

Justification of Political Authority in Theological(Islamic) Epistemology

Mojtaba Zarvani

Abstract

The political views of the speculative theologians have been more abstraction and justification of the events of the age rather than an issue resulting from their scholastic theological geometry. "In other words, in the field of politics, the speculative theology [not only today, but also always] has been a sort of filling the gap and resurfacing the work". In order to prove this argument, we will show a process during which from the early days of Islam up to Ghazzali, gradually the monitoring elements which challenge the authority of the Islamic ruler became fade. Moreover, the speculative theologians in their political views gradually reach to a point in which they consider a ruler with no specific features qualified to serve as a judge. That is to say, the authoritative nature of the Abbasid government, which according to many thinkers is the heritage of imitation from the Iranian and Sāsānid traditions made a situation that even the Ash'arites thinker who used to consider the return to the age of The rightly Guided Caliphs as a Utopia, mutilated and made a selection out of the traditions of the holy prophet and the caliphs.

Keywords: political authority, kalām, epistemology

Foreword

This research has taken form round a problem rather than a subject. Therefore, the appropriate statement of the issue and faithfulness to it has been emphasized. The difficulty of conducting research by a researcher who is so naive in such kind of experiences is clear to everybody. On the other hand, the interdisciplinary nature of the research subject (i.e. politics and scholastic theology - each of which has its own methodological and contextual necessities- has extended the scope and naturally the complicatedness of the job.

The claim of this research had been such that the researcher could not limit himself within a single scholastic system (such as The Mu'tazilite and Ash'arite schools of thoughts). Furthermore, the researcher was obliged to put forth three spheres of history, politics and

theology [which find an unbreakable interlink in this research] proportionally. On one hand, this multilateralism and the specialize nature of the work, on the other hand, made the job very difficult for the researcher. Finally, I guess that the evidences presented to prove the claim of this research are not sufficient but its idea is defendable and can be completed. For all these reason, this research is open to various criticisms and further corrections.

Statement of the Problem

If we consider the definition of Kalâm (Islamic Theology) as a set of systematic theorems which present a specific image of God, human and the world and gives clear responses to the related questions, in that event, as a rule, the political authority and sovereignty should allocate a role to itself in the scholastic theology. Given this explanation, it is obvious that in this research, we are not bound to find the responses to the questions which are merely historical ones, i.e. for example, we do not seek to find the impact of a specific theological idea concerning the creation of a kind of specific political sovereignty or its opposite one. What has been considered in this research is of the type of “political culture” which has a close relation with the above-mentioned definition of scholastic theology. The political culture is a series of beliefs, symbols and values which defines a position in which the “political act” occurs within its format. (Feirhai, 38, 39). In that case, it can be said that the political culture of the age imposes certain necessities on the idea of the theologian (dialectician) and he for the sake of maintaining the integrity of his own intellectual system forms its own theological geometry in accordance with those necessities. Of course, I emphasize that what is of significance in our perspective, is not to prove that the theological systems have been completely created in accordance with the political necessities, but we intend to make it clear that the dominating logic on the theological systems with regard politics and sovereignty is neither a natural logic nor a real logic but it is a “reconstructed logic”. The “reconstructed logic” or “Al-siyâghat Al-mantiqiyah” is an interpretation used by Hassan Abbas Hassan for this purpose. “The discussion of logical Siyâqh (or reconstructed logic) will not be separate from the social reality. In other words, the social reality within which the logical Siyaqah is manifested has a great impact on the restriction of the principles and values of that system” (Abbas Hassan, 42).

As we know for Exegetes or Theologians these are not the verses of the sacred book which gives shape to the exegetical or theological sets, but there exists specific epistemological foundations in the Exegetes or theologian’s mind. While reading the text, he interprets the verses such that they would not be in conflict with his intellectual set of mind. Now, in this research, we have assessed this issue concerning the political phenomena and their related scholastic theological theorems. Of course, we have focused on the primary years of the Abbasid period in particular and will show that the thinkers of that age have given shape to their scholastic theological geometry under the influence of an epistemology resulting from

the conditions of those times. Moreover, during this process, they have dealt with the selection and interpretation of the government of the prophet Mohammad (p.b.u.h.) and the Rightly Guided Caliphs. Then based on the necessity, they viewed the explicit wordings and tradition in a mutilated and selected form.

