

# The Influence Of Continental And Analytic Philosophy On the New Thinking of Iran

**Aref Barkhordari**

Assistant Professor Department of political Thought  
Center of Higher Studies of the Revolution,  
University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is a comparative study of the influence of continental and analytical philosophy on the New Thinking of Iran with emphasis on Abdolkarim Soroush and Reza Davari. In Iran society Since the 1960s, the discussions were formed, that these discussions from 1980 onward was more visible in the form of two rival discourse with a focus on Reza Davari and Soroush. Soroush influenced by Popper's philosophy of science, Logical and epistemological accuracies of analytic philosophy, Liberalism and religious interests, he consciously sought to catch up with modernity. But Reza Davari influenced by Heidegger and continental philosophy and with religious and identity interests, defended philosophy and opposed with Logicism, scientism and used western anti-enlightenment pre-assumptions and also religious entrenchment against modern human reason, and discussed anti-modern interpretations. These discourses had an impact on the formation of political, social and religious flows in Iran and each of these flows tended to answer the problems of Iranian society. These two discussions started with the disputes from the beginning of the revolution and reached their peak, but they became closer to each other in recent years.

**Keywords:** analytic and continental philosophy, scientism , anti-scientism, anti-modern, modernity.

## INTRODUCTION

In contemporary Iran, due to the entry of modern intellectual-philosophical structures, many intellectual debates were formed. One of these debates was the contention among Popper's and Heidegger's fans. The starting point of this debate returned to a discussion of Heidegger's critique of technology and liberal democracy in the thought of Popper. This debate appeared between Ahmed Fardid and Reza Davari on the one hand and Soroush, on the other hand and the intellectual controversy of these three thinkers was effective in the fate of philosophical thinking and political polarization in Iran. Fardid and later Davari believed that Soroush's thinking basically (affected by Popper) cannot be revolutionary and this distance between his liberal opinion and revolutionary action can be dangerous. Davari after Fardid was the most important critic of western modernity and by referring to Heidegger's ideas of technology critique, criticized the intellectual foundations of modernity and nature of the west and studied the relation between tradition and modernity. Soroush was also influenced by analytic philosophy and Popper and in responding to Davari, he accused Davari to be a justifier of violence, pressure theorist and etc. Soroush grew in Iran's religion political structure on the one hand and in the intellectual, cultural and social space of modernity on the other hand. He received a deep religious education, then graduated in the field of pharmacy and moved to England for studying analytical chemistry. He went on to the philosophy of science and analytical philosophy in England and became familiar with Popper's philosophy of science and logical and epistemology accuracies of analytical philosophy (For further reading, Hashemi, 2007). So, he became familiar with the Islamic, Western and modernity concepts and influenced by them, he wrote a text, in which linked the religious ideas with the modernity.

On the one hand, Davari was also developed in the political, religious space of Iran and on the other hand, he influenced by structure of modernity and the West. In addition to learning religious sciences, he went to Tehran University and learned philosophy and became familiar with the Husserl, Heidegger and Sartre's thoughts with the Fardid's class. So, influenced by religion-political structure and in encountering with modernity and following Heidegger's and Fardid's ideas, he wrote a text and his aim was west conflict and dealing with the subjectivity and modernity.

