

Globalization and Iranian identity (relying on the ideas of Dariush Shayegan)

Habib Ollah Fazeli

Assistant Professor of Political Sciences,
University of Tehran

Meysam Nazari

M.A. in Political Science,
University of Tehran

ABSTRACT

Dariush Shayegan, as one of the most prominent Iranian scholars in the last five decades, is known as “cultural theorist” due to the cultural nature of his philosophical thoughts. The influence of his theories about identity and cultural confrontations, between traditional civilizations and modernity is global and has associated his name with the idea of “dialogue of civilizations”. Shayegan’s works could be divided to, and examined within, two categories of the early and the later Shayegan. To discuss his thoughts and ideas about identity, the early Shayegan relies on the East/West dialogue and puts emphasis on the genuine identities of traditional civilizations confronting modernity and the Western civilization. However, through taking a different and critical approach, the later Shayegan examines the concept of identity in traditional societies as well as the multilayered and bricolage identity of the modern humankind. The present paper is to discuss the later Shayegan’s critiques on the notion of search for vernacular identity as well as his definition of the relationship between identity and the phenomenon of globalization. From a theoretical perspective, the paper relies on Shayegan’s support of the multiple-layered identity of the modern human and his reject of blind search for identity in a globalized world. Moreover, the paper addresses the idea of bricolage identity that encompasses the epistemic efforts of the later Shayegan.

Key words: Culture, tradition, modernity, traditional identity, bricolage identity

INTRODUCTION

The impacts of modernity include substantial and basic changes in cultural, economic, political, social and scientific fields, as well as new life styles that are incompatible with the traditional ones. As a matter of fact, the modern life is defined by rejecting and denying all aspects of tradition. “Modernity, defined as simple as possible, is a huge transition from traditional to modern style” (Jahanbegloo, 2005: 42). Unlike traditional life style which is based on stillness and repetitive patterns and concepts, modern life style is characterized by constant changes, plurality and mutations. The achievements of the new world and modifications of life styles have resulted in formation of pluralistic and diverse ambience shared by all societies and cultures. As the result of this diversity and pluralism, the public sphere, which once belonged to some exclusive identities, has turned to an inclusive arena that consists of different cultures and identities and where all the involving contributors gain advantages from this participation (constituting and implementing the new world). “The word Pluralization is the synopsis of the main characteristics of a worldwide developing process (globalization)” (Rajaei, 2001:13). It should be considered that this public and plural ambience is a suitable context for “multicultural” and “multi-voiced” patterns and not rigid and exclusive old ideas. Relying on this multicultural and multi-voiced world, Dariush Shayegan, the prominent Iranian thinker,

works on communications among different cultures and identities. Dariush Shayegan, is one of the few Iranian scholars whose philosophical thoughts and notions have influenced epistemic spaces beyond Iran. Shayegan's name is associated with the idea of "dialogue of civilizations" that earned him "The Global Dialogue Prize", in 2009, to appreciate his lifetime advocacy for establishing understanding and dialogue among different cultures and civilizations (1). His efforts for creating the culture of correlation, understanding and dialogue among all different identities and epistemic blocs extends back to the time that he was appointed as the head of 'Iranian Center for Dialogue of Cultures' (2) in 1976 to the time when he came up with the idea of 'bricolage identity'. The latter notion is based on the coexistence of different cultures, civilizations and ontologies. Pivotal to Shayegan's episteme is the intercultural issues and dialogue among different cultures. This is what has earned him the title of "the cultural theorist" among scholars. Shayegan's ideas on culture and identity could be discussed under two periods of the early Shayegan and the later Shaygan. The early Shayegan examines the challenges and crises of a pure and genuine identity confronting modernity and the modern world. However, the later Shayegan, scrutinizes the search for a vernacular identity through a critical perspective while at the same time discusses the multi-layered identity of the modern human being in this diverse and plural world. This paper is to examine the later Shayegan's critiques of the search for vernacular identity in a globalized world as well as his definition of identity in relation to globalization.

- 1- To appreciate their efforts for promoting dialogues and exchanges of cultures and civilizations, this prize was awarded to Dariush Shayegan and Seyyed Mohammad Khatami, Iran president during reform era, in Denmark in 2009.
- 2- This center was funded in 1976 and aimed at familiarizing Iran civilization with the Western and other Asian civilizations. Well-known thinkers such as Henry Corbin, Toshihiko Izutsu, Roge Garodi, Philippe Nemo, Anvar Abdolmalek and... participated in the summit held by the center in 1977.