We limit the boundaries of our research to the investigation on the process of change in the Islamic thinking on the authority of the ruler coinciding with the centuries of the Abbasids caliphate. Reviewing these changes, we seek to prove this claim that the logic of scholastic theology was changed in accordance with the changes of the time gradually. It was such that it was made so suitable for many political reasons to be put forth. Without presenting the views of each individual theologians, we will generally show that the acceptability of the political authority has not been directly extracted from the text of Book and Tradition, but it has emerged under the influence of the epistemological conditions of the age and within the framework of a reconstructed logic. So that, we have termed the title of the article “the mechanism of justification of political authority in the scholastic theological epistemology”.

Introduction

Introductorily, it is essential to mention two points about the political ideas of the Muslims. First that in Islam, opposite the Christianity, there was no government institution prior to the creation of religion. The government was born inside the religion and entered into the understanding of people. In the view of the Saint Augustine, the first Christian political theoretician, the political system is a humane and evil issue and The Cain, the first founder and administrator of the city (Louis, 65), but the historical attitude of the Muslims was moving in an opposition direction.

The viewpoint of the Muslims was not started with defeat but with victory and not with the fall but it started with the flourishing of the Islamic emperors. For the Muslim observer of the early periods of Islam, the political authority not only was not considered a humanistic evil, but also it was not considered as a lower MiniMom or even Maximom evil, but it was a divine gift. (ibid, 66). Secondly, in the first event, the government and more than anything else, it was understood as the community of believers (Ummah). This aspect has led Rosental to this conclusion that the Islamic government can be defined in a rather better phrase in the Western interpretation: A material and spiritual unity.

Rosental adds that these are in Islam two aspects of a single thing and are the same divine and vital rules. It is this very indispensable rule (Shari`a-religious law) which dominates all aspects of life including religious, political aspects and that of the others. The rule is prior to the government and the government is based on it. So that as Lambton states, no Islamic

political view put forth this question about the government that why there exists government, because no justification is necessary at all. The existence of government is taken for granted as the backup, protector and spreader of Shari`a (religious law). God is Himself the legislator of the law and He is the main ruler. (Nāderi, 43, 44).

The above two cases reveal, on one hand, why the political views of the Muslims have been created associated with the scholastic theology and, on the other hand, it makes the necessity of the research obvious. That is to say that the author is not to measure the ratio of the political standing of the speculative theologians with their scholastic geometry, but for the two above-mentioned reasons, the author believes that such an imagination of Shari`a (The ruling law on all the world, community and individual) has given rise to a situation in which the social position is used as a capital for the speculative theologians to refer to the divine will. In this path, the social reality has become capable to form the scholastic theories. That is to say that the political views of the Muslims, in general is the abstraction of the social realities and the reflection of the cultural-political crises at the level of intellectual worlds. This point is of great significance that the majority of important political clarifications, if not all, have emerged at the periods of crises or at least at the periods in which the Islamic community and the government have been facing great problems and the minds of the Muslim thinkers have been involved in them. (Feirahi, 42).

From this perspective, in our view it is important that the political view of the Muslims, in particular pondering on the nature of the Islamic government have emerged years after the changes of Caliphate. For the first time in about 132 (A.H.), in particular at the period of the rulership of Mansour, the great ruler of the Abbasid emperorship, the question about the meaning of the Islamic government was seriously put forth. (Ibrāhim Hasan, 42/2, Zarrinkoob, 411).

Then, the Islamic scholars, in particular among the followers of Sunnah and Jemaah, they began to deal with its general image. In the view of these thinkers, the Islamic ruler takes his power directly from God and obeying him is equal to obeying God and in the same direction of God's commandments. (Māvardi, 5).