### **SOROUSH AND DAVARI EXPLAINED THEIR THOUGHT INFLUENCED BY CONTINENTAL AND ANALYTICAL PHILOSOPHY.**

Continental philosophy is a collection of philosophical traditions in the 19th and 20th centuries in Europe that was applied to refer scholars' area and traditions outside of analytic movement. Analytical philosophy is also an Academic philosophy dominating the universities in English-speaking countries and its main founders were Bertrand Russell and George Moore that were influenced by Gottlob Frege. Bochenski believed that "analytic philosophy is more or less naturalistic, scientists oriented to materialism and finally, rationalists" (Bochenski.2000.34). Therefore, they considered science as the only valid knowledge and emphasized on the data of the senses. According to them, it is possible to reach the justified beliefs about the world only through observation and tests. They knew the mind passive and believed that everything comes from outside and recognition is the reflection of the outside and does not need understanding and interpretation and their emphasis is on scientific language. So, their aim is a careful and logical study of concepts and opposition to metaphysicism. But, according to Critchley "Continental philosophy is a reality that a large part of it is the reaction to understanding crisis in the modern world and trying to reach a critical awareness of the present time in order to be free." (Critchley, 2008, 106). Continental philosophy emphasizes on tradition and the historical nature of philosophy that is called the historicity (Ibid. 93). Continental philosophers are anti-scientism and critic of science and their reason for criticism and opposition is that the natural science pattern cannot be the pattern of philosophical method and natural science cannot open an orifice for entering humans to the universe, and philosophy of science scurry cannot view the role of science and technology in the human alienation of the world. (To study, ibid. 62 ff). Therefore, the contrast between analytic and continental philosophy is a dispute among scientific and hermeneutic perception of the world. Karl Raimund Popper and Heidegger are the one of famous thinkers of the analytical and continental philosophers. Popper discourse was since the beginning of differentiation between scientific knowledge and theories of metaphysics. The criterion of scientific status of its theory is on its refutability or testability. According to him, science and knowledge progress through the rejection and criticism. He believes that falsification should be the distinction between the experimental cases from non-experimental ones and the criterion for differentiating science from pseudoscience. There are guessing in the evolution of science, in order to explain things, and then those guessing will be exposed to refutation through testing. The growth of science is the product of their comments critique and their refutation (Popper .1990.s 47). Hence, scientific knowledge has an uncertain and speculative nature. In general, from Popper's point of view, science is an evolutionary process, and progresses as a result of responding to the problems. With scientific and philosophical perspective, Popper defended liberalism and democracy, and following up the uncertainty principle in physics and philosophy, emphasized on the historic freedom thought from the laws and unpredictability of future. Popper's political and social views appeared from his epistemological theory. In his opinion, the principles of rational criticism, which is used for scientific and metaphysical theories, must be used with the same size, in terms of political and social theory. Based on his methodological philosophy, the best way to achieve a better society is the gradual resolution of problems in the society. As progress requires constant critique of science, the development and

growth path in politics and society is the freedom to criticize and make changes, based on them. However, Heidegger's problem is the Western contemporary man and his initial attempt is finding the answer to the question of existence in this regard, because in his opinion, existence is forgotten (Khatami, 2005, 41). Heidegger used the phenomenological method, to find the answer to the question of existence, and understanding the existence (ibid. 42).

According to Heidegger, we do not need to understand the thoughtful essence as the main topic like Descartes, or consider it as a unifying factor and necessary condition of knowledge like Kant, because they are all based on the knowledge principle of the subject-object. If the Phenomenology is the ontology method, we ignore this separation. According to Heidegger, instead of talking about "I" in the world, we should talk about (in-the-world-), as a unified matter. Heidegger called this unit matter as a human (Dasein). This search, for Heidegger, began with the destruction of traditional concepts and the traditional concept of the world. The main problem of Heidegger is the Western contemporary humanitarian crisis and this crisis is rooted in the philosophical thought of the West and civilization and the advent of a new era of science and technology. This crisis has two dimensions, homeless people, which mean the separation of man and the world, as well as nihilism. Heidegger sought the solutions to this crisis, beyond philosophy and new science, in poetry and art (ibid. 13). To find ways of salvation and against Descartes' plan, Heidegger showed that man, by nature, interested in the world and homelessness destroys man. Then, he tried to explain the world that is man's essence against nihilism (ibid. 13). In Iran, the ideas of Heidegger were taken into consideration because of its root analysis and since Iran society has been attacked by Western culture and civilization for 150 years, this analysis as well as Poppers' ideas and analytical philosophy were important for Iran thinkers, and Soroush and Davari are including these thinkers.

