



## The Place of the "Other" in Ali Shariati's Political Thought

Donya Rah Hagh<sup>1</sup>, Reza Akbari Noori<sup>2\*</sup>, Hassan Abniki<sup>3</sup>, Giti Pourzaki<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Department of Political Science and International Relations, South Tehran Branch,  
Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>4</sup> Department of Islamic Thought, Research Institute of Imam Khomeini and Islamic Revolution, Tehran, Iran

Received: 22 Nov 2020

Accepted: 20 Feb 2021

### Abstract:

One of the most important concerns that have occupied the minds of Iranian intellectuals and thinkers for many years before the Constitution is the way "us" deal with the "other"; An important issue that became more important in the 1960s and 1970s, especially in the form of "Iranian identity" and "returning to self"; So that many writers such as Jalal Al-Ahmad, Shariati, Fardid and Nasr addressed this issue in their works. Accordingly, the present paper seeks to examine the question of what epistemological system can be understood by the confrontation of "us" with the "other" in Shariati political thought. To this end, in order to understand and interpret this question, we tried to test this hypothesis by dissecting the propositions in Bakhtin's theory; That Ali Shariati's approach to the issue of "us" confronting the "other", despite his efforts to understand the "other" and identify the "other", eventually led to the strengthening of a monologue; The possibility of a favorable encounter with the "other" and, more precisely, "dialogue with the other" was realized in a very weak and fragile way.

**Keywords:** Bakhtin, Self-Other, Dialogism, Dialogue, Shariati, Monologue

### 1. Introduction

Iranian thought and mind have always been involved in the definition of "individual self" and "collective self" since decades before the Constitutional Revolution; Which has been discussed in the context of discussions such as "Iranian identity" and the relationship between this identity and tradition and modernity. The "other" has shown itself in different

forms in the historical context of Iran; Sometimes militarily and in opposition to other civilizations and countries (Greeks, Arabs, Mongols) and sometimes in the form of religious differences (Shi'a, Sunnis). Moreover, the "Iranian self", especially after its first confrontation with the West and after its defeat in its wars with Russia, faced more

\*Corresponding Author's Email: R\_Akbari@azad.ac.ir

serious crises that did not manifest themselves only in terms of hardware and military; rather, it was a deeper issue and a sign of backwardness in the economic, political, social, and philosophical spheres. Thus, the "other" in the course of historical developments, was imposed on the text of "us" consciousness and forced our thinkers to examine the relationship between "self" and "other" to truly know themselves. In this way, these thinkers have taken different paths and have used various conceptual devices to achieve their definition, which has not been far from error and mistake; thus, in the face of the new world, they inevitably had to try to be seen. Nevertheless, such an attempt to achieve true self-definition and knowledge could not be made through the lens of "pure self-knowledge." Thus, any definition of self here required an understanding of the other and the other, and this led Iranian intellectuals to refer to the "other" outside of them to understand themselves.

In all the studies that have been done on this field, namely identity and identity-seeking intellectuals; Dr. Ali Shariati has been considered as one of the most influential political-civil thinkers in the sixties and seventies. As far as we can claim, to date, there has been no research on the political and social environment of Iran before and after the revolution that has been done without mentioning, albeit briefly, the name and thought of Shariati. Accordingly, in the mentioned socio-political researches, we are faced with a wide range of studies based on confirmation and denial, love and hate about him. A brief look at the many works and books that have been written about him and his views and ideas shows his importance in the field of Iranian thought. Especially since his ideas have not yet shown signs of antiquity and are still relevant today.

Ali Shariati, as a political thinker, according to the historical implications and context of his time, recognized a form of deep socio-political crises and was trying to draw a good picture. Of course, his drawing has always depended on his perception of man and his position in society. He tried to use literature to convey ideas and concepts. In this regard, Shariati preferred to use a symbolic method due to the tyranny of his period and also to have a greater impact on the audience. Of course, using this method was also a kind of immunity due to the closed political space for him. However, Shariati can be considered a continuation of an important and prominent spectrum of thinkers such as Jalal al-Ahmad in his time who thought differently about the concepts of "self" and "other".

The "other" in the world of politics is defined in the form of rival individuals, parties, currents, ideas, discourses, or paradigms that acquire existence based on their distinctions and differences; And finally, it is in this process of alienation that "identity" finds meaning. The reason for the importance of paying attention to the issue of our confrontation with another is that, unfortunately, after nearly two centuries, our society, like many developing societies, is in a period of transition; and he still has not been able to pass this period. This period, historically, objectively, and mentally, has affected many issues of society, the most important of which is the confrontation between the discourse of tradition and the discourse of modernity. The minds of Iranian thinkers, influenced by such a confrontation, were attracted to the discourse of modernism and its manifestations and consequences conquered the minds of many of our thinkers; As a result, it forced them to take different approaches to it. These reactions form a wide range, from complete imitation and approval (Taghizadeh and Ak-

hoondzadeh) to denial (the totality of the Islamic Republic discourse). Nevertheless, there are many thinkers in the middle spectrum; Thus, from then until today, we have witnessed a deep rift in contemporary Iranian thought; The difference that has caused the pro-Sunni forces to mobilize against the pro-modern forces, each defining itself in "otherness" with the other, and the other as an obstacle to growth and progress, and ordering each other to be rejected and rejected.

Now, considering what has been said, the main question of this research will be based on this; What is the place of the other in Ali Shariati's epistemological system and how can the aspects of this thinker's confrontation with the issue of the "other" be explained in Bakhtinian language? The purpose of asking this question is to answer a logical reading of this relationship and its importance in Shariati discourse. Which is hypothesized that his approach to the other, despite his efforts to understand the "other" and identify the "other" and despite the invitation to know the "other"; As well as the emphasis on the "necessity of another" in his political-ideological works (which were intended to politicize religion to change the status quo). He also came up with the idea of "returning to oneself" as an answer to the problem of the "other" (the West). Finally, it strengthened the monologue discourse; In which the possibility of a favorable encounter with the "other" and, more precisely, "dialogue with the other" was realized in a very weak and fragile way.

### **Theoretical topics**

#### **1. The central signifier of the Bakhtin paradigm: a dialogue based on the concepts of "self" and "other"**

Mikhail Bakhtin is one of the most influential and even, according to Tzutan Todorov, the

greatest literary theorist of the twentieth century. His life coincided with major developments in Russia, including the 1917 revolution and the rise to power of Lenin and Stalin, and his ideas were delayed for reasons such as Stalin's tyranny and political repression. Julia Cristova introduced her to the French cultural community in a 1966 article on "intertextuality." Since then, Bakhtin's tendency to think has grown significantly. His thoughts have entered the fields of philosophy, linguistics, social and human sciences, psychology and cultural studies, and even in the fields of teaching, expression, education at the school level. He is one of the few thinkers who has studied and theorized about the roots of the novel format. The result of these studies is the theory of "dialogue", which is used today not only in literature but also in many fields of humanities. By dynamically redefining the static concepts of linguistics, Bakhtin was able to develop the concept of dialogue as the cornerstone of human relations. The depth of his theoretical insight and the scope of his research was such that it strongly influenced the foundations of thought after him; So much so that many researchers find it impossible to place him in a single branch of the humanities.

Michael Holquist (2002), one of Bakhtin's leading commentators, describes him as a multidimensional thinker "who transcends common boundaries;" Mikhail Bakhtin has a major role in several fields of thought, each with its history, language, and hypotheses; As a result, thinkers perceive his literature in one way, linguists in another, and anthropologists in another. There are no comprehensive terms that cover all areas of Bakhtin's activity "(Holquist, 2002, p. 13)

In their joint work (2004), Julie Ryukin and Michael Rein on his role in redefining the language of literature, highlighting the

intertextual aspects of his thought; Bakhtin focused on how literature intertwines discourses from heterogeneous social sources. He also played a significant role in redefining the language of literature. According to his theory, all words exist only in conversation with other words. Thus, in Bakhtin's theory, the emphasis from the individual creation of the literary work shifted to the intertextual world in which creation is closed (Rivkin & Ryne, 2004, p. 674).