By the way, this issue should be considered that in this research, the classic categorization of this scene such as dividing the political ideas of the Muslims into political philosophy, policy directions and political jurisprudence are not given important attention. Though, while reviewing the political idea, this classification being innovated by Rosental with regard to the discourse, is effective, but it is not efficient in our research. Because, firstly, the attention of this article is directed at the speculative theology [scholastic theology], and to review the process of justification of political authority in the outlook of the speculative theologians. Secondly, these specific combinations are the "forms" and various secondary frameworks in which the political knowledge of the Middle Ages were emerged. Emphasizing the aspects

such as political jurisprudence, policy directions and political philosophy is never a sign accounting for their different nature, but they are descriptive and emphatic additions which in no way convey a restrictive meaning. So, in parallel with the above classification, some other features such as political mysticism, political gnosticism, etc... can be enumerated.

And finally, the last point which is of importance in our view out of the political analysis, is that in the view of many theoreticians, Muslims were succeeded in the establishment of political knowledge once and such a great achievement took place in the fourth and fifth centuries A.H., concurrent with the periods of the Abbasids government and also coincided with the dominancy of Ash'arits schools of thought. This age which is known as the Golden Age of the Islamic Civilization witnessed the establishment of main philosophical schools of political knowledge which in proportion with the authoritative nature of the Abbasid government and the authoritative nature of the Muslim ideas (the dominancy of Ash'arits thought) are all authoritative.

Hence, the claim of this article briefly is as follows:

“The political views of the speculative theologians have been more abstraction and justification of the events of the age rather than an issue resulting from their scholastic theological geometry. “In other words, in the field of politics, the speculative theology [not only today, but also always] has been a sort of filling the gap and resurfacing the work”. In order to prove this argument, we will show a process during which from the early days of Islam up to Ghazzali, gradually the monitoring elements which challenge the authority of the Islamic ruler became fade. Moreover, the speculative theologians in their political views gradually reach to a point in which they consider a ruler with no specific features qualified to serve as a judge. That is to say, the authoritative nature of the Abbasid government, which according to many thinkers is the heritage of imitation from the Iranian and Sassanid traditions (Rajāee, 17-36) made a situation that even the Ash'arits thinker who used to consider the return to the age of The Rightly Guided Caliphs as a Utopia, mutilated and made a selection out of the traditions of the holy prophet and the caliphs.

The change of speculative ideas from the restriction of power up to the justification of authority

The monitoring elements in the Islamic culture have specific specifications. In opposition with the “philosophical individualism” of the modern periods in the West, which by emphasizing on the individualism defines the nature of the person through differences and distinctions, a Muslim does not have any right independent from Shari`a. So, in the Islamic society, there is never a term “it is just or unjust”, and the individual and government are purely obliged to obey the commandments and rules of God.(Feirahi, 57). In the political view of Islam, a sing Muslim can not have any kind of rights beyond the Islamic legal rules

vis-à-vis the government. The individual and the government have only right to expect each other to be committed towards the framework of Shari`a. This mutual necessity and commitment, has been considered as a principle and a necessity in order to maintain the unity, innocence and integrity of the Islamic community. (For observing a sample, See, Nahj al Balāghah, Malik Ashtar Treaty)..

On one hand, the government has a right to expect the progress of people in every fields with the exception of sin. On the other hands, the people have rights to expect the government to be right and just in all its decisions and behaviors and to be bound to observing the rules and commandments of Shari`a (religious law). These rights, discussed in details in scholastic, jurisprudential and ethical books of Shiites and Sunnis, have given rise to the emergence of monitoring elements.

Presenting a brief report of the views of Abu Hanifeh, Māvardi and Ghazzali, we observe the dominating atmosphere on their political views. Though this perspective ignores many details, but it will show the ideal gradual change of this article clearly.

However, Abu Hanifeh is not a speculative theologian in accordance with the definition presented in the beginning of discussion, but if we consider the first face of the speculative theology as the same dispute and reasoning(argument), “Abu Hanifeh was a veteran scholar”. (Sharif, 2/126) and “he became skillful in the scholastic theology such that he was respected as a reference in that science by scholars”.(Ibid). The views of such a precursor speculative theologian on politics is the best starting point to realize the position of this issue in the view of the first Muslim speculative theologians.