Soroush and Davari influenced by the analytical and continental philosophy, created two main flows of thinking in Iran. Their method, which means the scientific, cancellation oriented, wisdom-oriented, and critical method of Soroush, versus history believer, philosophically-based, anti-rationalist oriented and anti-logic oriented methods of Davari were the first distinctions of these two people. Soroush considered Popper's flexible and flowing approach toward the new probabilism science more compatible with the politics and society principles than the old absolutist philosophy. He considered the concept of Popper's probable cancellation as the foundation of valid modern science (Soroush, 1982, 132). Soroush followed Popper and believed that the method of the natural sciences can also be used in the humanities and social sciences and defended the humanities science (Soroush, 2001. 191). He agreed with science as a social structure, and expanded it to the social sciences, and believed, "what are the product of public understanding and critique, and the sense that gives scientific meaning to the words in the custom of a society create science" (ibid. 178). In general, Soroush showed a lot of attention to a category, such as science, and by analytical philosophers' approach, in particular, Popper, studied categories of history, religion, freedom, science, democracy and politics. But Davari followed from the history believer and philosophy-based way and believed, "If a man does not know his situation and is an alien with the time, he is caught with destining history. Destining history is our thoughts and words and deeds. Each of us, human beings, lives in a city and usually thinks and acts in harmony with others and with the consent of society's system. This harmony and approval is destining." (Davari 1999. 5). Davari influenced by Heidegger, against Popper and his followers, defended the philosophy and considered it as a kind of thinking and believed, "Philosophy could defend itself when its existence was clear, but when it became educational and new educational religions, the defense of philosophy was no longer possible and with the genesis of these philosophies, thinking and defending the thought was almost finished and philosophy became the technological" (Davari, 1984. 106 and 107). Davari

criticized the modern and the new logic that critique philosophy and thought with the name of logic, and rejected the thinking and philosophy critique by the modern and shallow rationality, defended the philosophy and thinking, and considered the reputation of individuals, such as Russell, Carnap and Popper in their opposition with philosophy. He considered the opposition of the West with philosophy in conflict with the thinking and considered the new logics opposite the philosophy. (Ibid. 26) In Davari's interpretation of Heidegger, the new science is a kind of metaphysics and metaphysics has reached integrity in modern science. It is a science that its category can be called credit science idiomatically. In fact, the modern science is not a general and theoretical science and although it is mathematical, but this case does not require the new science to be true and general, but the credit modern science is due to this prestige (Davari, 1984. 107). Davari considered the modern science valid because it can measure the nature and seize on it; otherwise, he knew it with no general meaning. Soroush and Davari expressed their views on society, politics, religion, science, technology, West and techniques based on these premises.

Davari influenced by the totality belief, considered the West as a totality that began about 400 years ago in Europe. For Davari, West is not only a political being, but also one nature or essence. He considered the West as "a flowing spirit, a released flow of spirit among the people, not the whole thing in the Western world" (Davari, 2007 b, 1). He considered it more flowing in the technique (ibid. 2). Davari considered the West as a history with a specific term means or culture, and he knew it the world that appeared and realized in new life and civilizations. He considered the West as the condition for the emergence of science, technique, politics and new literature of countries that are called Western and in this sense, he knew the West as a whole. On the other hand, under the influence of Heidegger, he considered the West based on sensuality (humanity believes) and considered sensuality as, "the human condition, which is independent, and acts based on wisdom" (Davari. 2010, 74). He blamed the West due to the abandonment of metaphysical philosophy, and said: this philosophy, which the ancient Greeks created and reached its peak in the ideas of Hegel and Nietzsche, and now, it depended on the method of science and Descartes's philosophy and declined to a string of natural and social sciences. In contrast, Soroush considered the pervasive thoughts of Davari about the West, as a Hegelian's structure, and rejected it as a discredited history believed force (Soroush, 1993, 236). Soroush, followed the teachings of Popper and believed that the West is not an integrated whole, with distinct cultural and intellectual boundaries. He divided the West into various aspects, and considered different rules for each, and believed, "If we look with open eyes, we will see the diffraction and various parts of the West, along with the unity of its validity." (Ibid.235.). Soroush considered a West stroke in the sense of Hegel and Heidegger, as the creature of imagination, not a true case, and believed, "All that come from the West is a piece and point, literary and traditional, technical and practical, intellectual and philosophy of that land and it should not consider that the spirit of West Satan is infiltrated in the body of work and thought that with the purchase of each piece, we bought the spirit" (ibid.) Soroush, in contrast to Davari, did not consider whatever comes from the West necessarily corrupt and believed that human beings can accept the ideas, policy science and technology of the West, without hurting himself. For Soroush, the problem of dealing with the West was not the condemnation or give up, but it was the analysis and feeding from each other.