THE MODERN COUNTER-ENLIGHTENMENT (CRITIQUE OF BLIND SEARCH FOR IDENTITY)

Identity, as a challenging term that discusses our being, is more meaningful and clarified while juxtaposed to the other. "The other with any form and shape, emerging from any origin and root, is always present in the horizon of human's thought. This presence broadens human's narrow ideological perspective and elevates his familiar paradigms to higher levels" (Shayegan, 2014: 344). The confrontation of traditional societies and specifically Iranian civilization with the phenomenon of modernity and the modern West brought up questions about identity and being. The challenge encouraged many thinkers in such societies to examine and discuss these basic and significant issues. According to Dariush Shayegan, who has worked on these challenging topics, discussing identity and magnificent historical heritage should not result in retrogression, isolation or detachment. In other words, search for identity should not be perceived as a blind rejection of the others or denying them. The old approach towards traditional cultures that encouraged retrogression and isolation, as observed by Shayegan, is the modern counter-Enlightenment. As such, and to avoid any deviation, Shayegan asks traditional culturists to take a critical and analytical insight towards a proper perception and understanding of the past and historical heritages of these cultures. He also asks for a realistic view and insight about modernity and the West. In line with this view, he states that realistic attitudes towards our past and cultural heritage, as well as a proper perception of the dynamic Western system of thoughts, are dependents of an analytical and critical perspective. Without this perspective we would go astray and entrapped in isolation, retrogression and bigotry. Applying a critical and analytical paradigm in traditional societies contributes to a rational perspective that is based on the realities of both traditional and modern aspects of life. Through this perspective, traditional and modern subjects would be analyzed within their specific cultural context without being intermingled. Shayegan elaborates this as "putting

general constructive subjects of a culture together and finding the links that connect concepts amidst a chain of connections” (Shayegan 2014: 277). Conforming to this notion, Shayegan believes that analyzing and studying subjects and debates, whether from modern thoughts and civilization or the traditional life, in their own specific cultural context, would save us from distraction, wandering, confusion and incomprehensible talking. Moreover, and in the same way, the resulting sensible perception and insight would restrict the emergence of the threatening phenomenon of “modern counter-Enlightenment”. Modern counter-Enlightenment, as believed by Shayegan is “resubmerging in a kind of ignorance, rooted in kind of nostalgia, apprehends itself as right and wise. It’s an Oriental Westernization” (Shayegan, 2013: 281). Elsewhere, Shayegan reminds that: “any form of retrogression, with no critical analysis of the past is dangerous and could end in deviation” (Shayegan, 2014: 152).

IDENTITY CRISIS AND MENTAL AND CULTURAL DISTORTIONS

Taking a critical and analytical approach to the conflicts between tradition and modernity, Shayegan examines those problems of traditional cultures that are caused by the absence of a peaceful coexistence between these incompatible ideologies. “Non-Western civilizations are dwelling in an age of two epistemic paradigms: the first is inherent to these civilizations but the second is the result of great scientific revolutions (Shayegan: 2014/b, 273). The incompatibility and heterogeneousness of these two paradigms (traditional and modern) has resulted in problems that are studied in the scope of distortions by Shayegan. Distortions are challenges and confrontations between two epistemological paradigms that cause concepts to lose their original meaning and turn to unrealistic crooked images... modern concepts would lose their meaning and purpose within traditional frameworks if cultural differences and historical gaps are not appreciated. In the same manner, modern mirrors would reflect artificial and superficial images of traditional indications (Hashemi, 2014/b: pp 18-19). To discuss these distortions, Shayegan employs the concept of grafting. “Grafting can work in either of two opposed ways...either a new (modern) discourse can be grafted onto an old content, or an old (traditional) discourse can be grafted onto a new base. In the first case the result may be called Westernization (giving the links between modernity and the West and the second to traditionalizing” (Shayegan: 2014/b: 225). Taking a critical perspective, Shayegan examines cultural and epistemic distortions in non-Western societies caused by the conflicts of two heterogeneous paradigms on two individual and political levels. While on the individual level, the distortions appear as “cultural schizophrenia” on the political level, as remarked by Shayegan, they are presented as “false consciousness”.

A: cultural schizophrenia (Individual level)

Shayegan’s profound knowledge about the West and the East ideologies provides him with a legitimate context to study and analyze the social-political stance of non-western societies as well as the In-between status of the traditional individual who is constantly pulled between the two modern and traditional life styles and standards. As observed by him “we are situated on the fault-line between incompatible worlds between two heterogeneous paradigms...in this conflicting situation the two paradigms meet and ,like two reflecting screens face to face, disfigure each other by disintegrating their mutual images” (Shayegan, 2014/a: 220). Though the outer world of the traditional man (influenced by the process of globalization) is constantly changing, his internal world is still inspired by his poetic- mythical insight. One consequence of this contradiction is distorted thoughts and confused social stance of traditional culturists which is addressed by Shayegan by borrowing the term ‘schizophrenia’ from psychology. “The presence of these two incompatible tendencies within a single person brings up a situation near to what is known as dissociative personality” (Shayegan, 2014/a: 81). This is what Shayegan defines as “cultural schizophrenia” and elaborates as: “This issue can only be addressed and analyzed by those who have been raised in cultures like what we have lived in.