The views of Abu Hanifeh on caliphate are very clear and straightforward. In his view, acquisition of power by force and then legalizing it through compulsory oath of allegiance and reluctantly is not the legal way of appointment to that position. The caliph should be selected after consultation and exchanges of ideas with the wise men who are qualified to comment (Ahl al Raay). Abu Hanifeh expressed this view despite there was a risk of threatening his own life.

Concerning this issue, there is an interesting event in the mentioned history. Mansour asks Abu Hanifeh, “What is your opinion about the power which has been granted to me by God to rule the people?”, Abu Hanifeh responds Mansour Abbasid, “You have not invited us for the sake of God, but you have invited us to say something as a result of fear of life to please you and to be conveyed to peoples’ ear. The fact is that you have become the caliph without having even the acceptance of two jurisprudents. Whereas, the caliph should be selected through consultation and agreement of the Muslims. You know, Abu Bakr avoided to issue the appointment commandment for six months until he received the news of the oath of allegiance by the people of Yemen”(Ibid).

This story shows that how in the views of the early thinkers, the method of selection of

the caliph was as important as the method of his governance. Abu Hanifeh reveals some views on other subjects which are political serious matters and shows the political aspect of Islam from the beginning. For example, "Nobody is qualified to judge, unless he has power enough to impose the law (religious law) on you, your commanders and major generals. I do not see such a power in myself. I have been made such that when you call me, and as far as I come before you, I can not even breath easily".

Abu Hanifeh insists on freedom straightforward and boldly both as a right and as an obligation. He considers freedom not only as a non-transferable right but also a public duty or obligation. Opposite to Hashviyeh who believed "calling people to goodness and preventing people from evil-doing"¹⁾ at the time when a corrupted government is on power is harmful and evil, he tried to infuse the spirit of "calling people to goodness and preventing people from evil-doing" in the soul of people once again. This issue becomes clear in a response which Abu Hanifeh gives to the question rose by Ebrahim al şâigh and narrated by Jeşşâş. Concerning the issue of freedom of speech, he moves ahead to the extent that he does not allow to put in jail someone who has said something against legal ruler or a justice government. Even if this individual goes ahead to the extent that he/she insults Caliph or intend to kill him, with the exception of the one who intends to make a military rebellion or disrupt peace. He infers this verdict from the event which took place at the time of the caliphate of Ali.

"Five people were taken before him with the accusation of apparent insult on him in the alleys of Kufeh city. One of them was accused of saying that he intends to kill Ali. Ali issued a command to set him free." They said, "They intended to kill you". In response, Ali asked, "But, can I kill someone for this accusation that he has said he had intended to kill me?". They added, "They have also insulted on you", Ali said, "If you like, you may insult on them". (Ibid, 141).

Despite the views of a large groups of the followers of Ahl al-Sunnah,(Ash`ari, Maqâlât al-Islamiyin, 2/155), Abu Hanifeh believes that the caliphate of a cruel figure is incorrect and can not be confirmed. It is entitled to be overthrown and the people not only have a right but it is their obligation to revolt against him. Such a revolt is not only permitted but also it is obligatory, provided that it is likely to have a just ruler instead of the cruel one and the act merely does not lead to the loss of lives and power. (Sharif, 142).

It is clear that at the heart of such views, not only the society and politics are not the scope of emergence and manifestation of divine will, but monitoring it through "calling people to goodness and preventing people from evil-doing" is necessary and even to rebel against cruelty is permitted and is an obligatory duty.

Before discussing the views of Māvardi, referring to the views of The Mu'tazilit school of

thought on “calling people to goodness and preventing people from evil-doing” makes clearer the gradual change of this concept. Beyond the details which have been dealt with by the Mu'tazilit about the “calling people to goodness and preventing people from evil-doing” as one of the five-fold sides of their speculative geometry, what is almost agreed by all and is not included within the framework of our research is that the last stage of “preventing people from evil-doing” is to resort to sword. They believe that this theory, when takes the form of rebellious against the cruel Sultān, can be converted into Jihād (a holy war) (Balkhi, 64). Though, gradually this bold commandment is transmuted in this phrase which reads, “The priority (and not the monopoly) in recognizing the case of war and bloodshed is shifted to the Imam and his Caliphs, since their knowledge and power is more effective in this case” (The Islamic Large Encyclopedia, Entry: “Calling people to goodness”). This transform culminates in the views of Ash'aira round the issue of “calling people to goodness and preventing people from evil-doing”. The scholastic theologians of Ash'aira allows the possibility of armed fighting in the case of “preventing people from the evil doing”, if the initiative to be under the control of the Muslim ruler or the wise men who serve to solve the problems agree on it” (Ibid).