Regarding the technique and technology, following Heidegger, Davari did not consider them as a collection of objects and tools, but he considered them as the nature and way of thinking, which dominated the world (Davari, Where is the thinking tryst? Work and development, No. 1, 35) According to him, the technology did not make the people as its master, but it made them its obedient. Davari considered the technology related to human's capture and power seeker temper and considered the emergence of new technology related to me or us that formed with

the philosophy of Descartes and the Science of Galilean (Davari. 2007, A, 85). Regarding the technique, Soroush considered the technique, essentially, greedy, supremacist, causing competition and causing balance, but for now, he does not consider non-industrial life and incorporated with modern techniques of relationships imaginable. So, on the one hand, he considered setting up collective, human and non-industrial life, impossible and on the other hand, he believed that the technique cannot solve its inherent problem. So, he suggested contentment and simplicity to solve the technical problems (Soroush, 1993.312).

Other discussion of Soroush and Davari is their Theological debate. Soroush influenced by the cancellation and the development of science, as well as the use of the natural sciences for social sciences in Popper's thinking and the logic of analytical philosophy language, and discussed Theological issues. From Popper's perspective, theories, including science will be created during the evolution processes, and scientific knowledge has an uncertain and speculative nature. No scientific theory can be completely true and actual. (For the study of Bashiriyeh, 2000, 61 to 66) Affected by such theories, Soroush studied the discussion of the religious understanding evolution, expansion and contraction of the law and dynamic jurisprudence and believed, "No written text shows its meaning. It is the mind of linguistics, which finds the meaning in it. Hungry phrases are meanings not expecting them.... Similarly, the meaning of the phenomena of the world is not written on them. Someone must know the language of the world, so that he could read and understand them. The science and philosophy teach this language to the man learns and these languages are not stagnant and perfect, but they are in continuous transformation." (Soroush, 2003. 192) Accordingly, Soroush argued that our understanding of the world is from the sense of history. Social and humanitarian institutions have the flowing existence, rather than have fixed nature and, accordingly, he distinguished between religion and human knowledge. According to Soroush, sending the religion is from the God and its understanding is with us and here the religious knowledge, which is fully human, will be born. "We are all dealing with religious knowledge, which relates to religion, and it is about it, but it is not the religion and this rule is ongoing in all of human knowledge." (Ibid. 53) After accepting the separation of religion from religious knowledge, Soroush considered religious knowledge in relation with other human knowledge: "religious knowledge is a consumer and direct knowledge under the influence of producer knowledge, and it must be said, first of all, there is no understanding of religion that is not dependent on knowledge and outer understanding of the religion. Second, if the outer understandings of religion evolve, religious understandings change, and if they have stability, will remain stable, and Third, outer understandings are the evolver" (Ibid .347). Soroush considered the principle that every religious understanding is based on outer understanding, as a falsifiable principle, which means he says there is no sample of religious understanding in the Book and tradition that does not need external ideas for understanding it and... Finding such a case does not end to the cancellation of that principle. Based on the theory of contraction and expansion and the evolution of knowledge and religious knowledge, Soroush believed that this distinction between understanding and religious understanding permits the Muslims to create reconciliation between the eternal and holy on the one hand, and unholy and variable on the other hand, which will result in the revival of Islam and coordination between Islam and the modern era. Then, he reached a kind of religious pluralism, and believed, "our understanding of religious texts is necessarily varied and diverse, and this diversity cannot turn into a single understanding, and not only is it varied and diverse, but also flowing" (Soroush, 1998, 2 and 4). Based on the theoretical concepts, Soroush considered the dynamic jurisprudence against the traditional law and according to him; only dynamic jurisprudence can offer solutions to solve some practical problems, in the face of modernity (Soroush. 51, 2000). Soroush claimed that the jurisprudence, as a human science is interpretable and theoretical. Since, science and philosophy are constantly developing, understanding religion must be the same way. Soroush

concluded, since a philosophy and natural science are always unfinished and in search of perfection, jurisprudential theory is partial and temporary.

