

هایدگر که در جوانی از علم کلام به فلسفه رو آورده است داعیه متکلم بودن ندارد «اما این قدر هست که این فلسفه نوعی چارچوب مفهومی فراهم می‌کند که متکلم اگر بخواهد ایمان مسیحی را به الفاظ مفهوم برای جهان امروز بیان کند بدان نیازمند است» (پیش‌گفتار کتاب، ص ۹). می‌توان هایدگر را از حیث تأثیری که بر علم کلام جدید داشته است با افلاطون و ارسطو مقایسه کرد. این دو فیلسوف بزرگ هیچ کدام متکلم نبودند اما علم کلام عقلی با رجوع به آثار آنان قوام پیدا کرد.

طرح نکات بدیعی که در این کتاب در باب نسبت تفکر هایدگر و مسائل کلامی مطرح شده است از عهده نویسنده‌ای مثل مک کواری برمی‌آید که هم مارتین هایدگر را خوب می‌شناسد و هم عالم علم الهی و کلام مسیحی است.

توسعه و تضاد کوشی در جهت تحلیل انقلاب اسلامی و مسائل اجتماعی ایران

نویسنده: فرامرز رفیع‌پور
ناشر: انتشارات دانشگاه شهید بهشتی
چاپ اول: ۱۳۷۶، ۵۹۱ صفحه
قیمت: ۱۹۰۰۰ ریال

این کتاب به طوری که مؤلف محترم در مقدمه کتاب (ص ۲۱) اشاره کرده‌اند، جلد اول یک پژوهش دو جلدی در باب انقلاب اسلامی ایران است. در این مجلد مطالبی آمده است که خواننده با مطالعه آن مهیای خواندن جلد دوم می‌شود. روی جلد کتاب و در صفحه شناسنامه ذکر نشده است که این کتاب جلد اول است یا جلد دوم، فقط در صفحه فهرست عنوان جلد اول: آناطومی

جامعه: مفاهیم اساسی جامعه سیاسی کاربردی و جلد دوم: توسعه و تضاد کوشی در جهت تحلیل انقلاب اسلامی و مسائل اجتماعی ایران قید شده است. چون این عنوان به کتابی که در دست ماست تعلق دارد ظاهراً باید همین کتاب جلد دوم باشد. در جلد دوم به گفته نویسنده وضع جامعه ما و بیماری‌های آن تحلیل و بررسی شده است. از این اشاره پیداست که پژوهش حاضر گردآوری مقدماتی آثار و نقل اقوال این و آن نیست بلکه یک پژوهش انتقادی است.

پژوهش‌های اجتماعی که در کشور ما صورت گرفته بعضی کاربردی (و البته مفید) و بعضی دیگر تقلیدی بوده است. در پژوهش تقلیدی پژوهشگر پرسش و طلبی ندارد و برایش تفاوت نمی‌کند که در باب چه چیزی پژوهش کند. این قبیل پژوهش‌ها در نهایت امر مضر است، اما پژوهش دکتر رفیع‌پور پژوهش کاربردی نیست بلکه یک تحقیق جدی در باب پیدایش انقلاب و سیر آن است.

کتاب مشتمل بر چهار بخش است. در بخش اول پیدایش انقلاب اسلامی با رجوع به نظریه‌های صاحب‌نظران مسائل انقلاب و با توجه به شرایط خاص ایران تبیین شده است. بخش دوم در باب دوران بعد از انقلاب و «شکل‌گیری صورت» و «تغییرات درونی در نظام اجتماعی بعد از انقلاب» و «عکس‌العمل‌های کشورهای عربی» و جنگ و تأثیر آن بر نظام اجتماعی است. بخش سوم که مفصل‌ترین و مهم‌ترین بخش کتاب است به «شرح تغییرات در نظام اجتماعی ایران بعد از جنگ اختصاص دارد و در بخش چهارم مؤلف به عنوان نتیجه‌گیری برنامه توسعه را نقد کرده است. اجرای سیاست نادرست توسعه در زمان شاه و اعمال سیاست حقوق بشر و فشار وسائل ارتباط جمعی غربی موجب پدید آمدن شرایط انقلاب شد و رهبری قوی انقلاب را به پیروزی رساند. انقلاب در گام‌های اول بود که عراق به ایران حمله کرد و این حمله «تغییرات اساسی در نظام ارزشی مردم به وجود آورد».