Nevertheless, Bakhtin's literary theory is, above all, a reaction to Saussure's linguistics; Also, the relentless efforts of Russian formalists to refine literature and extract its components, but also to face Bakhtin and the abstraction of his literary thought, bring with them difficulties; "Bakhtin's encyclopedic thought, the complexity of expression, his great use of metaphor, the use of sometimes different terms for the meanings and purposes of others, and vice versa, make it difficult to present something called a summary of Bakhtin's approach." (Amiri, 2007, p. 96)

Bakhtin, by extending his linguistic theories to literature and culture, laid out a plan that, in addition to its tremendous impact on the humanities, and especially cultural research, became the basis of literary poetry, which was the focus of the novel. Bakhtin's literary rhetoric is based on the centrality of the concept of dialogue. "Conversation" is the cradle of thought and the oil of his theorizing, which is manifested in various forms in various fields (heteroglyca, polyphony, carnival).

Mikhail Bakhtin, in formulating his ideas, has paid attention to several fields of thought (including the neo-Kantians, Einstein's physics, Dostoevsky, Bergson, and in particular Martin Buber's conversational philosophy). Also, the birth of great literary and artistic currents, such as Russian formalisms, took

place during his time, and Bakhtin was closely associated with formalists and was influenced by them in emphasizing form in literature. He was also influenced by "Buber" in his aesthetic and moral view of the world, as well as his relationship with others; And used Dostoevsky on the importance of polysemy - the multiplicity of discourses and the dialogue space in the novel.

The neo-Kantians, especially Einstein, also played an important role in his view of the world. Influenced by Kant, Bakhtin paid attention to the tradition of European thought, especially the epistemology of the humanities, and in line with this view, Bakhtin believed that humans interpret and interpret the world from different positions. Due to the existence of these different positions, perceptions and interpretations will be numerous and multiple. The world is a multi-conceptual nature (polyglossia) Bakhtin's reflection on our knowledge of the world is a kind of epistemology that the humanities claim to have something to say. His reflections are based on dialogue, and unlike many other theories, the position of knowledge he assumes is not uniform.

Moreover, from Bakhtin's point of view, nothing is static and neutral; Human life is not created in a vacuum but is a process in progress, a process of "being", without a conceivable beginning and end, and what realizes this process is "dialogue"; From the levels of everyday conversation to more complex levels and conversations between different ideas, works, and cultures. Thus, man's understanding of the world is inherently dialogical, because human beings live in a world where everything is full of the voices and utterances of "others."

Such an attitude gives a subconscious nature to human life. Every single word we use, all our behaviors, thoughts, dreams are full of

meanings given to them by "others" and "us" give in turn. Every concrete discourse or utterance finds its subject in something already hidden in a complex understanding or in the light of another word about which it is spoken. It is said to be formed in the path of thoughts, views, value judgments, and foreign voices, and they are bound by these. A word that is subject-oriented enters an environment that conflicts with other words in a way; An environment with value judgments and foreign sounds, the word in such an environment fluctuates in complex reciprocal relationships and has mixed with some of them and has moved away from some and faced with others (Amiri, 2007, pp. 111-112).

As a result, it can be said that Bakhtin's philosophical anthropology revolves around "otherness". Based on this component, the fundamental principle of his anthropology is that it is impossible to imagine a being apart from the relations that link it to the "other." We can never see ourselves as a whole, but the existence of the "other" is essential for us to have an idea of ourselves. A concept that can only be achieved in part in our mere relation to the "self"; thus for Bakhtin (like Martin Buber), anyone who wants to keep safe loses himself. For this reason, he places a prominent place for dialogue and believes that life in its essence is "dialogue." In the view of this philosopher, the "I" attains self-consciousness by revealing the "self" to the "other" and through him. In his view, the most important actions - those that form the basis of our self-awareness - can only be explained by "other" self-awareness. Cutting off others and separating and imprisoning oneself is the main cause of losing oneself; Therefore, when there is no dialogue, the result is a monologue discourse, and all Bakhtin's efforts are an escape from such a situation. On a more general level, every culture is

only from the eyes of another culture, which manifests itself more and more completely.

At a glance at Bakhtin's works, one can see concepts such as dialogue, dissonance, polysemy, extraterritoriality, and intertextuality that pervade Bakhtin's writings. He is one of the most prominent figures of the golden age of thought in Russia, who is also one of the last representatives of this period. It was not long before the flames of the October Revolution ignited all the flourishing symbols of that time, and with the coming to power of the socialist government, its representatives were pressured to denounce their glorious past.

## **2. You lost the basic components of dialogue**

Mikhail Bakhtin spent sixty years of his life thinking about the concept of "dialogue"; and theorized about the relationship between the "self" and the "other" in the form of a coherent theory called "dialogism"; which can be considered both as a reflective theory and as a kind of method for producing such theories.

In his dialogism, any capacity for knowledge and awareness is based on otherness. This otherness in a method is not just a dialectical alienation from decay that gives it a unifying identity with a higher consciousness; in contrast, in dialogism, consciousness is otherness. More precisely, it is a variable relationship between the center and all that is not at the center (Holquist, 1990, p. 17). Of course, the center does not have an absolute meaning in Bakhtin's thinking, but it is relative and no center claims superiority.

Relationship and difference are also concepts that he reminds whenever he has the opportunity. In his view, the world is formed in relation, the relation of the components of the world, the relation of man to the world, the relation of man to man.

It must be borne in mind that dialogism is always opposed to certainty and denies any surrender or transformation. Bakhtin's thinking was largely influenced by new concepts of time and space that emerged with the collapse of Newtonian physics, and according to it, unity was avoided. Both Bakhtin and Einstein resorted to what might be called "philosophical optics." A conceptual tool for seeing that is invisible to other lenses and requires another to be fully aware. (Khodaei Rad, 2012, p. 26)

Nevertheless, Bakhtin had to explain the two issues of "differentiation" and "participation" to analyze the concept of dialogue. In dialogism, separateness and simultaneity are basic conditions of existence (Holquist, 1990, p. 18). How these two could be explained in the form of a single concept, dialogue, was also made possible by Einstein's theory of relativity. With the help of this theory, Bakhtin was able to challenge the certainty and authority of monologue discourses and provide the basis for hearing other voices. Relativity was sure to support for the Chinese field, and Bakhtin was able to conclude from Einstein's experience:

- i. Understanding the realities of the world takes place from specific and different perspectives or perspectives. Depending on the difference in position, attitude and perception of existence will also be different.
- ii. Knowing the world from a certain position alone will be incomplete. Consequently, any interpretation of the world from a particular perspective cannot reflect all the facts of existence.
- iii. The world, cognition, and meaningful response to it are the result of partnership and communication between cognitive actors.

- iv. Everyone occupies a place in the universe and from that position understands and knows the world. This place is unique and unique. The person is responsible for this position.
- v. Everything in the world is interconnected and understanding their temporal and spatial position depends on this connection (Khodaei Rad, 2012, p. 32)

In general, in Bakhtin's thought, the real distinction is a necessary principle for real participation, and on the other hand, real participation is the fundamental principle for real distinction.

It is worth mentioning that Bakhtin has tried to show that the place and position of each person and human group in the universe is different from that of another person or group of people; And every perception and meaning of the world is different from other interpretations and meanings in terms of places and places in existence; Therefore, a complete understanding of the world is possible if there are a connection and dialogue between different interpretations and meanings of the world.