In contrast, Reza Davari, under the influence of Heidegger and in defense of tradition, defended traditional and religion jurisprudence. The metaphysical view distinct and considers the ontologique more original than scientific view and Ontique (Dolacompany, 2001. 286). Davari influenced by this view, and criticized the supporters of Popper, Soroush and people who, evaluated and criticized the traditional and religious jurisprudence according to a new scientific method, and believed that, if they observe and interpret the religion with scientific method and new wisdom, religion turns into a set of virtues and information, apart from the world of religion, and this is not the rehabilitation and reformation of religion. Davari criticized the critics of traditional Islamic jurisprudence, and fans of dynamic jurisprudence, and considered their subject as a political posturing (Davari, 1999. 299). Davari knew the dynamic jurisprudence as an Islamic jurisprudence that is adapted with the new wisdom, and asked the fans of dynamic jurisprudence, "Is the reason enough for you? Is it possible to change the appearance of religion by referring to the appearance of western culture, and call it the name of revival of religion" (Davari, 2010, 207). In defense of traditional jurisprudence, He said, "In our time, that the evolution of return to religious thinking happened, we should seek the real religiosity and if we say, the current world needs religion, first and foremost, it needs religious principles and fulfill them" (Ibid, 2010. 228). Then, he said, "it is not necessary to capture in principle and change the inferred resource... and for the identification and designation of rules topic are the experts' responsibility, entering the new principles into jurisprudence technique principles cannot be done without the opinion of jurisprudence scholars" (Ibid.299). Finally, in criticizing the fans of dynamic jurisprudence, Davari considered the dynamic jurisprudence that is adapted with the new intellect, the intellect that interprets religion and considered the issues of metaphysics without meaning (ibid. 307).

Political philosophy is another discussion of Davari and Soroush, which led to their differentiation, and included the concepts of development, human rights, and freedom, civil society, democracy, politics and philosophy, reason and politics and the religious democratic governance. Davari influenced by Heidegger, and considered many of these concepts as the result of rational new world, and criticized them. However, Soroush followed liberal thinkers, and the theories of Popper and rationalism of the modern era and liberal thinkers such as Locke, Rousseau and Izaberlin, accepted many of these concepts and tried to compatible these concepts with the Iranian community. Regarding the concept of freedom, Davari considered freedom as a component of human nature, and considered it different from permissibility, and criticized thinkers such as Popper that promoted freedom in the sense of permissibility (ibid. 481). However, he considered the new period freedom as a dignity of liberalism that though, was inconsistent with the old form of tyranny, but it was not antagonism with any form of tyranny. (Ibid. 482) He considered the new freedom in reaching the Western wisdom and following it. Davari considered the new West's freedom as a freedom, in which the human sees himself as a creature that wants everything to be under his control and ownership and becomes the foundation of everything and establishing universe. He knew the emergence of a new freedom in contrast to the political science and new technology and considered the source of all in one place. Finally, Davari knew the real freedom in pain and struggle and considered it along with the discovery of the truth and its realization (Ibid. 492). But, in the freedom debate, Soroush examined the freedom, in the form of three topics of limited freedom, fair freedom, and freedom, such as a method. On the discussion of limited freedom, he knew freedom, like any other blessings that has many dimensions and restrictions and considered the unlimited freedom indecent and considered two types of look to the freedom: means look, right look.

In the right look, he considered freedom such as right and fair and the achievements of the New World. In the fair freedom discussion, Soroush knew the freedom as a part of justice, and the only thing that restricts freedom is justice, and he considered inner freedom different from the freedom from vices. He knew it a political freedom that was not in previous literature and it was relative to justice. He divided the fair freedom into two types of positive and negative or Az and Dar, to comply with Isaiah Berlin, and considered Az freedom a kind of freedom and Dar freedom in being your own master (Soroush.2000. 219). In the discussion of freedom, Soroush knew freedom as a way to understand and recognize and learn (Ibid. 219). In the discussion of liberalism, compared with Davari, who knew the new freedom as a form of liberalism that made human the owner and proprietor of everything, Soroush divided liberalism, on three sides of the economic, political and epistemic and knew it the doctrine of freedom (Soroush.90.2001).