در بخش سوم نویسنده وضع ایران بعد از جنگ را تحلیل کرده و به این نتیجه رسیده است که «شرایط داخلی و اشتباهات برخی سیاستمداران خودی» عامل اصلی بیماری‌های اجتماعی ماست. میکروب‌ها همیشه و همه جا وجود دارند اما تأثیر آنها بیشتر بر روی بدن‌های ضعیف و مساعد است. به نظر نویسنده «ما مسائل داخلی و اهداف و راه‌های رسیدن به اهداف و ارتباط خود با دیگر کشورها را به طور علمی و دقیق بررسی نکرده‌ایم و به نظر می‌رسد که در این زمینه نیز با هاله‌هایی از تصورات همواره در حال تغییر کار می‌کنیم» و بالاخره در بخش چهارم مؤلف نتیجه گرفته است که مهم‌ترین عامل داخلی در وضعیت فعلی کشور ما نداشتن قدرت تفکر منسجم و علم سازمان یافته است...

بعد از مسئله قدرت تفکر، عامل اساسی بعدی که فرآیند اخیر تغییرات تهدیدکننده را در جامعه به وجود آورده، چیزی است که به عنوان اقدامات در دیاگرام فوق آمده است (در دیاگرام صفحه ۵۳۶ اقدامات به نابرابری، ارزش ثروت و کاهش کنترل و فساد و انحراف، ولع ارتقاء و مدرک و مقام‌پرستی و استبداد و... مؤدبی شده است) و منظور از آن اقداماتی است که بعد از پایان جنگ در پیش گرفته شد... نویسنده می‌خواهد که این اثر انتقادی ره‌آموز سیاست آینده کشور باشد و بخش چهارم نوشته خود را با این عبارات پایان می‌دهد: «... دریغ است که این همه درایت، شجاعت و تجربه سیاسی چندین ساله از قبل از انقلاب تاکنون به خاطر چند اشتباه مورد سؤال قرار گیرد و از این پتانسیل بزرگ مجدداً در جهت اصلاح عمیق ساختار اجتماعی استفاده نگردد. بدین منظور لازم است که مسئولین شجاع و خوش فکر ما به این خدعه ظریف بیندیشند. این خدعه در قالب پدیده‌ای است که نام آن را «توسعه» نهاده‌اند و ما را با اقدامات توسط خود به آن‌سو سوق داده‌اند. آقای دکتر رفیع‌پور توسعه را اسب تروای دشمن خوانده است که مایه نابودی جهان سوم خواهد شد. برای آنکه خواننده گمان نکند که مؤلف

با تجدد و جامعه متجدد دشمن است می‌گوییم که بحث در خوبی و بدی تجدد نیست. سخن این است که راهی که کشورهای جهان سوم در آن می‌روند به مدرنیته نمی‌رسد بلکه به تضاد و آشوب منتهی می‌شود.

شاید بعضی سیاست‌مداران و دست‌اندرکاران سال‌های اخیر مطالب این کتاب را نپسندند و با خواندن آن آزرده خاطر شوند و حتی ممکن است بعضی استدلال‌های نویسنده را نادرست بدانند اما تحلیل‌های خوب و نکات دقیق و مطالب قابل تأمل در آن فراوان است. حتی اگر انتقادهای کتاب درست هم نباشد می‌تواند مایه تذکر شود و در هر صورت به هیچ چیز و هیچ کس زیان نمی‌رساند؛ به خصوص که ملاحظات خصوصی و شخصی و خطی و گروهی در نوشتن این کتاب دخالت نداشته است. شاید ذکر این نکته بی‌مناسبت نباشد که چون نوشته با زبان فنی مناسب با گزارش پژوهش علمی تدوین شده است گاهی نثر نوشته صورت فرمول پیدا می‌کند. این سبک که در جای خود، خوب و موجه است برای نوشته‌ای که اختصاص به دانشمندان و پژوهندگان و ارباب سیاست ندارد و برای همه نوشته شده است چندان مناسب نیست. اگر این ملاحظه وجهی داشته باشد خوب است وقتی که می‌خواهند کتاب را برای چاپ دوم آماده کنند مؤلف محترم خود یک بار دیگر آن را بخوانند و یک ویراستار خوش ذوق آشنا با علوم اجتماعی نیز کتاب را پیراسته‌تر کند.