From Bakhtin's point of view, the concept of place and time is a field in which all perceptions are revealed. Dialogism, like relativity, assumes that nothing can be perceived except in opposition to the perspective of something else. The basic premise of dialogism is that there is no person without context. The mind is structured in such a way that the world is always perceived based on this opposition (Holquist, 1990, pp. 20-21).

Thus, in dialogism, the inherent limitations of an object exist only in the perception of the world. Dialogism considers the human perception of the world as the result of a

complex process of situation, time, text, multiplicity. For those who understand, time is open and unfinished; Their location is the centers of perception, and this is the point at which objects arrange themselves around a horizon, and their meaning is determined by their position.

"Situatdness" is another important concept in Bakhtin's thought. Everyone has a unique position in the universe and is responsible for it. The perception and meaning formed about the world depend on the position of each person in the universe. Bakhtin sees the world as a kind of "action" and the universe as an "event" whose main feature is unrepeatability. As Gregory Kavanagh points out, Bakhtin's emphasis on true historicity is related to his plan to place the ethics of human action in the specific eventuality of what Bakhtin calls a single-event moment of existence (Cavanaugh, 2004, p. 16). In other words, for Bakhtin, ignoring a moment of unrepeatable human action in favor of an abstract theory is an immoral practice.

Also, under the influence of Martin Buber, he gives the world a moral status. In other words, man and the world have a set of moral principles. Some of them are related to the position in which the person is and should be responsible for addressing the world. If, on the one hand, we strive to fully understand the world as one of the dimensions of man's moral relationship with the world; And on the other hand, a more complete understanding of the world depends on the sharing of interpretations and meanings with each other; As a result, every individual is responsible for other people and every culture is responsible for other cultures. And it cannot go unanswered by others' questions and answers to oneself.

Another concept is the "Chronotope" or temporal/spatial continuum; Which is one of

the important components of Bakhtin thought. The Bakhtin Chronotope shows us "how time is experienced in different periods and cultures." "What is the place of time and place in the dominant response and speech of each period?" Bakhtin himself writes about the temporal-spatial continuum; We call the inherent dependence of temporal and spatial relationships shown in the artistic literature a temporal and spatial continuum. This term, which is used in mathematics, is known as a part of Einstein's theory of relativity (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 137). The Chronotope, more than anything else, points to the importance and dependence on time and place on any semantic maker. On the other hand, Bakhtin regarding the meaningful response of man to the world, although he gives the most important to the component of the present and contemporary; But he believes that to better understand the present, one should read the dialogue with the past and consider any meaning in the future tense. That is, the audience of the near and distant future will be the audience of texts that appear in the present. He calls these contacts the "Super addressee". In general, any semantics and any dialogue should focus on the present and the future.

### **3. Monologue discourse from Bakhtin's point of view**

A monologue is a discourse that Bakhtin calls an "authoritative discourse"; And contrasts it with the Persuasive Discourse - which is characteristic of the state of the conversation. Bakhtin writes about the nature of authoritarian or authoritarian discourse: "The assertive word asks us to recognize it and, without considering its inherent power to persuade us, treat it as if it has a predetermined credit." (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 440) He writes according to the contemporary reality and the components of time and place, which are character-

ristic of any dialogue; the word domination is in a distant realm and has a physical connection to a hierarchically seemingly superior past; As if the word belongs to the fathers, its validity has been recognized in the past. This word is a priori discourse. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 440) Gradual change, flexibility, and creativity do not emanate from the heart of this discourse. This discourse acts as a compact and inseparable mass in our theological mind. It must either be fully approved or completely rejected. This discourse is inextricably linked to its authority. The connection with political power, tradition, or individual, the ups and downs of a dominant discourse depends on the status of the power associated with it. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 440)

Accordingly, such a discourse by its nature cannot be ambiguous and is always characterized by a single concept. It does not take responsibility for responding to others and does not give any rights to other awareness. So if a dialogue-oriented writer cares about horizontal relationships, scattered, centrifugal, and competitive perspectives, he is a monologue; conversely, if it emphasizes vertical, centrist, and absolute relationships, it is dialogue-oriented. (Emerson, 2008, p. 134)

In the monologue situation, there is no difference, dialogue, or polyphony. Everything is inflexibly defined by a single, static, static consciousness. As a result, this discourse is deprived of being contemporary, of understanding time and place objectively, and of living completely. Todorov expresses Bakhtin's view of the features of the monologue as follows; Monologue ultimately reveals that outside of consciousness, there is another with the same rights and able to respond with the same degree of validity. Monologue arises from the denial of the other and its independence and adequacy as a self with equal rights. For the monotheistic view in its ex-

treme and pure form, the "other" remains merely a matter of consciousness and cannot attain true consciousness in itself. An answer that is not able to change my world of consciousness is not expected from "other". The monologue is complete and sufficient in itself, and therefore it is unfamiliar with the answer and does not wait for such an answer. (Todorov, 1998, p. 203) In Bakhtin's view, there is nothing more frightening than not having an answer. Therefore, monologue discourse is terrible because it does not respond. Although the other and the objectification of the whole reality are other features of monologue and pretend to be the last word.

In general, in a world whose nature is based on the participation of oneself and another; any discourse that ignores the other in the process of meaning-making will be prone to change its nature to a monologue discourse. Because such a discourse distorts the meaning and disconnects it from other meanings; inevitably, he seeks refuge in power and domination for his supply. Bakhtin, who considers dialogue to be moral and aesthetic; considers monologue discourse immoral and cognitively anti-aesthetic. Therefore, using the term self-loss, it should be said; There is no excuse for turning away from oneself, and man has no choice but to participate in existence and enter into endless dialogue with others. Such a relationship and dialogue determines self-awareness, achieving identity, helping others, fulfilling the moral principle of existence, and respecting time and place. From this perspective, Bakhtin says:

The world in its most fundamental form is a moral place; A place that is structured with an irreversible difference between me and the other. Everyone's place is unique; Not because of its special spatial or temporal posi-



tion, nor because it is physically unique, but to the extent that one experiences it as the unique position of one self-facing another. Accountability means understanding this uniqueness and commitment to others. (Hirschkop, 1998, p.58) Hence, "dialogue" is the key to Bakhtin's assumptions that guide his works throughout his intellectual period. In the notes he kept from his youth until his death at the age of eighty; The dialogue is somehow present. And from his point of view, in his relationship with the other, the dialogue is the most desirable and moral way that Bakhtin suggests.

#### **4. The threefold nature of the relationship between the "self" and the "other" from Bakhtin's point of view**

Bakhtin is said to be a theorist and philosopher known for his work in the field of literature. But his theory has great potential in terms of interdisciplinary applications outside the literary field; which can also be used in the fields of social sciences and political sciences. In non-political language, he has emphasized that any relationship can be political; this can be seen, for example, in a study of Dostoevsky's novels. On the one hand, some characters try to impose themselves on the other and dominate their narrative; and on the other hand, some characters try to resist this domination in various and even unconventional ways. Therefore, in his view, the self-other relationship is one of the centers of the formation of political relations and relations in which the two currents of power and resistance exist at the same time.