Davari considered development and modernization as historical affairs, and he knew development as the continuation of modernization. He knew development as the modernity development and modernity as an adventure that emerged in the West and the concept of development emerged in the West for not a long time, and it means the expansion of life and civilization of the West (Davari 7.2005). However, Davari considered the issue of development and the development of science and technology as fundamental issues, that although they are the product of the new era and the era of human sensuality and misanthropic, but there is no way other than that. ( Ganji. 1996. 157)

Regarding the relationship between philosophy and policies, Davari knew them dependent to each other from the beginning of the history of philosophy, but he knew the level of philosophy in a wider level (Davari, 2004. 102). Davari considered the political system, arising from the cosmos that is disturbed with the coming of the modern world. He knew this rupture as the result of two factors in establishing a new relationship between philosophy and politics in the new era and mixing them, and the other in creating chaos in the language and context for misunderstandings. Davari knew philosophy as the basis of politics, but rejected mixing philosophy and politics and showing plans and political purposes in the form of philosophy, and considered individuals, such as Popper and Huntington, people that carry out such actions and in the end, he believed that philosophy should not be a policy instrument and if it becomes the one, it will be unfounded (ibid. 102 to 114). Davari considered the distinction between the wisdom of the policy, and intellect in the old era and wisdom in the new era. He knew the new wisdom as the self-attribute and sensuality effect and knew rationality as a system that people will be in it and benefit from it. He considered politics and the new political and intellectual system as a manifestation of the modern world intellectual system (For the study of Davari. 2010, 124). Davari did not know the political issues of the new world solvable only through politics, but he believed that, for politics, we should ask from the thinking and wisdom for help. He knew politicization as giving originality to political power. (Davari. 144.2007) He knew the thought and culture as the political wisdom support and criticized the matter that thinking and philosophy have been affected by the policy, and knew this new policy influenced by the new philosophy of the West.

Religious democratic governance is another political discourse of Soroush that faith plays an important role in it. According to him, faith belongs to the people, and the people's faith is possible, when they are free in the election. As a result, faith and freedom form the basis of democracy. Soroush considered the difference between religion and liberal democracy. He knew the foundation of liberal democracy in pluralism and religious democracy in freedom of faith. (Soroush, Tolerant and management, Kian, Year 4.No 21) Soroush tried to connect between democracy, the principles of religion and morality. So, he considered the morality as

the best support for democracy and its guarantee (Soroush, 330, 1997). According to Soroush, religions that are the moral support are the best guarantee for democracy's survival (ibid. 329).

Finally, it must be borne in mind that, Davari and Soroush revised somewhat in their recent thinking, and became closer to each other. Davari believed that, we are connected to community issues, such as development, science and technology, and development is a historical matter, and we cannot oppose with it (Davari, 2005, 14). In contrast, Soroush became far away from his initial thoughts to some extent, and turned into the issues of modernity. Soroush founded his political and social views in this period, based on his scientific methodology, and he changed the subject from the discourse between East and West, and started the tradition and modernity discourse. During this period, Soroush knew many of the modern world concepts showing the rationality of the modern era, which is the requirement of this period. During this period, He knew the most important event and milestone in human history in secrecy, followed by Max Weber (Soroush. 5.2000).

### CONCLUSION

in contemporary Iran influenced by the structures of the modern world was formed many intellectual debates. The most important debates was the debates between Popper and Heidegger fans. The most important representatives of these two flows of thought were Soroush and Davari that influenced by analytical and continental philosophical flows and could start major intellectual discussions in Iran society. Through their intellectual discussions, two discourses were formed in Iran that were able to effect on the formation of political and religious social and secular flows in Iranian society. Davari sought to defend philosophy with religious and identity interests and influenced by Heidegger and continental philosophy and oppose to the Logicism, Scientologist and applying anti-Enlightenment pre-assumptions about society, politics, religion, science, and also anti-West, and religious positioning against subjectivity. Soroush sought the compatibility of religion with modernity, consciously by religious affiliations and influenced by Popper's philosophy science, logical and epistemology accuracies of analytical philosophy and liberalism. These two discussions began with the dispute from the beginning and reached its peak and each one proposed a lot theoretical debates. But it seems that they became closer in recent times and reached common points and the common point is that our problem is not a geographical part of the Western world, we are faced with a period in human history that has features. Davari knew the fundamental issues of society in the development, science and technology, and Soroush also believed that when we consider the epistemic system and intellectual dominant paradigm, and measure the kinship of the concepts, we never make any mistakes to impose and compatible one of the discourse over another discourse.