While it's about death, nobody can die on behalf of others. Similarly, those who have lived outside our civilization cannot wholeheartedly experience the presence of such a gap in their conscious. In other words this duality is our unique and non-transferable fate" (Shayegan, 2014/b: pp257-258). To discuss Shayegan's notion of cultural schizophrenia in more details Hashemi (2014/b: 18) states: "Cultural schizophrenia describes people who are trapped between tradition and modernity...the symptoms of this disorder appear as a sick attachment to, or hatred of, tradition and the past. It shows itself as extreme fascination by the modern culture or loathing it and in a nutshell causes dual stances such as simultaneous appraising and fighting tradition, westernization and anti- westernization and etc. The origin and source of this cultural and epistemic dissociation and bewilderment, according to Shayegan, lies in several factors such as different historic characteristics, heterogeneous development of ideas, the static culture of traditional societies versus the dynamic Western culture, different thought style, totalistic views of traditional culturists, as opposed to the detail- oriented modern individual, and etc. Based on tradition and modernity discrepancy, Shayegan points to the constant struggle between influential new ideas and stubborn old thoughts that we are witnessing since our traditional world has encountered modern ideas and thoughts. The intelligentsias of non-Western societies dwell in a suspended and In-between space; neither are they profoundly attached to their vernacular origins and memories, nor have they become familiar with the modern world. Shayegan defines this situation as 'neither this nor that' and regards it a suitable context for all forms of mingling between new and old ideas and concepts. "We are trapped between ideas that fall apart due to unfavorable conditions and old perspectives that become fixated as the result of their discrepancy with reality" (Shayegan, 2014/b: 265). As such, Shayegan regards cultural schizophrenia a reasonable description for such a situation where old and new ideas are entrapped by the entangled conflicts between tradition and modernity. In line with this he remarks: "Beyond defining our particular current conditions, cultural schizophrenia is a network of symbols we receive from several sources including life, school, politics and the baffling wrong decisions we make on a daily basis" (Shayegan 2014/b: 265).

b- Ideologization of Tradition (political level)

After discussing contradictions of two traditional and modern worlds on the individual level through the concept of cultural schizophrenia, Dariush Shayegan takes the argument to the political level and scrutinizes the challenges of the traditional cultures by relying on the concepts of 'unconscious Westernization' and 'ideologizing of tradition'. 'Unconscious westernization', which defines the baffling ambience, caused by conflicts between tradition and modernity, is coined by Shayegan as another term of his epistemic terminology. Westernization, as discussed by the early Shayegan, was considered as ignorance and unawareness about the true nature of Western epistemology. The notion of unconscious Westernization, brought up by the later Shayegan, is clarified as: "an unconscious stance that molds us into perceptive forms with no knowledge about their infrastructure. This stance, which creates an inevitable gap between form and content, resembles being unaware of the eyeglasses we are wearing" (Shayegan, 2014/a: 232). "An example of this version of Westernization, known as unconscious Westernization is an individual who, unaware of the western origin of his beliefs, tries to save and restore the Tradition he believes in through practicing the same westernized theories that he disapproves" (Dabbagh, 2011: 22). The mind that is nourished by two incompatible ideologies, and is unable to differentiate the two, creates a fusion of contradictory ideas by mixing different terms and concepts borrowed from both ideologies. "One social aspect of this unconscious Westernization is 'ideologization of Tradition' as called by Shayegan. The concept is significant to the analysis of many phenomena in countries that are on the margin of modernity" (Hashemi, 2014/b: 20).

Ideology as a term was first used by Destutt de Tracy, the French scholar. The function of ideologies in our time, according to Shayegan, “is similar to the role of myths in the ancient world; from one hand, they fill and satisfy the collective mind and spirit with an image of a restricted society while on the other hand they claim to be scientific and in accordance with experiment and reality” (Shayegan, 2014: 193). Ideologies, as stated by Shayegan, would not thrive in two contexts: the society that sanctifies the Tradition and the society that is run by philosophers. The best time for ideology to flaunt, according to Shayegan, is when these two societies are falling apart and Tradition and philosophy become less influential. “A successful ideology fulfills two essential and vital needs; the need for belief and the need for justifying that belief” (Shayegan, 2014/b: 196). Influenced by Joseph Gabel, Shayegan also regards ideology as false consciousness.