Accordingly, given the supposedly political Bakhtin self-other relationship, this rela-

tionship consists of three elements; First the center, second the non-center, and third the relationship; Or "self" and "other" and the relationship between them. The important issue here is the relationship between these; with the help of dialogism, which is the science of discovering relationships, this becomes an understandable institution. The relationship between oneself and another is also established through the structure of time/place, and so we can always wait for the discovery of new meaning by changing the structure of time and place. On the other hand, there is three-dimensionality; Because the relationship between oneself and the other also requires the presence of an observer whose job is to discover a relationship that has been established between oneself and the other. (Pourzaki, 2011, p. 42)

Accordingly, this relation is not possible in Bakhtin's thought beyond the boundaries of language; That is, his philosophy and dialogic method are based on the particular linguistic philosophy he has developed during his work. According to Bakhtin, it is in language and with language that the connection between the "self" and the "other" becomes possible; therefore, the creation of meaning is also done through language, and without the existence of "other", the word cannot convey any meaning. Understanding the relationship between self and other and the dialogue of such a relationship requires an understanding of Bakhtin's linguistic philosophy. To him, language is inherently a dialogue. He believes that language should be studied from the point of view of those who use language. According to him, understanding language requires understanding the social situation, and understanding speech also requires the intersection of linguistic and non-linguistic / social. The content or meaning of each expression can be obtained at the

intersection of these two linguistic and social dimensions. However, Bakhtin does not neutralize the social situation and considers it synonymous with the ideological situation. That is why it introduces the element of ideology into the discussion of language. In his view, there is no expression or value-free expression. The expression is the center of ideology.

It is in the continuation of this process of formation of self and other in the relation of conversation that we can search for concepts such as identity and political identity. Therefore, based on what has been said so far, the identity can be defined in Bakhtin language in several parts:

- ≠ Identity is a thing and it has a kind of transformation, dynamism, and continuity in it.
- ≠ Identity derives its validity from individuality before it becomes similar, that is, "self" to another. It means self-awareness to another.
- ≠ Identity is a kind of reinterpretation of oneself, that is, it is not equal to the concept of identity, but it is the definition, identification, and re-identification of oneself through communication with another.
- ≠ Identity is a function of place (space) and time; Because place (land) and time have a great ability to create an identity (Behzadfar, 2011, p. 29)

As a result, according to Bakhtin, identity is a kind of awareness of the "self" that arises through the establishment of the "other"; and this cognition is the result of the interaction and interaction of the "I" or the non-I or the "other". The assumption, therefore, is becoming a thing; That is, due to its formation during this two-way process, it is always changing and transforming and is dynamic. Also,

according to this approach, identity, individualization, and discourse boundaries are formed only in discourse distinctions and differences, and different discourses have a two-way relationship with each other; and so it is on the other hand in differentiating and disagreeing with each other that they are also threatening. And on the other hand, it is only in differentiation and alienation from each other that they are differentiated and as a result, they identify with each other. Therefore, to gain true knowledge of ourselves and our identity, we need to gain knowledge of another. Therefore, in this reading of identity, there is no more conflict, rejection, and denial; Although here, too, the existence of each identity unit is related to the other and the relationship with it, but this relationship is not of the relationship between the adversaries in war. Rather, it is a dynamic and constructive relationship and a kind of constructive conversational relationship on which the existence, content, and form of an identity unit depend.

Until this part of the article, we have tried to describe our research method to explain the qualities and aspects of our relationship with another, from Bakhtin's point of view. It should be noted that we intend to use part of the philosophy and method of this Russian thinker and to the extent that this theory provides the necessary tools for our understanding of the self-other relationship in the Shariati's epistemological system; And to evaluate the capacity of this theory to examine another place in Shariati's works.

### **The "other" in the epistemological system of Ali Shariati**

Almost at the same time as concerning intellectuals such as Naraqı, Bazargan, Jalal Ahmad were involved in the issue of "us" and "another" (the West); Shariati, as the closest

heir to this legacy and as a political thinker who felt responsible for the current crisis, sought to provide a solution and a "favorable answer" to this question. Before entering into the discussion, it is necessary to consider that; The study of the self-other entity in Shariati thought is a multifaceted study. This analysis is sometimes possible ontologically and descriptively and sometimes prescriptively and normatively. This dichotomy in approach can be understood both like his anthropology and in the understanding of social ethics examined in his work. Thus, the social ethic that presupposes the presence of the "other" in this collection of works; And even precedes the "self", ultimately offering collective salvation and a free and just social order as an alternative to the unfavorable situation; Which we see most of it in his literary works with his emotional approach and more precisely mystical. It is in this collection of his works that Shariati has presented the possibility of a form of "dialogue" to achieve mutual understanding. A collection of desert, social, and religious writings, as well as his children's literature, have such characteristics. This dialogue and gathering is a major part of Shariati's mystical and literary views. Works that offer a kind of social theory in which a kind of critical and liberating dialogue, "dialogue with another", is possible at the intersection with the responsible participation of citizens in their civic life. In line with such a dialogue, Shariati believes that committed Muslim intellectuals should practice dialogue with six audiences: world intellectuals, Muslim brothers, the urban masses, women, villagers, and children.

Also, it must be borne in mind that the "other" in the true sense of the word in Shariati's thought is not only a general relationship between two persons but encompasses a wide range. He is a multidisciplinary thinker and

has a variety of works that are relatively different from the mystical-literary approach and the political-ideological approach in the present article, ease research; In the following, we will examine the position of others and the aspects of the self-other relationship from his point of view.

### **5. Other in terms of political-ideological works**

#### *≠ Identity and recognition of other nations and cultures as "other"*

Considering the wide and diverse range of Shariati's works on the issue of identity and ideology in his system of thought, he sees different levels of the relation between "self" and "other"; How we deal with the "West", how we Iranians deal with "Islam" and then the recognition of cultures and civilizations in a reciprocal process as well as the recognition of nations. In the title of the book "Recognition of Iranian-Islamic Identity" (Shariati collection 27, p. 35); The concept of Recognition refers to the relationship between the Iranian-Islamic self, Civilizational self with other civilizations, national self against other nations, integrated self (integrated approach to the history of post-Islamic Iran), the formation and characterization of the Iranian nation through strife, the Arab invasion, and the summoning through successive strife. Under the heading of the history of Islamic Iran up to Safavid times, Shariati acknowledges that the Iranian-Islamic civilization is a kind of open civilization. In other words, this civilization itself has benefited from drinking fountains and "various others", including Greek, Indian and Chinese civilizations. He considers the conflict between civilizations as a sign of a movement, while the closure of civilization is a sign of the Institution of Stillness and Freezing. (Shariati collection 27, p.32)

Shariati attributes the formation of Iranian nationality to the Arab invasion of Iran. With five divisions, he considers post-Islamic Iran to include five periods, which are; the period of the interval, the period of primary nationalism, the period of foreign rule, the period of secondary nationalism, and the new period. The period of an interval is the years when the Arab invasion begins and Iran is at war, but the two cultures have not yet clashed. But the second period (nationalism) is the period of formation of Iranian ethnic groups. According to him, the nation (self) comes into being when its existence is threatened with death (Shariati collection 27, p. 49). The period of foreign rule is the period of Turkish rule over Iran, which begins with the Ghaznavids and Seljuks and continues until the Safavids. It is natural that after the period of alienation that has imposed itself on the national self; we see the formation of a kind of nationalism that formed in the Safavid period.

According to Shariati, the message of Islam in the face of Iranians is based on the four axes of denial of domination, denial of hegemonic approaches that cause the "Iranian self" and the "Islamic other" to accept each other's presence and dialogue to be established. These four axes are:

1. No one should worship anyone because worship is the exclusive monopoly of God.
2. No one, no one should be afraid because everyone's destiny is in God's hands.
3. No one is superior to anyone, no group to one group, and no class to another class, because all children are from one father and one mother. Therefore, humanity is not equal to each other, but brothers to each other.

4. No power in the name of political, spiritual, and economic power should prevail, because all powers and governments in all their forms are exclusive to God. (Shariati collection 27, p. 51) Also, according to Shariati, after the formation of the Iranian Shiite movement in Iran, we see a kind of peaceful and reconciling relationship between the national-religious self, which means that neither is rejected by the other. This Iranian-Shi'a movement celebrated Ashura on the (10<sup>th</sup>) day of Muharram and the next day the (11<sup>th</sup>) celebrated Nowruz, which shows that this movement does not want to sacrifice either (nationality and religion) to each other (Shariati collection 27, p. 73).