Studying the views of Abulhassan Māvardi, the famous scholastic theologian along with the views of Abu Hanifeh reveals that during some centuries of Abbasid Caliphates which is concurrent with the completion of scholastic theology too, what kind of events took place in the constellation of the ideas of the Muslims. Māvardi, who had been also appointed to serve as the senior judge of Alqādir, the Abbasid caliph, was under the influence of the conditions of the age of this caliph and his son who both were trying to revive the glory of their ancestor. This historical situation explains the efforts made by Māvardi to put a theory about caliphates based on this principle that everything is dependent on the sovereignty of the caliph, in a period in which the dignity of the caliphate had reached to its lowest level. Among the political views of Māvardi, what was accepted by Ash'ari too (Sharif, 196) is of great significance and that is: Imam is selected in two ways: A) It is possible to select Imam by the group of selectors B) Imam can be nominated by the ruling ruler. (Māvardi: 4,5)

Concerning the first part, some researchers say that Imam should be elected by all members of the selecting board in all cities. Some others oppose with this view and says that only Abu Bakr was elected by the people of Medina. Even some claims that only five people are sufficient to select Imam and this is what happened in the case of election of Abu Bakr and Othman. According to Māvardi, even one person is sufficient to select Caliph. In order to prove this, he uses the tradition of Abbas (the uncle of prophet) as an evidence. Abbas told Ali, “stretch your hand and I swear allegiance with you. When people know that the uncle of prophet has promised loyalty to his nephew, nobody will object towards your Imamah [Divine leadership]. This belief has been confirmed by Ash'ari too. (Baghdādi, 271).

Another point which in the idea of Māvardi helps us with proving our claim is on

demolishing the capability of the ruler in monitoring and administrating the country affairs. He believes that this incapability may occur in two forms. One is that the ruler to be under the dominancy of an individual from the ruler's relatives and supervisors and that figure shifts all of ruler's authorities to himself, but does not fight against Imam openly. Secondly, Imam to come under the control of enemy. In the first case, Māvardi commands that as far as the usurper of the government practices in accordance with the view of caliph and according to the religious commandments, there is no problem. This issue has been expressed in details by Māvardi and based on his smart understanding in jurisprudential affairs. Once again, in the next Chapter, he deals with this issue and discuss it in details. This principle for which in the old resources or in the views of the jurists, there is no permission for it, was created as a result of pressure of necessities which brought the Bani al-Abbās into power two centuries before the death of Māvardi. The usurp of power by Ale Buyids in Baghdad and the fall of the power of caliph to a lower level, made inevitable the creation of a theory which to be in accordance with the necessities of the age and expresses the real relations between Buyids and the Abbasids. This issue is considered to be an apparent detachment from the principles of caliphate which is mentioned by Māvardi in the first part of his book. But in order to remove this conflict, he innovated a middle limit theory.

If the despotic or usurper ruler (Emir by dominancy) announces his obedience towards the caliph and promises that he will maintain the unity of the caliphate and execute the religious commandments and will cooperate with Imam against the enemies of Islam, the caliph can recognize his absolute authorities by granting him the commandment of appointment publicly. Though these arrangements are in conflict with the long-standing traditions of caliphate, but they can be completely considered legitimate, because they imply the maintaining of the commandments of Shari`a. One can not permit these commandments to be violated as a result of inevitable conditions due to power usurp. In this theory, on one hand, the situation of ruler on Baghdad has been apparently recognized, and on the other hand, it contains a clear warning to Ale Buyids that if they trespass their limits, they can be suppressed with the help of the power of Ghaznavid (who are the apparent ally of the Abbasid caliphate). In another place, Māvardi says, "If the usurper individual began to show incompatibility, and rebellious attitude, then the caliph can seek assistance to release from the narrow pass". The person who is referred to by Māvardi is nobody but Mahmoud Ghaznavi(d.421AH). (Sharif, 197).

