the literature of Sadra's wisdom with complications such as "observation of a separate imagination" and his failure to reach this position can also be considered as part of human perceptions in the connected exemplar world. Perception of nature is related to the mind, but the nature of existence is that it is not transmitted to the mind. Therefore, what happens in the perception of presence and the world of a separate example is the perception of existence. What Foucault and others who believe in discourse theory are the things that the human mind learns from history, language, etc., and therefore remain connected at the level of the example world and essences (Ghomshian, Meysam, <https://www.ricac.ac.ir>: 2016).

Denying the application and inclusion of the principle of science production as a social action and denying the effect of social conditions and relations on the content of science do not mean denying the relationship between social action and science production and denying the effect of conditions and social relations on the content of human knowledge. Because, firstly, when scientific knowledge enters the mental horizon by which it enters the field of culture, this entry is not possible without social and cultural action, and secondly, the entry of scientific facts into the mental field of individuals is not isolated from social factors and contexts, but the effect of these factors is limited to numerical causes (Parsania, 2009: pp. 148 and 149).

In general, parts of discourse theory that deny the existence of a transhistorical and transcendental truth are in complete conflict with Sadra's teachings and, above all,

religion. Discussions that refer to the relativity of knowledge and uncertainty can also be in conflict with the literature of Islamic wisdom and Sadra's philosophy.

The critical or corrective approach of Sadra's realism in relation to discourse theory is the presence of practical reason in the field of this theory. Practical intellect also invents human concepts and meanings in proportion to the goals that judge its correctness with the help of theoretical intellect. This part of the innovation, which he calls social credentials, outlines the ideal pattern of human behavior and biology. This ideal model provides the basis for a critical approach to social realities because social realities are often rooted in the credentials that human beings act on based on their social inclinations, interactions, and relationships. The presence of practical reason prevents social scientists from being confined within existing realities and in what is called conventional understanding (Parsania, 2009: 154 and 155).

Conclusion

The reason we believe in Sadra's methodology is that none of the existing methods can claim discovering all the facts concerning the humanities. And we believe that Sadra's method is a purely argumentative meta-methodology different from other methods, and by using this meta-methodology, the validity of other methods can be demonstrated.

Based on Sadra's philosophy, the epistemological and ontological foundations of this meta-methodology are responsible for the existential and ontological issues of science and provide the thematic principles and confiscation of logic and other sciences, thus paving the way to certainty.

This meta-methodology has powerful and comprehensive tools because different levels of research require different methods. The methods used in basic research are not the same as the methods used in applied research. This metaphysics, along with the argumentative intellect, both empirical and abstract, also evaluates the practical, theoretical and sacred intellect. It also uses political jurisprudence and the words of jurisprudence, the authority of revelation, and the authority of narration.

The conclusion is that Sadra's methodology is a hybrid method contrasted with some methods such as feminist methodology and with some methodologies in general and in particular. Extensive use of various sciences from philosophy to jurisprudence, principles, narration, mysticism, theology and the use of tools such as sense, experience, intellect, discovery and intuition is possible in a place and in accordance with the needs. It is worth noting that just as the boundary between knowledge saves us from superstition, the boundary between methods saves us from error and superstition, and this important point does not mean, for example, that we use quantitative methods in qualitative research.

The truth is that Sadra's meta-methodology neither seeks to reject all methods, just as it does not reject experimental methods and methods and tools such as questionnaires, sampling and statistics, nor monopolizes and regulates them. In fact, it sets rules for them (e.g., non-association of contradictions). It also wants hermeneutic methods to be disciplined and law-based. It does not reject the method of discourse and its

components such as opposition, agency, power and domination, but considers its application valid in the third world (social and interpersonal world).

The Sadra's meta-method means to eliminate the defects and flaws of the common methods and to see the natural method in its place in harmony and compatible with other sources of knowledge. However, in some cases it offers completely new content in different categories. Accordingly, different methods are certainly used in their place in situations where they provide useful results of rational certainty and do not live within the boundaries of hypothesis and speculation.