Shariati points to a kind of religious approach, referring to the agreements that the Prophet made with the representatives of the tribes; That Islam has tried to replace the principle of conflict with the principle of comity for any nation to maintain its sovereignty over itself. It realized in Shariati's view a true internationalism, when every nation attains two distinct human qualities, one of which is to have an opinion and the other to have a will. In this sense, the call to return to oneself is not a return from the originality of humanism to ethnic localism and racial narrow-mindedness; Rather, it is an ascent from cultural self-alienation and existential meaninglessness and historical impersonality to the transcendent stage of human self-birth and self-awareness, and finally the true realization of human originality (Shariati collection 27, p. 129). According to Shariati, understanding with a European will be possible when both he and I are human; But I am now a person in his form and not in his content. In

this case, our understanding is not possible. I am Eastern and I only look like a European body without any human connection. Because he thinks, but I do not, one who can think that the worldview is in line with his social and cultural realities. So everyone has to go back to their true atmosphere to reach a situation that I think is both European and European; Both I consume and produce, and the Europeans at that time, like two human beings, created human unity hand in hand. As long as we do not have our own culture and personality, this uniformity is only for the benefit of Europeans and to the detriment of non-Europeans (Shariati collection 12, pp. 162-163). For Shariati, therefore, the richness of human life depends on the preservation of cultural distinctions and differences. Transformation is a necessity that draws its strength from tradition. Renewal means breaking with rotten traditions and indigenous barriers is possible only through the critique of traditions (Ghani Rad, 2002, p. 179)

Shariati, considering the concept of assimilation (similar to another), considers it as one of the phenomena resulting from the collision of colonial modernity with southern (less developed) societies. He writes: I use the same term (assimilation) with the same dialectic as the relationship between non-Europeans and Europeans. In this profound saying of the Prophet, whoever imitates himself to other people, is no longer attached to his community, is dependent on other people, has been uprooted and alienated from himself. (Shariati collection 31, p. 339)

But in Shariati's view, with theoretical caution, the concept of each other may be an appropriate interpretation of the kind of confrontation that Shariati intends in dealing with nations. Among the causes of alienation from oneself, he refers to another who has always sought to eliminate and reject himself.

These factors include; First, the domination of foreign governments that could have dominated by weakening the national spirit and culture and creating historical rifts. Second, the plan of Islam, which has been wrongly propagated as a culture against culture and nationality - includes Iranian culture and nationality. Third, assimilation, imperialist domination, Occidentalism, and Western cultural colonization, which in recent centuries have always been the basis for political and economic colonization in the East. And fourth, new ideologies, namely liberalism (in the form of the world market), Marxism (in the form of the world-class), and the church (in the form of the establishment of this world government) have sought to attack the existential character and historical selves of nations. Naturally, the result of such a situation has been the root of the income of nations (Shariati collection 27, pp. 81-86). In the face of such a situation, the nation, which saw its true existence being plundered, tried to defend its endangered existence with all its might through some kind of defense and reaction mechanism. But this reactionary approach to defending and introducing nationality has either followed fanatical and reactionary ethnocentrism or has combined nationalism with racism. The occurrence of such an encounter has forced Shariati to speak of his self-recognition differently. According to Shariati, nationality is not only opposed to reaction and racism; rather, it is a human reality and a social reality among human beings. This is not only the cause of ethnic supremacy and national conflict; rather, it is a factor of understanding and compliment (recognition) between nations. And not only is it not an obstacle to humanity; which is the path through which the true realization of humanity (humanism) passes on earth, not on paper (Shariati collection 27, p. 89). Shariati

acknowledges that the word "nation" has no genetic or blood roots. Rather, as it is understood from its Arabic equivalent, branches; It means a branch and string of a single human tree. Which at the same time gives a nationality, identity, and existential originality; It maintains its dependence on the human tree and even other human branches. He agrees with the difference between the two types of nationalism; that the nationalism he sought was not only concerned with denial, humiliation, and confrontation with others; rather, it tried to reach out to other people instead of dropping his fist (Shariati collection 27, p. 114). This Shariati view of one's relationship with the other in international relations imagines nations as members of one body that are organically and organically related to each other.

It should also be noted that according to Shariati, nations do not live alone in conflict; But they also find out in their interactions with each other, what, knowing each other leads to knowing each other. Thus, it is clear that it is in these mergers and gatherings and mutual relations that the face of nations becomes clearer and clearer; As international and global awareness increases, national self-awareness in nations becomes deeper and clearer, and each nation makes its conscience clearer and more secure. (Shariati collection 27, pp. 150-151)

#### **6. Political identity and the idea of returning to oneself**

The theory of self-return was the answer and solution that Shariati proposed for the self-destruction and identity crisis of the generation of the time. In the theory of self-return, he tries to organize a plan that can be interpreted as a kind of critique and reconstruction of internationalism based on acknowledging the presence of different nations in an equal

and fraternal confrontation. His work is a prime example of postcolonial discourse and expresses concern for the long process of experiencing double frustration. He has analyzed and challenged the colonial practice of cultural domination and negation (Manouchehri, 2004, p.118). In his works, Shariati exposes the impact of cultural colonialism on the creation of another dominated and at the same time, the process of self-transformation that has been transformed and alienated. It is noteworthy that in postcolonial discourse, the return to self-dominated zeal for a resilient self occurs precisely at the historic moment of a postmodern turn in which a disillusioned generation has rejected the European interpretation of the human self. In other words, while the world under domination seeks to defend itself, colonial Europeans have denied themselves, but this does not necessarily preclude postcolonial discourse from fulfilling the historical task of developing a serious self. The necessity of post-colonial speech is what Shariati has tried to cover up in society (Shariati collection, 27, p. 118)

Nevertheless, the mechanism of revival for Shariati was to achieve the original self of any nation. A self that has been established and perpetuated as an identity on indigenous sources commensurate with time and place, and he saw this meaning in the common term of his day during the colonization and exploitation of third world nations, namely independence. This independence must first be achieved in language as an epistemological system to show itself in other dimensions and the existence of individual social and political life. In this sense, independence in the mindset is the prelude to political and social independence. Independence from the West, which is the most important "other of Islam", is not possible except by freeing oneself from the domination of the Western mentality,

which is an independent epistemological system, and understanding the language of its intellectual resources. Liberation from the aspect of the epistemological system of Western thought is the same ideological freedom that is the essence of thinking (Shakeri, 2003, p. 105).