قانون عشق

مجموعه شعر: نصرالله مردانی

با مقدمه دکتر غلام حسین ابراهیمی دینانی

ناشر: مرکز نشر صدا

چاپ اول: ۱۳۷۶، ۴۰۷ صفحه

این دفتر علاوه بر مقدمه شامل گزیده غزل‌ها قصیده‌ها، مثنوی‌ها، دوبیتی‌های پیوسته، رباعی‌ها و دوبیتی‌ها و غزل‌های کازرونی آقای نصرالله مردانی است. نام کتاب، نام یکی از غزل‌هاست. آن غزل را اینجا می‌آوریم.



این سیل لحظه‌ها که ز جا می‌برد مرا
از هر چه هست و نیست جدا می‌برد مرا
رودی که از ازل باید می‌کشد زمان
دانی که از کجا به کجا می‌برد مرا
با رقص صوفیانه بر امواج جذبه‌ها
تا بحر بی‌کرانه لا می‌برد مرا
هر جا نواخت چنگ محبت نواي دل ،
آهنگ نینوا ز نوا می‌برد مرا
تنهاترین پرنده عاشق دل من است
آنجا که هست مهر و وفا می‌برد مرا
در کوچه باغ یاد تو ای مهربان‌ترین
بوی گلم که باد صبا می‌برد مرا
قانون عشق و شور تماشایی جنون
تا چشم زلال شفا می‌برد مرا
بر دوش آفتاب و دست بلند عشق

دستی که در هوای خدا می‌برد مرا
گلبنگ آسمانی آن روح سرمدی
تا قله‌های قاف بقا می‌برد مرا
ای دوزخ زمین که ز ما گر گرفته‌ای
می‌آید آنکه از من و ما می‌برد مرا

روان‌شناسی امروز

تنهایی: بیماری عصر حاضر

بنگاه انتشاراتی: بلنس

قیمت: ۹/۵۰ مارک

(به زبان آلمانی)

در این کتاب به مسائل مختلف روان‌شناختی اشاره شده است و از آن جمله:

— چرا مردم آلمان دچار ضعف ارتباط با یکدیگر هستند.

— تعداد انسان‌هایی که احساس می‌کنند منزوی شده‌اند روبه افزایش است.

— ۲۰٪ از مردم آرزوی برقراری ارتباط با یکدیگر را دارند.

— علت ضعف ارتباط از جمله ضعف انسان‌ها از لحاظ «رفتن به سراغ یکدیگر» است و حتی آنان هم که تشکیل خانواده داده‌اند از این بیماری مصون نیستند. در بسیاری از خانواده‌ها زن و شوهر در روز فقط چند جمله خشک و بی‌روح با یکدیگر رد و بدل می‌کنند.

worlds, influenced the manner of education, debates, research and studies. It is possible that the manner of philosophical debate served as a model for scholarly polemics, and brought about more tolerance. It is also possible that when a history or culture is developing, the potential for scientific understanding and moral capacity rapidly grows. A case in point is the Islamic history in which the great men of religion would debate with those who were denying and fiercely opposing [the truth of religion]. These debates and other debates taking place among the scholars of different persuasions were recorded and now the texts of many of them are extant and can be consulted. Would this situation indicate the status of tolerance in the world of Islam and among Muslims? The Muslims were tolerant men of knowledge and research, and, hence, they were not afraid of facing those who held other beliefs to hear their views. But as we saw, many of our contemporary liberals do not consider this spirit and approach as political tolerance, and they even view it as a preamble to the lack of tolerance and initiation of violence. It is said that tolerance is promoted in a world in which the religious beliefs of the people has become weak. This statement is to some extent true, because those who do not believe in religion are not bothered or pleased at all by things that are said about a religion. But if tolerance, as a political analyst has said, is associated with religious apathy, first it becomes apparent that the main aim of [the call to] tolerance is to elicit forbearance in the face of rejection and denial of religious beliefs; second, it belongs to the domain of a non-religious society. In other words, political tolerance is defined through its relation to religion, and it is realized in non-religious world.