Here, it is also clear that a deep scholastic theologian such as Māvardi, in his theological views has only undertaken to resurface and fill the gaps of the issues of the age. He has theorized such that the social events do not disrupt the order of his intellectual geometry.

In addition to the above views, Māvardi established another idea which became an indispensable part of the Islamic view and that is also a reflection of the events of his age. Concerning "calling people to do good and preventing people from evil-doing" issues defined

in the views of individuals such as Abu Hanifeh and basically at the time of the Rightly Guided Caliphs as a political concept and in the ratio of people and ruler, he changed it by defining the term “Mohtasib” [The official responsible for safeguarding the standards of religious morality] by which he shifts the responsibility of these two religious duties from the “individual” to “Mohtasib” which is a governmental position. (Māvardi 240-247). In other words, opposite to the views of other authors such as Judge Abuljabbār Mu` tazili who were still emphasizing on the detachment and independence of this duty (Balkhi, 64)- Māvardi linked the duty of “calling people to do good and preventing people from evil-doing” to the political board of Islam and embedded it inside that. Following him, the authoring board of the political knowledge of the middle age all emphasized on the same view.

Though, long times before Māvardi, the Islamic society had forgotten the political dimension of “calling people to do good and preventing people from evil-doing”. (Zarin Koob, 411 onwards). But from the theoretical dimension, the changes in the position created by Māvardi were important. By extending the political reality of the Abbasid period and some decades before that to the theoretical domain and political knowledge of Islam, he created a situation in which, in theory also “calling people to do good and preventing people from evil-doing” to be re-directed from the political domain to the ethical realm and the relations between the people and not the relations between the individual and government.

Such a political knowledge established by Māvardi and expanded in the following periods found a place which could undertake a two-fold function. Firstly, by establishing a network of specific epistemology, it made a false reflection and basic selective view towards the explicit wording and traditions of the society of City of the Prophet. A community and a government that this very knowledge – according to Ash`ari- was an ideal and exemplary community and government.

Since the age of Ghazzali onwards, this issue was clear that the duty of “calling people to do good and preventing them from evil-doing”, has increasingly been driven to the ethical and non-political realm. He recognized the duty of official responsible as a public duty. But finally, he tried to diminish it to the limits of pure ethical and verbal admonishes. Though, at the same time, he reminds that the highest martyr is the one who is killed in the path of conducting duties by the hand of a cruel Sultan. But this phrase is never taken seriously by him. (Ghazzali, 123/2).

Of course, it is not only Ghazzali who is encountered with such a conflict. It seems that the whole Islamic society has faced this important conflict within its intellectual and political changes. On one hand, the Muslim individual had right to reject and rebel against the despotic ruler and this right was resulting from the Islamic exact and explicit wording (in particular, “calling people to do good and preventing people from evil-doing”), but they had never a possibility to rebel against the ruler. Though, in theory, the ruler was bound to perform

Shari`a, but there was no legal instrument and institution to compel and make him responsible or exert pressure on him. In a situation in which the political knowledge of Muslim was incapable to establish such an institution, political pondering along with dissatisfaction with the current situation was finally led to an idea, according which the ruler of the society, either good or bad was the God's will and advisable and therefore has to be obeyed necessarily.

Briefly speaking, it can be summed up that due to the right of people in objecting any oppression and cruelty; some hints are made on the monitoring elements over the government (such as "calling people to do good and preventing people evil-doing") in the religious texts. But the existing selections in the political knowledge of the middle age made these monitoring elements not to be organized within the framework of any social institution outside the government and as a peer institutions to be able to monitor and have an effective control over the government. Consequently, and despite various revolutions in the history of Islamic governments, whenever the institution of government was established at any time or by anybody being converted into a huge giant and something which can never be controlled by its creators and follows only its own specific rules (i.e. more intensive emphasize and reliance on the instruments of dominancy and violence).