Thus, the first stage of returning to oneself in Shariati is liberation from Western domination and mentality and rejection of the West. The next step is to find Mavi to seek refuge. To find a foothold for an "identity" that could not be found for Sharia except through Islam; the issue of returning to oneself is not a slogan that religious people in the world have now raised; Rather, advanced non-religious intellectuals have raised this issue for the first time. Like Aimé Césaire in Africa, like Frantz Fanon, like Julius Nyerere, like Jomo Kenyatta, like Léopold Sédar Senghor in Senegal, like the Algerian writer Kateb Yacine, and like Al-Ahmad in Iran. These are the ones who have raised the slogan of returning to oneself, and none of them are religious brigades. (Shariati, undated B, p.15) Shariati considered religion as an essential element of himself and in the next stage, proposed a more specific and specific interpretation of religion; When it comes to returning to "self" for me, I am religious, and you, who are non-religious, and we both share our social responsibility and have reached a common understanding. The issue goes from returning to "self" to returning to our "cultural self" and knowing the self that we are, and it is in this direction of studies that we reach a return to Islamic culture and Islamic ideology and Islam. Not as a tradition, inheritance, a system of belief in society, but Islam as an ideology, Islam as a faith that gave knowledge and created that miracle here. (Shariati, undated B, pp.15- 16)

Nevertheless, Shariati did not add anything new in his analysis of the role of social forces and the reasons for their disconnection from the roots of tradition and sources of identity. He considered a goldsmith war between the quasi-clergy and the quasi-intellectuals as a result of a two-pronged roof and an enemy of Kami in the Iranian intellectual sphere, which has divided society into two halves. Half of them are led to exaggeration and the other half to bigotry. In his view, pseudo-intellectuals, like childhood toys, are mere imitators of the West. So in a society where half do not know religion and the other half know evil; For the intellectual and spiritual revolution and the religious renaissance to take place and for the dead and rotten body of culture to come to life; The only condition is that all conscious and responsible intellectuals believe that the only way to unify this double roof is to resolve this ominous contradiction and save it from this deceitful duality; to revive the life-giving, moving and creative spirit. (Shariati, undated C, p.23) Thus, returning to oneself becomes both a tool for overcoming the internal divisions of society and a means of taking a stand against the West. Therefore, Shariati intends to explain the idea of returning to oneself as an answer to the questions of the present. In his opinion, this slogan does not mean to turn back from the present and turn our backs on the future, to flee from everything new, and to be afraid of the past, but the goal is to return to our human, cultural and religious selves. Thus, returning to oneself for Shariati is a progressive movement to save oneself from alienation from oneself, alien solution in one's human nature and spiritual and cultural identity (alienation), and as a result to recover lost truth and looted values. (Shariati, undated C, pp. 46-47)

Shariati played a prominent role for the intellectuals and criticized them harshly, but he considered replacing the degenerate and frozen Islam from the depths of the minds and depths of people's lives with true and life-giving Islam as the first task of Islamic intellectuals. In his view, "intellectual responsibility" dictated that while tracking the shortcomings of society, it should offer solutions that are in harmony with the culture of society, that is, Islamic culture. (John Furan, 2005, pp. 545-546) Shariati gave a return to the actual self-existing in the soul and conscience of society, a capacity that can be explored and extracted by an intellectual like a substance and a source of energy and come to life and movement, and that is our Islamic cultural self. (Shariati, collection 4, 2005, pp. 38-40) It can be said that returning to oneself is another interpretation of the Islamic Renaissance. In all his definitions of the Islamic Renaissance, Shariati expresses the same issue of returning to the original, the first and true Islam, returning to the Qur'an, the rebirth of that awakening revolutionary spirit, and pure human faith as the content of this subject; (Shariati collection 20, 1392, pp.380-384) which is also seen in the Ummah and Imamate.

In the slogan of returning to oneself, it should be specified which return to oneself? Mythical self? Ethnic and racial kinship? Historical self? Traditional and indigenous self? Ancient self? Religious self? Which religion? Mehri? Zoroastrian? Manichaeism? Mazdaki? Or Islamic self? Which Islam? Sunni? Shia? Which Shia? Allawi? Safavid? (Shariati, undated C, p. 47) Shariati's answer to this question is nothing but a return to prophetic Islam and Alawite Shiism. Returning to oneself meant something to Shariati in the face of alienation from oneself. The West, with its cultural colonization, current reac-

tion, current religion, ignorance, blind bigotry, and false modernity, were respectively the most important elements alien to the self that had to be overcome.

Here it is said that "self" in Shariati's view means only within its national and cultural self; and of course, history and civilization are part of the existence and identity of every person, and without that person, he will suffer from an identity crisis. Finally, Shariati's views and theories, especially regarding the presentation of this idea, contained the themes of a monologue discourse. For him, achieving a lost identity meant moving away from the realities of the world in the form of rejecting modernity and science, threatening the West with indigenous and traditional identities, and believing in a unifying policy in society to resist colonialism. Although he did not consider his program reactionary, he willingly or unwillingly produced the characteristics of a traditional Pre-modern society. He was more concerned with compensating for the backwardness of society than a period that had inevitably become modern, and he was more concerned with the discontinuity created by traditional and religious values. All in all, Shariati's response to the crisis of his time was to formulate a plan for Shi'ism to emerge as a leading revolutionary party in the face of the status quo and the ruling system. By reinterpreting as well as combining a set of religious elements, symbolic and symbolic categories, using mythical concepts and characters such as Abu Dharr, who is a symbol of the revolutionary struggle; He presented an ideological interpretation of religion and the element of religion, using historical and religious theology and using verses from the Qur'an, hadiths, left-wing class ideas; To politicize a religion that he thinks is capable of responding to the crisis of his time. Thus, here, when Shariati seeks to pro-



vide an ideological understanding and response to the crisis issues of his time, the self-other formulation in his system of thought becomes a conflicting monologue; because ideologies are tools and they need an "other" or, more precisely, an "enemy" to fight; especially the revolutionary and militant ideology that wants to change the status quo.

Finally, the "identity" and "self" that Ali Shariati sought to define; Not in the new and contemporary view of the world, but if a large part of the realities of the world that had already become inherent in the new world were removed/rejected. In the light of such an attitude, an isolated identity was theorized that was so fragile that it was thought that to maintain it, its connection with other cultures had to be limited.

### **7.Modernity as "other"**

The formulation of religion and modernity as (self-other) according to Shariati, in his thought, is not merely an ideological model, but the basis of "identity". In many propositions, Shariati has an opinion based on the importance of modern science, and sometimes, to emphasize that Islam is compatible with science, he speaks of natural issues in the Qur'an and has acknowledged this; That we do not need to destroy the material system, but instead of the spirit of hostility and materialism, we should blow the human spirit in its material body. He also believes that the manifestations of modernity without self-awareness, faith, and ideals do not cause society to move from consumerism to productivity and that as technology progresses, it will be a means to further ruin man. However, in the end, he destroys the foundations and the basis for accepting and confronting modernity (dialogue) with modernity, because the centrality of dialectical movement

in Shariati ontology forces him to confront the common religion and the modern world. We know that Shariati sees the modern world in crisis and believes that today's Western civilization has been shaken in three aspects: social, scientific, and philosophical. Shariati considers the basic components of the modern world, namely science, reason, and humanism, as a cover for the same rule of the three powers of gold, force, and hypocrisy; and he believes that the new materialist and anti-religious worldview, just like polytheism, is specific to the new ruling class. Believing in class antagonism, he explains the totality of modernity in the shadow of bourgeois rule and defines the new world in a state of conflict and contradiction with which dialogue is ultimately impossible. Also, Shariati criticizes the modern world that has been realized and sees no desirable and hopeful signs in it. Another point is that he does not accept many of the preliminaries and necessities of the modern world that have become the basis for the production and invention of the manifestations of modernity, including the machine. Including science, order, modern bureaucracy, private property, and in general the difficult parts of modernity, which include; Accurate measurement based on testing and calculation, technical approach to a limited problem, machine efficiency, economic results expressed by statistics, and daily routines of the bureaucracy and strict decision-making system, are not favored by Shariati.

In sum, he sees science as a tool of the bourgeoisie that has led to the metamorphosis of man. Therefore, it prevents the formation of the desired cohesion and dialogue life.

On the other hand, it seems that the ruling spirit of Ali Shariati's thought is an escape from the current unfavorable situation, that is, a disintegrated society, in the process of

modernization and conservative clergy; finally, the presentation of an ideal solution was based on paying attention to an ideal past and drawing an ideal future. He was critical of the reactionary and conservative clergy and the prevailing political situation. To this end, the method that Shariati uses in the framework of organizing his thought to challenge the unfavorable situation of his time was symbolic and symbolic; This method was adopted to play an effective role in the audience. And it was said that the choice of method was also since Shariati was in a closed political space; That this form of authoritarian rule represented a complete form of one-sided political paradigm that operated in a monologue-dominated discourse. Therefore, the choice of method could have created a kind of immunity for him in conflict with this monologue force (system).