According to Joseph Gabel, ideology considered as false consciousness or pseudo consciousness, is composed of four elements: 1- perpetuation of the current status, 2- idealization of the ingroup and demonization of the outgroup, 3- totalistic and degradation of dialectic dimension, 4- the ego-centric attitude. (Shayegan, 2014/b: pp196-197). In fact, every ideology is accompanied by these four characteristics. In line with this, Shayegan believes in ideology as irrational and sometimes insane revelation of unconscious (distorted) which appears staggeringly from off the path, enchants mind and soul and creates a false consciousness which is schizophrenic, ego-centered with no connection to reality. In other words, ideology explicates and interprets reality within the specific sphere of its own vision and perception” (Shayegan, 2014/b: 199). According to Shayegan, Ideologies that tend to simplify the phenomena and events, progress and thrive in the third world countries. He regards the popularity of leftist ideologies in these countries as a proof of this notion and states that: “The third world countries have not experienced the scientific and technologic era of Enlightenment and the adventurous road of dialectical thinking. Therefore, ideologization, as the only way for secularizing their civilization, is not influenced by the critical judgement in these societies. While critical judgement protects the West, now and again, from extreme dogmatism and works against ideologization, third world countries are deprived from such a controlling system” (Shayegan, 2014/b: 214). Non-Western countries have not played any role in forming and completing the process of establishment of the modern world and so have compensated for that by taking the shortcut of leftist ideas (the last link in the chain of West epistemology). Being unconscious about the developing process of Western paradigm is revealed as ‘doubled illusion’ in such civilizations. The maleffects of ideologizing the Tradition and religion and entrapped by these ideologies, as observed by Shayegan, result in “de-sacralization of religion, losing the capital of myths in a temporary trade, changing them to political figures, de-mythologization and expending myths for temporary affairs” (Shayegan, 2014/a: 155).

Doubled illusion, as defined by Shayegan, is “the illusionary knowledge about the nature of Western episteme and controlling it by selecting parts that are in accordance with our cultural heritage, and the illusionary maintenance of our own cultural identity” (Shayegan, 2012/a: 7).

MODERNITY IN A PLANETARY CIVILIZATION

Modernity, as observed by Shayegan, could be addressed through two different perspectives. Though from the positive view, it has significantly influenced our life styles it has been criticized for “lack of spirit and moving emotions...Modernity deals with legal, political and economic aspects of human’s lives and has no impact on the inner spiritual aspects of their being” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 31). He talks about “the lost land of the soul” and tries to restore that role of soul which is lost and ignored in this demystified and disenchanting world. Shayegan declares that the mysticism and spirituality inherent in religions, particularly those

that had not participated in “the feast of modernity”, could fill this void and pay the share of soul through making a balance between inside and outside (Dabbagh, 2011: 24). Shayegan is conscious of the spiritual void as a consequence of this demystified world and looks for a balance in the inner and outer life of the modern man. In agreement with Andre Malreux, Shayegan also declares that “the twenty first century will be spiritual or it will not be” (Shayegan, 2014/a: 258).

Shayegan observes the spiritual and mental void in the West as a negative aspect of modern changes. However, his general approach towards modernity and its achievements is positive: “modernity is comprehensive and creates a magnetic integrity for other ideologies (based on religion, identity, and nationality) to coexist with no ethnic or religious conflicts” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 28). As such, “Shayegan is cordial towards modernity and considers it as a context that provides us with a more humane and pleasant life” (Dabbagh, 2011: 23). To describe our stance in the current world that is influenced by modernity and its consequences, Shayegan states that “we live in a world where we are interdependent. We cannot stand out from the crowd, cannot build walls around ourselves, cannot isolate ourselves and declare our independence from the world” (Shayegan, 2003: 29). Shayegan denounces cultures and identities that put emphasis on their specific and limited cultural paradigms. Through addressing the principle of comprehensive correlation in our time, he believes that “the old binary system, that would separate cultures by designating cultural borders and defining people as us and the others, ingroups and outgroups, the East and the West or the North and the South, has totally lost its influence” (Shayegan, 2014: 336). In fact, Shayegan openly believes that modernity and its achievements belong no more to a particular civilization but have turned to a global discourse and heritage and the intersection of all cultures and identities. “Modernity has inevitably become a center that all insights, even those that reject its eligibility, turn around. As such, the achievements of the age of Enlightenment are the achievements of all humanity” (Shayegan 2014/b: pp338-339). By referring to the ambience created by the achievements of the modern life, and the stage where all cultures play their roles on, Shayegan asks people from non-Western civilizations to be part of their own age and live in accordance with the changes of the modern world. “As there are no substitute values for the values of modernity, all civilizations should conform and submit to modernity and adopt its values or be left at the margins of the world’s moving path of progression” (Shayegan, 2014/c: pp30-31). Modernity, as believed by Shayegan, has made a pluralistic environment for all kinds of awareness and epistemic paradigms. By creating a paradigm that is centered around rational and reason, modernity promises a global and planetary civilization that is formed without favoring any particular culture. “This inclusive civilization is clearly acceptant that holds a relative perception of all subjects and connects all displaced levels of human consciousness simultaneously” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 47). The globalized achievements of modernity have influenced the social and political structures of all societies including non-Western civilizations and have changed many facets of these communities. “These civilizations (except for those that have completely perceived the modern age) are in an In-between situation; they are between ‘not yet’ and ‘never ever’, between an establishing modernity that has not yet been fully absorbed or accepted, and a collapsing tradition that will never ever be revived in its original form” (Shayegan 2014/c: 66-67). Addressing those who are vocal about the search for their genuine identity and the revival of their ancient originality, Shayegan remarks that: “There is no point in reviving the past and starting from scratch. Any retrogression is an illusion that reaches nowhere but the waste land” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 67). Talking about genuine identity and culture, according to Shayegan, is a pure illusion nowadays. Non-western and ancient civilizations are not advancing in their own historical age but in a global and planetary civilization. He remarks that “it’s nonsense to talk about non-Western civilizations as self-sustained and independent wholes...these civilizations do not move in their