### References

- Bvkhnsky .a.m.( 2000). Contemporary European philosophy, translation Sharaf al-Khorasani, cultural, scientific publications.
- Bashiriyeh, Hossein.( 2000). Liberalism and conservatism. Tehran. ney Publishing.
- Dola Kampany, Christine. (2001). History of philosophy in the 20th century, translations Bagher Parham, Tehran, Agah, first published.
- Popper, Karl. (1984). Conjectures and refutations. Translated by Ahmad aaram. Tehran . Khwarizmi.
- \_\_\_\_\_.(1971).Logic of Scientific Discovery. Translator Hossein Kamali .thran cultural and scientific publications.
- \_\_\_\_\_.(1975).Poverty of Historicism. Translated by Ahmad Arram. Tehran . Khwarizmi.
- Khatmi, Mahmoud.( 2005)world in Heidegger,s Thought. Tehran . Contemporary thought.



Reza Davari Ardakani, (1995). What is Philosophy? Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies, Tehran .

\_\_\_\_\_.(2007).About the science, Hermes, Second Edition, A.

\_\_\_\_\_.(2010).Philosophy trapped in ideology, Tehran, international publishing, Second Edition.

\_\_\_\_\_.(2007).About the West, Hermes, Second Edition, B.

\_\_\_\_\_.(1999).Culture, reason and freedom, Saghi publication, first published in.

\_\_\_\_\_.(2005).Treatises of tradition and modernity, Saghi publication, first published.

\_\_\_\_\_.(2005).We and the difficult path of modernity, Saghi publication, first published.

\_\_\_\_\_.(2004).Philosophy and contemporary man, R & D Institute of Humanities.

\_\_\_\_\_.(2010).Politics, history and thought, Saghi publishing, Third Edition.

\_\_\_\_\_ Where is tryst? Work and development .No 1.

Sejuik, Peter.(2009). Descartes to Derrida. A review on European philosophy. Mohammad Reza Akhund Zadeh . Ney publishing.

-Soroush abdolkarim.(1977).What is science, What is Philosophy? Tehran, Thirteenth Edition,serat publishing.

\_\_\_\_\_.(1982).Critique and introduction on dialectical contradiction, Tehran, Third Edition, University Complex.

\_\_\_\_\_.(1993).Outing Production, Tehran, Fifth Edition, Serat.

\_\_\_\_\_.(2003).Theoretical Contraction and Expansion of Law, Cultural Institute of Serat, Eighth Edition.

\_\_\_\_\_.(1998).Direct paths, Second Edition, Cultural Institute of Seart, September.

\_\_\_\_\_.(2000).Prophetic experience expansion, Serat Institute, Third Edition.

\_\_\_\_\_.(2000).The custom of helping and religiosity city, Serat Institute, first edition.

\_\_\_\_\_.(2001).Conducts of gods, the New Deal, Third Edition.

\_\_\_\_\_.(1997).Toleration and management, Tehran, first printing, Sirat.

\_\_\_\_\_.(2000). Enlightenment, secrecy and religiosity. Tehran, Fifth Edition, Serat.

Ganji, Akbar. Tradition, modernity, postmodern. Tehran, Serat, first edition, 1996.

Krichley, Simon.(2008) Continental philosophy, translations Khashayar Deyhimi, Tehran, Mahi publishing.

Hashemi, Mohammed Mansour,(2007) modern religion thinkers, Tehran, desert, Second Edition.

Heidegger, Martin. (1998) philosophy of technology, Translation Shapur Etemad, Markaz publishing.