Therefore, Shariati, with a word of religion and history, on the one hand, tries to criticize and analyze the society of his time and on the other hand; seeks to provide solutions in the form of these categories. These symbolic categories in Shariati's thought are to express and critique the crises in his contemporary society; In fact, it is an analysis of the decline and destruction of time and gives shape and content to these categories according to the current situation. Otherwise, and if these categories are merely expressions of history, they are not new, and they were even discussed in the time of Shariati. But their expression as a metaphor is in line with the analysis of the crises of the time, which made them look fresh and attractive.

Shariati also sought to reinterpret religious words and meanings in a way that would play a revitalizing role. He used the method of the degree of meaning, according to which, although the words had a unique meaning; but with different circumstances,

their content and theme could be changed, he tried to take many religious concepts out of passivity and turn them into a tool to change the movement. Thus, in addition to the use of metaphorical language, he had the symbolism, the use of historical religious and mythological categories, with the help of reinterpreting these concepts and removing them from passivity and with a critical action; And he used this method to respond and find a solution to the crisis of his time. If in his redefinition we see concepts such as monotheism, ontology, anthropology, ideal society, philosophy of history, polytheism, struggle, and then concepts such as self-sacrifice, waiting, martyrdom, prayer, the oppressed.

Ultimately, Shariati's main intention in the face of the crisis of the time, and Bakhtin's language, was "his answer" to the "question" that lay ahead; Formulates a plan of Shiism from which a leading revolutionary party will be organized in the face of the current situation and the ruling system. Ultimately, Shariati's main intention in the face of the crisis of the time, and Bakhtin's language, was "his answer" to the "question" that lay ahead; Formulates a plan of Shiism from which a leading revolutionary party will be organized in the face of the current situation and the ruling system. He presented an ideological interpretation of religion by combining a set of religious elements, symbolic categories, application of mythical concepts and personalities, with historical and religious theology and use of Quranic verses, hadiths, leftist class ideas, modeling of revolutionary and leftist parties; To politicize the religion that he thought was able to respond to the crisis of his time, and finally to formulate the Shiite party and its ideal society and ideal human being. The Shiite party that he portrayed was a party to fight for the realization of the

ideals of the monotheistic faction of history, which at this time is carried out in a regular and organized manner by the party. The distinctive feature of this party is the struggle and building and equipping people who do not give up any kind of struggle to achieve the goals of the party.

Thus, when Shariati seeks to provide an ideological understanding of Islam, he must inevitably address the self-other as what Schmidt calls friend-enemy. Because the "other" sign is essential to any ideology, and this in itself reinforces the monologue-conflict discourse; because ideologies are tools of struggle and for the struggle, they need the existence of "other" and more precisely the enemy; especially revolutionary and militant ideologies that demand fundamental political, socio-economic change.

In this part of the article, we explained how the self-other relationship works in the political and ideological works of this thinker. In the next section, we will try to examine how Ibn's relation relates to Shariati's emotional-literary works.

#### **8. Otrrr cccss in hhiiii tti's mttt illl - literary works**

It was said that one of the most important components of Bakhtin's dialogism was the principle of "otherness" of this philosopher. In this regard, it seems that the best text in which one can see signs of the "necessity of the existence of another" in Shariati's writings is his "deserts" and especially the text of the "descent". This work, including literary-emotional texts, has a mystical approach that raises multiple issues such as the relationship between self and other, philosophical Anthropology, Normative Thought, Philosophy of Creation, Existentialist Subject Intrusion, Practice, Critique of Consumerism, and the Age of Technique and individualism in a sys-

tematic and meaningful connection. In this work, Shariati connects a kind of anthropology based on understanding and communication and the need to "talk to another" with his desired political thought. Here he portrays a self-governing law that transcends itself and even goes beyond talking to God, to another human being. Also, in this work, with an emotional-mystical approach, we see propositions that remind us of this Bakhtin interpretation (If we want to protect ourselves from others, we eventually lose ourselves.); and also the fact that if we are freed from being understood by others, we have escaped from our being. In this work, Shariati repeatedly emphasizes the necessity of the existence of another, and in explaining the relationship between oneself and another, it is inferred that the subject realizes his "presence" with the help of "another's presence". In addition to this relationship in this kind of mystical approach and Shariati's view, the purpose of creation was explained as follows: What is the purpose of creation? I was a hidden treasure and I wanted to be known, and finally, here Shariati does not consider his perfection and excellence possible without anyone else. Thus, in the descent, when the "emotional" attitude prevails over the "other", Shariati pays more attention to the "other". For him, being alone was considered to be half-hearted. Suffering and pain are tolerable with a sense of empathy and familiarity with another. Here he turns to another to relieve the pain of separation. On the other hand, the important point raised against the "other" was the discussion of responsibility on his part, in which Shariati assumes the "presence of another" in the matter of responsibility.

Thus, Shariati seems to accept another role in his emergence and the necessity of the existence of another; And he says: I arise when he is conscientious towards another, in

which in this proposition the identification of the "self" depends on the existence of the "other." Shariati defines this issue in some places under the same dialectical approach and says, for example, that it is about the "other" that man reaches me and that he discovers himself by knowing and feeling "other". Finally, Shariati in the descent, where the "emotional" attitude prevails over the "other", pays more attention to the "other".

But on the whole, given both mystical and political works of Shariati, it is understood that the "other" is ultimately marginalized in his mind and that what matters is the knowledge of the "true"; because Shariati considers having a real relationship with another possible when a person does not establish a relationship with another based on his daily needs and interests but returns to his true self. Thus, although he speaks of having a real relationship with another, his argument is about pure and true self-knowledge and a dialectic that has overshadowed Shari'a anthropology; Cognition of the settled and possibly human beings and the desired coexistence aside for the sake of achieving the true and pure self, and only when it thinks of the spiritual life, it considers the desirable relationship with the other (dialogue).

Another important element of Bakhtin's dialogue was the principle of "positionality" and "responsibility" that we mentioned. It was said that this philosopher believed that each person occupies a unique place and a special place in the universe and from that place he understands and interprets the world. Besides, the uniqueness of this position is inviolable, and man has a responsibility to "answer" to the world. Based on this conceptual necessity, anthropology is important in Shariati's thought, which is one of the most important components of his discourse,

which he explains with a metaphorical word derived from religion. Although this concept is in appearance and religious theology and taken from the text of the Qur'an, but included an analysis of the current situation and indicated that not only society has been divided and crisis, but also man is involved in a kind of duality. There are an unexplained explanation and the hope of liberation. In the continuation of his discussions in this regard, he enumerates the characteristics of human beings; these include human dialectics, rebellion, and possibility, as well as freedom, will, awareness, idealism, creativity, and transcendence. The point he makes in this regard is that everyone emphasizes movement and migration until they reach the pure and true self. As a result of this perception of man and by presenting this plan, it seems that man is settled and possibly has no place in his epistemological system. The main issue seems to be that Shariati considers man to be an incomplete and imperfect being; and so it can be said that after the centrality of dialectical movement in Shariati ontology and human rebellion in his anthropology, he could not have a clear vision of his desired confrontation with the other and Bakhtin's dialogue in his thought. Although it has been observed that he presents us with individual propositions in this regard, before he thinks about his encounter and relationship with another; He thinks about what man is and how to raise him in the modern era with the help of religion, and he sees this what and how in "rebellion" and "rebellion". So, finally, in Shariati's thoughts, we are facing a kind of anthropological crisis. So that he and the other do not have an independent identity with him and objects are defined that are dominated by "movement" and "rebellion" to perfect them.