own historical orbit but are experiencing an In-between situation amid 'not yet' and 'never ever'" (Shayegan, 2014/c: 69). As people who belong to traditional cultures, we are recommended by Shayegan to pay attention to our modern identity that breaks the restricted surroundings of our single-dimensioned identities and reconciles us with a broad and open world that is shared by other cultures. The meaning of planetary civilization is not removing differences and identities and cultural differentiations. This civilization, in fact promises a multi-voiced and mosaic world where all "different levels of consciousness" have their share and play their role.

PETRIFICATION OF IDENTITY AND MULTICULTURALISM

The concept of multiculturalism, pivotal to the diverse and plural current age, has been studied by from a critical perspective. According to Shayegan, coexisting and integration of different cultures and knowledges, that do not share the same ontological nature, creates a dual situation resulting in two different consequences that are either productive cultural combinations or misunderstood cultural contradictions. As described by Shayegan: "coexistence of these civilizations (non-Western cultures and civilizations) and the Western civilization, named as multiculturalism, leads to connections among diverse levels of awareness that, to some extent, could be both productive and explosive. Multiculturalism, as a vague term would address the coexistence of different levels of culture within a distinct scope"(Shayegan, 1993: 49-50). Shayegan then continues to elaborate multiculturalism as an ambiguous and obscure term: "multiculturalism advocates for change; it presents a hypothetical analysis and epistemic framework that defines the cultural sovereignty of the authorities while at the same time implies an anti-sovereignty strategy by suggesting an inclusive cultural paradigm" (Shayegan, 2014/c: 110). Multiculturalism, as believed by Shayegan, holds out two potential possibilities; one results in the understanding and coexistence of nations and cultures while the other, by focusing on the right of cultural distinction, could lead to global misunderstanding and chaos. According to him, "political identity, as the extreme interpretation of multiculturalism, determines culture as a specific form of ethnic identity" (Shayegan, 2014/c: 111). Thus, as observed by Shayegan, those advocates of multiculturalism who deny and reject the global principles of modernity, by focusing on some exclusive cultural differentiations might end up in an idea that leads to a worldwide total catastrophe: "The consequences of propagating Africanization, Spainization or Asianization, within a multicultural context that shows no tolerance, would result in uncontrollable dangerous deviations (which nowadays is happening a lot) and finally a total collapse of democratic pluralistic systems" (Shayegan, 1993: 51). Extreme focus on indigenous and ethnic identities, distinctiveness, exclusiveness by radical multiculturalists and their antagonistic attitudes towards the global discourses of modernity could provide the background and context for the emergence of the phenomenon of petrification of the identity. To clarify petrification of identity, Shayegan explains:" any kind of exclusive identity, taking any form or wearing any mask, is a quest for uniformity and the original purgation. It's an all smoke and mirrors which deceives and fascinates at the same time" (Shayegan, 2014: 122). Regarding modernity and its global achievements that are inseparable from the modern life, any kind of retrogression towards the pure and original old cultures according to Shayegan is going from bad to worse. As he remarks, we as the holders of the non-Western cultures do not advance inside our own historic circle or self-sufficient world. On the contrary, we all live in a global age that is rooted in the modern age progressions. "There is no Indian, Chinese, Japanese or Iranian history in our age. And by that I mean a specific history that is independent from the global network as from now there is only one global history" (Shayegan, 2013: 42). By criticizing the ideas of supporters of multiculturalism which, according to Shayegan, results in the petrification of identity, he discusses our modern identity as the rule maker that defines how to play and live in this diverse and plural world. "Don't we go from bad to worse and from

inflexibility and petrification to counter-Enlightenment by attaching to our restricted vernacular resources or questing for our imaginary origins and archetypal myths? Herein lies the danger that threatens all infuriated supporters of multiculturalism, ethnocentrism and fundamentalism whether African, Mexican, Afghan, Iranian or Indian with any attitude” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 122-123).