It is possible that from the previous statement it would be inferred that religiosity and political tolerance are mutually exclusive. Perhaps, what should have been said at first is that usually it is thought that if tolerance does not prevail, inevitably violence and lack of tolerance takes over. When we say that political tolerance belongs to the non-religious

society, one must not conclude that a religious community is the enemy of tolerance and a place for force and violence. I as the writer of these words do not see such a contradiction between tolerance and lack of tolerance...

It is possible that a society would not be a society of tolerance, but would not resort to force and violence either...

As we see those who call for tolerance, are sometimes trying to impose their own views and even the 'tolerance' itself on others. As an example, Hayek, the proponent of freedom and liberalism, would consider the Pinochet's regime preferable to Allende's regime...

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی

مصیبت وارده را به همکار گرامی
آقای تهرانی تسلیت می‌گوئیم.

residing in a world which is overly influenced by politics do not have much patience, and do not wait for the results of the research of researchers, and it is possible that they would consider avoiding praise or criticism as a political tactic. It would be normal that the people would reject the words of someone who, for instance, would question what has a good reputation. It would also be possible that they would call him a man of twisted thinking, a deviant, possessing corrupt beliefs, anti-people, the enemy of science, reason and freedom...

The anxiety that tolerance in its new sense would be turned to intolerance is justified, because tolerance is no longer a good attribute among other good attributes. Tolerance is considered a principle of political society and no one has the right to violate it. That is, an idea which could limit the extent and domain of tolerance should itself be limited. As some of the liberals of today are saying that if the majority of the people want to, say, have a religious system, one must try to prevent the emergence of that system. The situation which has emerged in Algeria and Turkey is not a mere mistake or a manifestation of hunger for power of influential politicians or groups. But this is in line with the opinion reflected in the works of most contemporary liberal political analysts. One can see and understand the transformation of tolerance into intolerance in the conduct of the writers of our country as well. Perhaps Thomas Paine had understood this point to some extent when he said that tolerance is not opposed to intolerance, and that both are of the same nature, and will end in despotism, as those opposed to tolerance would give themselves the right to take away freedom *from* others, and the supporters of tolerance would give this right, i.e. the right to take away others' freedom, *to* others. Perhaps it was this point which was taken into account in the French constitution which was markedly devoid of any reference to tolerance or intolerance. The constitution instead referred to freedom of conscience...

Undoubtedly tolerance has its roots in philosophy. I cannot say how history would

unfold, and how the human beings would live, and so forth if philosophy had not been there. However, because the freedom to debate is one of the requirements of philosophy, in philosophy there is a sort of intrinsic tolerance...

In rational discussion and in an area where proofs are the final determinant, the premise is that the interlocutor listens to the speech of the speaker and wants to understand its meaning. Therefore, the philosopher does not say anything to a person who is not receptive to philosophical discourse. Hence, in the philosophical debates and polemics there is no room for inviting to tolerance or complaining about, and lamenting, the lack of tolerance. Faced with someone who resorts to violence during the debate, a philosopher would end his discussion or if he has any Socratic art he would adopt the language of sarcasm.

In a society in which religious beliefs are the source of social cohesion and solidarity among the people, the presence of other types of beliefs are accepted but the opposition and confrontation of these beliefs with the official belief is usually not tolerated. Hence, except for the modern society in which religion has been turned into a personal affair, in no other society tolerance is accepted as a principle. Shah Abbas of the Safavid dynasty took a special interest in the Christian Armenians in Jolfa, and would take part in their religious ceremonies. But this was a political tactic, i.e. Shah Abbas was dealing with the Armenians in Jolfa not based on principles, but based on political expedience. [Persia's] Cyrus--who was tolerant toward a defeated nation, respected their religious temples, took an oath in the name of Baal Merodach, freed the Jews, and returned them to their land--was taking into account subtleties of statesmanship...