It is exactly in this very process of false reflection and selective attitude that the concept of council and consultation finds a specific meaning in the political culture of the Muslims and brings it closer to the concept of "admonition" and "admonition for the Muslim A`immah(Imams)" and is unified with that. Basically, the political knowledge of the 'middle age' is an authoritative-oriented knowledge and its authorities, in one way or the other have prevailed the leadership of the caliph in all aspects of the individual and collective life of the Muslim. Therefore, the concept of council could not inevitably have anything but transformation into the concept of admonition. In this situation, council in Islam is not only an institution of collective management but also means an auxiliary intellectual force which without having a power to challenge with the political management of the society, gives the right of final decision making to him. It is natural that such an understanding of the concept of council makes it exactly the same as the concept of "admonition of A`immah". (Feirahi, 61).

It seems that the emphasize of the Abbasid caliphs on the concept of admonition is not a sectional issue but it is in line with the above analysis, it is a basic emphasize. So that, it is not strange that the Islamic "admonitions of the kings", parallel with the "policy directories" of the ancient Iran are expanding in the whole middle ages. The general features of these admonition letters are such that without making any aggression against the ruler of the society, they intend to present consultation as an intellectual auxiliary force.

Discussion and Conclusion

Concentrating on the process of change of a factor (monitoring and restricting factors of power), this Article tried to prove that the political views of the speculative theologians have been more abstraction and justification of the incidents of the age rather than an issue resulting from their theological views. In other words, in the field of politics, not only today but also all the time, the speculative theology has served as a filling the gap and resurfacing instrument. We showed that from the early days of Islam up to Ghazzali, gradually, the monitoring elements which challenged the authority of the Islamic ruler became fade. Little by little, the speculative theologians reach to a point in their political views that even they consider a ruler with no specific qualification as someone who merits serving in the position of judgment. That is to say, the authoritative nature of the Abbasid government made even the thinkers of Ash'arite school of thought, who thought the return to the age of the Rightly Guided Caliphs is a Utopia, to mutilate and select the tradition of prophet and caliphs.

In such a system, the position of caliph is more dependent on the historical events. This is not surprising, because the institution of caliphate moves ahead shoulder to shoulder of the Shari'ah and in the Islam of Sunni, the history has a nature of legislation. The changes of the authority of the caliph are the main samples to show the legislative nature of the history. On the other hand, the influence of the legislation of history, is basically provides for the past. For this very reason, it is said who was the caliph in the past and what he should be now. Of course, the views of the Sunnis about caliphate, is not a parrot-like explanations about the current events, but one can find a close relations between the incidents of the age and the formation of the views and even a specific speculative theological difference. This is the same thing that we mentioned it by employing the phrase "reconstructed logic". That is to say that the logic of speculative theological logic on politics and the institution of caliphate is not an objective logic but it is a reconstructed logic. It is in a way to make reasons and fill the gap rather than theorizing for the future in accordance with the tradition of the past as Ash'ariyyah were claiming. Using this very viewpoint, it is possible to study the relationship between Saqifa events and formation of the logic of Shiite on one hand, and also the relation between the war of Siffin with the school of Khawârij on the other hand and show the quality of preceding and the impact of social incidents on the structure of the reconstructed intellectual cancellation. So that, it is possible to guess how is that despite the clear exact wording on the political role of the individual, the reconstructed logic necessarily see these resources as selective and brings them in its own favor.

This is a basic similarity which the speculative theology has with the politics and therefore there has been interesting dialogues between them constantly. Perhaps, it is for this very basic similarity that Ash'ari sees the God in the role of an authoritative king who governs the world. (Ash'ari, *Al-Ibâna*, ...98-104). This point that despite the considerable differences

between the views of Ash'arites and Mu'tazilites, both found an authoritative nature in the government is another sign explaining the internal nature of speculative theology.