IN-BETWEEN SPACE AND THE FORMATION OF BRICOLAGE IDENTITY

The new colorful and diverse world, as observed by Shayegan, is the arena for three simultaneous and interdependent phenomena of disenchantment, technologization and cyberization that have fundamentally changed our age. As the achievements of the modern world and through invalidating old ontologies, these phenomena have caused profound and inner changes in traditional cultures and ideologies. On the opposite side of this invalidation lies a comprehensive connection among diverse cultures and identities on a global level. As a matter of fact, the principle of comprehensive interdependence influences different contexts including culture, society, science and etc. As such, the productive connective ambience provides the modern humankind with so many choices. The ambience, as described by Shayegan, “gives the modern humankind the opportunity to take so many different roads and commute among different cultural ambiances, take advantage of different historical treasures, redefine themselves within these opportunities, synthesize their different experiences to make their own take and create imaginary spaces that are compatible with their attitude about life” (Shayegan, 1993: 53). Cultural communications and integrations, as the achievements of the interdependence and dialogue of cultures have resulted in the creation of ‘In-between spaces’ and ‘integrated areas’ where, according to Shayegan, two different communication methods take place. As elaborated by him, the communication is either between “equal and comparable” ideologies or between ideologies that do not share the same ontological background. In the latter case, the communication and exchange of concepts and patterns take the form of “mutation” and result in eclectic and hybrid forms and patterns. As mentioned by Shayegan, these eclectic and hybrid forms bring up two different aspects; the negative and disastrous aspect happens in the sphere of ‘thought and analysis’ and leads to chaos and disturbed concepts and pave the way for the dangerous mutated individuals to appear” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 210). For Shayegan “the mutated individual” sets the clear example of anthropological type that reflects the negative side of cultural communications within the In-between spaces. “The mutated individuals”, often suspicious and thoroughly eclectic, idolize their inflexible images and remain faithful to them. They are personifications of the chaos that has surrounded their whole existence” (Shayegan 2014/c: 213-214). Just contrary to this negative aspect, Shayegan refers to the positive facet that happens in areas such as culture, imagination and art and results in productive mutual cultural achievements and unique and creative artistic works. For Shayegan “the mobile immigrant” is the ideal anthropological type and instance of this positive aspect; conscious of his scattered and diffused self totally rejects all kinds of rigid and fix assumptions, does not put incompatible patches together and observes his different moods while experiencing different surroundings. He acknowledges that his personality, like Arleken outfit (3), is made of different colors and that he is a bricolage individual” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 214). The mobile immigrant is in fact the ideal example of the modern humankind who, like the mutated individual, is the product of the In-between space. However, he recognizes the difference between myth and reason as well as traditional and modern concepts and, unlike the mutated individual, does not get trapped by dangerous and distorted cultural and intellectual notions. Shayegan admires the mobile migrant who, according to him, is the master of changing and turning situations. He is both this and that and while staying on one layer of existence, breathes the air of other ambiances too. His presence is not limited to a single wave of perception. He disapproves the congruency of pure and homogeneous affairs.... The mobile immigrant is in fact a bricoleur...he is a dissociated being. He is capable of assembling his

internal landscape and presenting it through his unique and personal method” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 218- 219). The mobile migrant, imposed to the in-between space, is consciously influenced by all cultures and for this very reason is called a bricoleur by Shayegan. Bricolage, according to Shayegan, “is the hobby of an individual with a multiple identity; an individual who, through cultural communications, would take advantage of limitless sources from his cultural connections to integrate different subjects and rearrange them” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 16-17). Hence, it's inevitable for a mobile migrant who is living in, and constantly influenced by, the In-between of different awareness, cultural and ontological spaces to become a bricoleur. “Bricolage is a device for making and shaping our versatile personality in our time” (Shayegan, 2014/b: 344). Here again, Shayegan makes a distinction between two different kinds of bricolage and puts “playful bricolage” as opposite to “ideological bricolage”. Playful bricolage, as observed by Shayegan “is shaped directly by our diverse selections and is supposed to beautify and enrich our lives” (Shayegan, 1993: 54-55). This bricolage with its positive energy stands against ideological bricolage. Ideological bricoleur, according to Shayegan, “through employing any combination tries to make explosive mixtures. The art of bricolage then ends in monotonous, boring, vengeful and suppressive discourses... this aspect of bricolage is the exact origin of dangers such as alluring illusions, mental corruption and false consciousness” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 233-234). As such, the broad range of choices and selections enables the modern humankind to create a personalized life style that matches his needs and demands. Like a mobile migrant, he can experience different In-between spaces and create a playful collage. To avoid ideological bricolages, he should be conscious of the traps that are spread by ego-centered and exclusive identities as well as rigid and petrified thoughts and ideas.

3-Harlequin is the best-known comic servant character from the Italian Commedia dell'arte who wore an outfit with irregular shapes in bright colors.