## Conclusion

In this article, we have tried to achieve a correct understanding of the self-other relationship in the Shariati intellectual system based on Bakhtin dialogue, using an appropriate conceptual framework. Using some important components of Bakhtin's dialogism, let us examine the self-other formulation in Shariati thought; also evaluate the capacity of this theory regarding the self-other encounter in Shariati thought.

Our world, as we have dealt with it in the context of the Bakhtin concept, has presented us with challenges and questions, and we must inevitably give meaningful answers to these questions. Accordingly, in the context of the time and place that Shariati and his contemporary thinkers experienced; one of the most important questions and challenges was the issue of Iranian identity, or more precisely, the fundamental relationship between us-ourselves and the world that the West and other cultures and ideologies were a small part of this relationship and a historical pretext for testing them. To understand this relationship, this group of thinkers sought to provide a favorable answer to the question that Ali Shariati was one of the most influential. As we have seen, given the wide and varied range of Shariati's works on the issue of identity and ideology, there are different levels of the relationship between oneself and the other, how to deal with the "West", how to deal with "Islam" Iranians and then the recognition of cultures and civilizations in a reciprocal process as well as the recognition of nations. In this regard, Shariati has recognized the issue of identifying nations, other civilizations, and cultures as "non-existent" and emphasizes the need to get acquainted with other cultures to achieve a correct understanding of "self". He also considers the Iranian civilization as an open-armed civili-

zation and willing to talk and dialogue with other civilizations; And by acknowledging the principle of compliments, it seeks to show that Iranian civilization has not been transformed and digested in the face of Islam as an "other" and has maintained its independence. He criticizes the imitation of other nations and strongly opposes cultural domination and cultural colonization. According to Shariati, nations do not live together in minarets, and he considers the richness of human life to depend on maintaining cultural distinction and differences. Given the content of these propositions, it seems; In this category and range of his works, based on the Bakhtinian model, dialogue with another (dialogism) is possible by maintaining conditions of equality and without the domination of the "other" over the "self", That here, the "other", other nations, cultures, and civilizations, are members of one body. However, regarding Shariati's response to the other / the West in the face of the current situation and the crisis of society; And also when the ideological shadow falls on his system of thought. Like what exists in his political-ideological works such as Ummah and Imamate, the Shi'a party; And with a reinterpretation of concepts such as martyrdom, struggle, self-sacrifice, and social responsibility, and praises a revolutionary figure such as Abu-Dhār; The situation of dialogue with the other becomes weak and fragile; because he finds the solution in rejecting and ignoring others. And the answer that is due to ignoring the other is meaningless in Bakhtin's epistemological system and leads to the strengthening of the monologue discourse; As mentioned, Bakhtin considers it immoral and cognitively anti-aesthetic; because he finds the solution in rejecting and ignoring others. And the answer that is due to ignoring the other is meaningless in Bakhtin's epistemological system and

leads to the strengthening of the monologue discourse; as mentioned, Bakhtin considers it immoral and cognitively anti-aesthetic.

It must be borne in mind that in terms of the formation of new structures, the modern world no longer allows any culture to remain in isolation. This situation is not the will of a country or an individual. In these new circumstances, another isolation and rejection, passivity, which, in the words of Bakhtin and Martin Buber, ultimately leads to the loss of "self." Of course, with the rapid changes that are taking place in today's world, identities are also becoming more complex; because, in such a situation, the identity framework is constantly exchanging meaning with other cultures. However, it seems that the important task of the Iranian intellectual in the present period is to interact and talk with other areas with an open spirit while recognizing the problems of society and solving them. Besides, it must be borne in mind that another issue is at the core of a nation's identity. It is like a double-edged sword, which is also a threat at the same time. The possibility of it becoming an opportunity or a threat depends on how it is addressed and the type of theorizing. The point to consider is whether both the emergence of the other and the processing of a sensible relationship in dealing with it both reflect the cultural and identity characteristics of each nation. In this sense, freeing one from any encounter with another does not mean refining the identity of one nation from another, but the same kind of exclusionary encounter adds a problematic element to the complexities of identity.

Finally, the world will now be a nation that understands the real world in terms of time and space. Fundamental knowledge of the world is not possible without using the cognitive experiences of other civilizations and cultures. Every culture in the Bakhtin

language can reach true self-awareness in the sense of understanding the meaning of its presence in the world when it enters into a continuous and endless dialogue with another. Because the "other" does not necessarily seek to communicate with us, and the basic rule governing the relationship between us and the other is conflict. The only actor and event that can curb this conflict and bring it closer to dialogue is political language, the democratization of democracy, and, in general, the calling and guarding of politics along with distrust of structured institutions.

### References

- Amiri, Nader (2007). *Collective Memory and Narrative*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Tehran
- Bakhtin, M. M (1993). *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*, Vadim Liapunov (trans), Vadim Liapunov & Michael Holquist (ed). Texas University Press
- Bakhtin, M. M, and Voroshilov, V. N (1986). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*
- Bakhtin, M. M (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* C. Emerson, Translates and Edited by University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis MN
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (2008). *Conversational Imagination: Essays on the Novel*, translated by Roya Pourazar, first edition, Tehran, Ney Publishing
- Bakhtin, M. M (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, Translated and Edited by Vern W. McGee and Cayla Emerson, and Michael Holquist, Austin University of Texas Press
- Behzadfar, Mostafa (2011). *The identity of the city, a look at the identity of the city of Tehran*, Tehran, Shahr Publishing

- Furan, Jan (2004). *Fragile Resistance: History of Social Developments in Iran*, translated by Ahmad Tadayon, 5th edition, Tehran, Rasa Cultural Services Institute
- Ghani Rad, Mohammad Amin (2002). *Genealogy of Modern Rationality; Post-modern reading of Dr. Ali Shariati's thought*, Tehran, Culture Critique
- Khodaei Rad, Lotfollah (2012). *He and another; Iranian thinkers' encounter with the West from (1951) - (1981)*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Tehran, Faculty of Law and Political Science
- Manouchehri, Abbas (2004). *Hermeneutics of Liberation and Civil Mysticism*, translated by Hossein Khandaghabadi, Tehran: Institute for Research and Development of Humanities
- Pourzaki, Giti (2011). *Self and other political aspects in the fiction literature of the 1940s Jalal Al-Ahmad*, Tarbiat Modarres University, Faculty of Humanities-Department of Political Science
- Shakeri, Seyed Reza, (2003). *Shariati Political Thought and Critique of Shariatism*, Tehran, University Jihad, Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Shariati, Ali (1982). *Collection of 27 works (Recognition of Iranian-Islamic identity)*, First Edition, Tehran, Elham Publications
- Shariati, Ali (2005). *Collection of 4 works, Return*, Tehran, Elham Publication
- Shariati, Ali (2013). *Collection of 20 works, what to do*, Tehran, Qalam Publication
- Shariati, Ali (2014). *Collection of 33 works, Lonely Conversations*, Tehran, Dr. Ali Shariati Cultural Foundation
- Shariati, Ali (2015). *Collection of 31 works, characteristics of new centuries*, Tehran, Chappakhsh
- Shariati, Ali (W.D.). *Return to Self*, Tehran, Parto Publishing House
- Shariati, Ali (W.D.). *what should be done?* Tehran: Qalam Publication
- Shariati, Ali, *Collection of 12 works, History of Civilization (2)*, Tehran: Qalam Publication
- Todorov, Tzutan (1994). *Self and Other, Conversation with Todorov*, Conversation, No. 6
- Todorov, Tzutan (1998). *The Conversational Logic of Mikhail Bakhtin*, Translated by Dariush Karimi, first edition, Tehran Publishing Center

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی  
 پرتال جامع علوم انسانی