Consequences

If the claims of this article to be correct, one can argue that in general, it is not the set of religious explicit wordings which allows authoritative dominancy or despotism to dominate, but despotism or dominancy forms its scholastic theological geometry in such a way and sees the texts and traditions so mutilated in order to avoid any conflict with the realities of the age. So, any efforts to prove that in the text of religion or the tradition of the prophet, there is no permission to dominate or hegemony is neutralized by the rulers by highlighting the explicit wordings. In other words, scholastic theological disputes and arguments will never change the theological logic of the sovereignty. Because, this logic is not an objective logic but a reconstructed one and the coating of the work which is capable to reconstruct and resurface every external reality. In other words, it can be said that the speculative theological thinking organized the realities in an absolutely logical order, an order which starts from a main, obvious and definite theorem and then deduces all other things from the same theorem. On one hand, the speculative theology is interested in history in its regular meaning and on the other hand, is fully independent from reality and experience. So that it is capable to make a type of specific logical analogy which provides necessary logic to justify and orient the behaviors of a pervasive regime. This authoritative attitude is the feature of a logic which is dominating the generalities of the speculative theology and seems to be independent from the context of each school. It is such that it can be shown that the political knowledge of the Muslims even in two key Shiite and Sunni sects have a united skeleton and figure. Their differences will only be led to personage documents and, for the subjects discussed in each one, it is possible to find a similar example in the other one.

Notes

- 1) الامر بالمعروف والنهي عن المنكر -

Bibliography

- Al-balkhi, Abolqasim, *Fasl Al-I'tizāl Va Tabaqāt Al-mu'tazila*, By Fouād Saeed, Tunisia, 1406 A.H.
 -Ash`ari, Abulhasan, *Al Ibānah An al-Usul Al-diyāna*, Beirut, Dar-al Kitāb al Arabi, 1410 A.H.
 -Ash`ari, Abulhassan, *Maqālāt Al Islāmiyin Va Ikhtilāf Al-Mossallin*, Tehran, Amir
 -Baghdādi, Abdolqāher ibn Tāhir, *Alfarq Bain Al firaq*, Egypt, Maktab Nashr al Seqafah al Eslamiyah, 1988

- Feirahi, Davood, "Individual and the Government in the Political Culture of Islam," *Journal of Naqd va Nazar*, 3rd and 4th Issues,
- Ghazzali, Abuhāmid Mohammad, *Ihyā o Ulum e al-Din*, Vol.2, Dāro al-kheir, Beirut, 1411/1990.
- Hasan Abbas, Hasan, *Alṣiyāghah Al-mantiqiyah* Lelfekr Alsiyasi Al-Islāmiya, Beirut, Al-dār Ālālamīyah Le al-Tibā` Va Al-nashr, 1992.
- Hassan, Ebrahim, Hassan, *Ta`rikh al- Islam*, Vol.2, Dār o al- Ihyā` al- Torāth al Arabi, Qāhira, 1964.
- Ibn Khallakān, Ahmad ibn Mohammad, *Vafiyāt al A`ayān va Anbā o Abnā al- Zamān*, Beirut, Dar-al-Seqafah, 1968.
- Ibn Qotaybah Dinevari, *Al-Imāmah val al-Siyasah*, Beirut, Dar-al Azvā, 1410 A.H.
- Louis, Bernard, *Political Language of Islam*, Translated by: Gholāmrezā Behrooz Lak, Qom, Office of Islamic Propagation, 1999.
- Māvardi, Abulhassan, *Al-ahkām Al-Sultāniyah*, Beirut, Dar al-fikr, 1405 A.H.
- Nāderi, Nader, *Emergence of the Abbasids*, Translated by Abdulhossein Āzarang and Negar Naderi, Tehran, Sokhan, 2005.
- Rajayee, Farhang, *Battle of Worldviews*, Tehran, Ehyae Ketab, 1994.
- Sediqi, Gholāmhossein, *Iranian Religious Movements in the Second and Third Centuries A.H.*, Tehran, Pājang, 1993.
- Sharif, Miyan Mohammad, *History of Philosophy in Islam*, Tehran, Nashre Daneshgahi, 1983.
- Zarinkoob, Abdulhossein, *Ta`rich e Iran Ba`d az Islam*, Amir Kabir, Tehran, 1983.