BRICOLAGE IDENTITY

Our world, as observed and defined by Shayegan is diverse and plural. According to him, the exposure to the constant influence of different cultures and identities has contributed to shaping us as multiple-layered cultural beings. “Identity, if not exactly like unity, is attracted to unity” (Ardakani, 2004:53). As such, identity crisis is of concern to the modern human being who lives in this diverse and multicultural world. In this regard and relying on his knowledge of such condition, Shayegan discusses: “The challenge of identity for the modern human being is because identity is no more a homogeneous set of stable and secure values” (Shayegan 2014/c: 134). According to him, the current situation is the result of a context which allows different cultures and identities to integrate and connect within a communicative environment and as such puts authentic, unique and pure identities into serious critical phases. Shayegan believes that “due to modernity, as a worldwide network, and the interconnection of cultures, the identity of the modern individual has no (homogeneous) identity and discussing uniform identities is totally outdated” (Shayegan, 2003: 22). However, Shayegan is optimistic about this diverse, bricolage and multi-layered identity in the modern world and approves the bricolage identity of the modern humankind by quoting Michel Serres: “Yes I am a multiple plural: a numerous collectivity of all the others” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 156). To clarify the concept of bricolage identity Shayegan adds: “What is meant by bricolage is that those diverse and heterogeneous spheres that have shaped the historical and epistemic spheres of our beings are not on the same level. Each level of consciousness is defined by a different sphere as if, through a complicated process, we have encompassed all historical ages within ourselves” (Shayegan, 2014/c: 155).

Regarding these integrated and diverse identities, Shayegan discerns three layers of national, religious and modern identities in Iran. "The idea of three Iranian identities was first proposed by Dr. Abdolkarim Soroush" (Shayegan, 2014/c: 162). The first layer or identity is rooted in Iran's ancient culture and civilization. According to Shayegan, Ferdowsi has played a unique influential role in surviving Iranian's national identity by saving Farsi language, myths and epics in his masterpiece the *Shahnameh* (Book of Kings). "Ferdowsi's *Shahnameh*, this eternal epic poem, has played an essential role in reviving Iranian's national identity...*Shahnameh* has rightfully developed to the iconic national identity in Iranian's collective memory" (Shayegan, 2015/a: 25). The development of the second layer of identity, going back to 1400 years ago, is the result of Iranians' acquaintance with Islamic culture and civilization. The third, which forms our modern layer of identity is the consequence of Iranians confronting the modern West and is more recent than the two previous layers. According to Shayegan, it is through this latter layer that we could connect with, and understand other worlds. The contemporary Iran, in a nutshell, is involved in a constant dialectic among these three layers of identities. Though the notion is of concern to Shayegan, he does not believe in negating or rejecting any level of Iranian identity and supports the coexistence and collaboration of the three of them. As a matter of fact, the tensions among these three layers of identity affect Iranians and inspire their ideas and beliefs as well as their lifestyles. Finding a balanced status could save us from epistemic and cultural distortions that are rooted in misunderstandings of these three layers. With an optimistic view towards Iranian trilogy of identity, Shayegan remarks: "If we manage to put all three layers in order, then this three layered structure provides us with new and amazing opportunities for understanding and communication. compared to the identity of the modern humankind, composed of a single element, the three-layered identity, which provides us with the opportunity of experiencing a twofold life, is a blessing" (Shayegan, 2014/c: 153). This section is concluded by a quote from Shayegan that gives a clear image of the modern humankind in the new world: "Like expanding bricolages, we are all sets of shapeless patches stuck together...with no center, we are scattered and developed like rhizomes (4). We are exposed to numerous changes and constant metamorphosis" (Shayegan, 2014:153).

CONCLUSION

This paper concludes that regarding the process of globalization, Shayegan perceives the simultaneity and coexistence of different cultures and identities as the most significant characteristics of our world and observes the modern humankind within a broad and diverse range of connections. By taking a critical perspective, the later shayegan puts emphasis on the In-between space (tradition-modern) in traditional cultures and societies and magnifies the challenges of the two incompatible paradigms and ideologies in the social-cultural spheres of these societies. According to Shayegan, incongruity and heterogeneity of these two different patterns on cultural level results in an unhealthy situation which is observable in social-cultural contexts as well as thought and intellect. The consequences of this situation in traditional civilizations are regarded as unhealthy and distorted by Shayegan. According to him, exclusive identities and ontologies do not fit into this new pluralistic, diverse and colorful world in which the coexistence of different cultures lead to cultural syntheses and combinations. The development of what is known as 'the principle of comprehensive correlation' is a consequence of the invalidity of the classic ontologies in our time. The most definite outcome of cultural collaborations and correlation is the creation of contexts for connection, combination and integration of different cultures and the diverse and colorful world where Shayegan, relying on Diderot is a place that: "we learn as well to speak by twenty mouths at once" (Peyvandi, 2012:645). It's this multicultural and multi-voiced world that has provided the modern humankind with the opportunity to develop his combined and multi-layered insight and identity. As remarked by Shayegan: "Our combined identity is definitely

developed through the contribution of multiculturalism, the connection of nations and the integration and hybridity of ideas" (Shayegan, 2014/c: 135).