The importance and major point of this discussion is that every method leads to a specific type of knowledge and not every knowledge is obtained from every method. Thus, method is also one of the things that is involved in the definition of knowledge. The methods are the same. Therefore, we can have a methodology in which religion plays a part in this process, so that we can also talk about religious methodology. Later and naturally, religious science can also be analyzed, produced and accepted.

References

- [1] Parsania, Hamid (2010) *Critical Methodology of Hekmat Sadraei*, Qom, Tomorrow's Book.
- [2] Parsania, Hamid (2009) *Science and Philosophy*, Tehran, Institute of Islamic Culture and Thought.
- [3] Parsania, Hamid (2008) *The Existence and Descent of Man in Islam*, Qom, Maaref Publishing.
- [4] Panahi Azad, Hossein (2015) *Philosophy of Sadra Wisdom*, Tehran, Institute of Islamic Culture and Thought
- [5] Javadi Amoli, Abdullah (2008) *The status of reason in the geometry of religious knowledge*, Qom, Esra '.
- [6] Seyed Sadegh (2012) *Methodology of Political Science*, Qom, Mofid University.
- [7] Khosropanah, Abdolhossein and Parsania, Hamid (2013) *Production and Development of Islamic Humanities*, Tehran, Research Institute of Iranian Wisdom and Philosophy
- [8] Rahimpour, Hassan (2008) *Five Speeches*, Tehran, Tomorrow's Plan.
- [9] Rahimpour, Hassan (2014) *Social sciences and dealing with rationality*, Tehran, Maaref Publishing Office.
- [10] Soroush Jamal (2016) *Reason in Transcendent Wisdom and the School of Separation*, Qom, Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute.
- [11] Sharifi, Ahmad Hossein (2016) *Methodology of Islamic Humanities*, Tehran, Aftab Tose'e.
- [12] Fayyaz, Ebrahim (2013) *Iranian Anthropology, the nectar of Sepideh Bavaran*.
- [13] Kachoyan Hossein (2011) *Our Identity*, Qom, Tomorrow's Book.
- [14] Marsh, David and Stoker, David, Haji Yousefi, Amir Mohammad. (2013) *Methods and Theory in Political Science*, Tehran Institute for Strategic Studies.
- [15] Mesbah Yazdi, Mohammad Taghi (2003) *In the Light of Azarakhsh*, Qom, Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute.
- [16] Mesbah Yazdi, Mohammad Taghi (2003) *Multiple readings*, Qom, Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute.
- [17] Mesbah Yazdi, Mohammad Taghi (2007) *An Abstract of Fundamental Islamic Thoughts*, Qom, Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute.

- [18] Motahari, Morteza (2003) Collection of works Volume 6, Tehran, Sadra.
- [19] Nabaviyan, Mahmoud (2002) Religious pluralism, Tehran, Young Thought Center.
- [20] Pourhossein Darzi, Ghasem and Solgi, Maryam (Autumn and Winter 2013) A Study of Allameh Tabatabai's and Students' Perspectives on Science, Philosophical Research Quarterly, Year 9, Number 24, Allameh Tabatabaei University.
- [21] Soltani, Seyed Ali Asghar, Winter (2004) Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method, Journal of Political Science, No. 28, Baqer al-Uloom University.
- [22] Zahiri, Seyed Majid, (2005) Diversity of Pluralism, Ghabsat Scientific Research Journal, Volume 10, Number 37, Institute of Humanities and Cultural Studies.
- [23] Ghorbani, Mehdi (2013) The effectiveness of the theory of Velayat-e-Faqih in the crystallization of unity while political pluralism, Scientific Research Journal of the Islamic Revolution, Year 10, Winter 92, No. 35, Institute of Humanities and Cultural Studies.
- [24] Ghomshian, Meysam, (2016) Introduction of discourse theory on Sadra's philosophy (comparative study of discourse theory with the principles of Sadra's wisdom) <https://www.ricac.ac.ir>
- [25] Habibi, Fouad, Discourse Theory, Roots and Application, Bitā, Bija.