4- Rhizomatic identity or thinking is a concept Shayegan borrowed from Gilles Deleuze. Contrary to self-centered identities, Rhizomatic identity puts emphasis on the notion of accepting the other and as observed by Shayegan, is a root that appreciates other root.

References

- Athari, Seyyed asadollah (2011), 'Identity, development and Modernity', *intercultural studies quarterly*, issue 14, Spring, pp 139-176).
- Berman, Marshal (2013), *The Experience of Modernity*, Translated by: Morad Farhadpour, Tehran, Tarhe Now publication 8th Ed.
- Hashemi, Mohamammad Mansour (2008), 'The Epistemic Constellation of the Playful Philosopher', *Bokhara magazine*, issues 68 & 69, November and March, pp 593-604
- Hashemi, Mohamammad Mansour. (2014/a), *Identity Scholars and the Intellectual Heritage of Ahmad Fardid*, Tehran, Kavir publication, 4th Ed.
- Hashemi, Mohamammad Mansour (2014/a) *Merge of Horizons* (Introduction), Tehran, Farzan rooz publication, 3rd Ed.
- Jahanbegloo, Ramin (1995), 'Modernity from a Concept to Reality', *Cultural and Social Dialogue quarterly*, issue 10, Winter, pp 49-55
- Jahanbegloo, Ramin (2005), *The Fourth Wave*, translated by Mansoor Goudarzi, Tehran, Nei Publication, 4th Ed.
- Kaji, Hossein (1998), *Our Being from Iranian the Perspective of Iranian Scholars*, Tehran, Rozaneh publication, 2nd Ed.
- Mirsepasi, Ali (2013), *A Reflection on Iranian Modernity*, translated by Jalal tavakolian, Tehran, Tarhe now publication, 4th Ed.
- Mottaghi, Mohsen (2013), *Multilayered Awareness: 'The Condition of Humankind with Multilayered Identity in the Planetary Civilization'*, *Bokhara magazine*, issue 92, March.
- Parham, Mehdi (2001), 'Modern Enchantment', *Bokhara magazine* issue 20, September and October, pp 379-386
- Peivandi, Saeed (2012), 'Shayegan and Living on the Intersection of Cultures and Times', *Bokhara magazine*, issues 87, 88. August and September, pp 642-652
- Rajaei, Farhang (2001), *The Problematic of the Contemporary Iranian Identity*, Tehran, Nei Publication, 8th Ed.
- Rajaei, Farhang (2017). *Globalization on Trial: The Human Condition and the Information Civilization*, translated by Abdolhossein Azarang, Tehran, Agah publication, 1st Ed.
- Shayegan, Dariush (1993). 'Multiculturalism', *Cultural and Social Dialogue quarterly*, issue 2, January, pp. 40-62
- Shayegan, Dariush (2003). *The Scattered Ontology*, *Cultural and social dialogue quarterly*, issue 37, August, pp. 21-33
- Shayegan, Dariush (2013/a), *Asia Confronts the West*, Tehran Farzan Rooz publication, 1st Ed.
- Shayegan, Dariush (2013/b) *In Search of Lost Spheres*, Tehran, Farzan Rooz publication, 2nd Ed.
- Shayegan, Dariush (2013/c) *Hinduism and Islamic Mysticism*, translated by Jamshid Arjmand, Tehran, Farzan rooz publication, 5th Ed.
- Shayegan, Dariush (2014/a), 'Under the Skies of the World', interview: Ramin Jahanbegloo, translated by Nazi Azima, Tehran, Farzan Rooz publication, 7th Ed.
- Shayegan, Dariush (2014/b), 'Merge of Horizons', Selection of the works, select and edit: Mohamad Mansour Hashemi, Tehran, Farzan Rooz publication, 3rd Ed.
- Shayegan, Dariush (2013/c), *The New Enchantment*, translated by Fatemeh Valiani, Tehran, Farzan rooz publication, 8th Ed.
- Shayegan, Dariush (2015/c), *Henry Cerbin, the Horizons of Spiritual Thinking in the Islamic Iran*, translated by Mohamad Bagher Parham, Tehran, Farzan Rooz publication, 7th Ed.

Shayegan, Dariush (2016), interview: Meysam Nazari, December

Shayegan, Dariush (2016), interview: Meysam Nazari, May

Vahdat, Farzin (2016), *Iran's Intellectual Encounter with Modernity*, translated by Mehdi Haghighatkah, Tehran, Ghoghnoos publication, 5th Ed.