Without wanting to contradict what I have said about the lack of tolerance in the pre-modern society, I would like to stress two points. First, emergence of philosophy and its flourishing in the Islamic and Christian

wonder that these two ideas have been discussed at the same time in modern political works. The problem is that when we come across old words, we presume that the existing meaning of the word has always been there. We forget that an old word in the new era has acquired a new meaning...

At the outset of the modern Western era, Francis Bacon compiled an index of obstacles on the path of understanding and perception (modern thinking), showing to what extent the language can serve as a veil over meaning. He called these obstacles to perception 'idols'. Today the Western idols of time, language and history are great obstacles on the path of our perception. The West talks of 'reason and rationality' and we think that what is intended is the same thing that has been discussed in the Holy Qur'an, the tradition of the Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W.) and our other religious works. I have even heard that someone has written a ludicrous article in which he has tried to prove the righteousness of the idea of 'development', using the traditions and sayings of the Blessed Household of the Prophet (S.A.W.). It would be no problem to seek the roots of modern ideas and events in ancient history. But it would not be right to use the old manners of thinking as tools for justifying the political whims, biases and unhealthy politics. This is actually tantamount to making the statements and words of the great people of the past into a plaything. We do not mean to say that religion is opposed to development and tolerance, and that one cannot create harmony among religiosity, acceptance of development and the spirit of tolerance. What we mean is that it is incorrect to view all the religious thought and philosophy of the past as incomplete forms and phases of Western thought and civilization...

If we want to know what tolerance is we must refer to the work by John Locke and others like him. Of course, not all the truths about tolerance is written in these works, and if they are mentioned, they are not straightforward. But the essence of tolerance which is mentioned in recent political debates has

emerged in modern era and did not exist prior to the present era. Hence, we must not try to ascribe to ourselves that which has emerged in Western history and has become desirable and acceptable, and must not try to find its roots in religious thinking. This would harm religion. At a time when Western values are facing a crisis, or at least, have been questioned, it might be perceived that they want to safeguard and revive the devalued values of the West by resorting to methods and tools that have no connection whatsoever with those values. This is an impossible venture in which even contemporary Western thinkers have no interest. The bitter irony of history is that today it is not the Western thinkers of the past but some of the intellectuals of the oppressed countries known as the Third World who have risen to the defense of the West..."

"In fact, these intellectuals find some of the philosophical writers of the West who defend the West and designate them as their sources. The fact that some of the Third World intellectuals are following the 'mundane manner of thinking' of the Western thought is an indication of the tragic history of development.

I repeat and stress that I am not denying that the spirit of tolerance exists in the religious and ethical thought. Tolerance has been considered a virtue in our culture. Today, too, wherever tolerance might be, it is considered a virtue. But tolerance in modern politics has an identity that is not in sync with ethical virtues in all respects.

My task as the student of philosophy is not to exalt and praise or oppose the idea of tolerance (although as a member of society and the nation and subject of the government and the country, I am calling for, and defending the cause of, tolerance). Students of philosophy are not alien to forms of admiration that at times acquire philosophical tone. One must not be perplexed to see a thinker calling eighteenth century thought and its idea of tolerance an exercise in 'mundane manners of thinking.' But those who are

Editorial: “On Tolerance”

By Dr. Reza Davari Ardakani

“1. It is very difficult to discuss the nature of some of the political concepts that have acquired ethical dimensions. Such concepts as freedom and tolerance as well as human rights, although considered within the domain of political issues, seem to have a moral overtone. I do not want to say that the concepts of freedom and tolerance are not in any way related to morality. Nor do I want to say that they are merely political in nature. Nor do I want to suggest that some people have given an ethical dimension to these concepts so that they can make them acceptable to other people, so that no one would oppose such concepts, and if someone opposes them, they would ignore their opposition...

Usually we consider such concepts as freedom and tolerance as ideas that can be realized everywhere; if they have not been realized sometimes, some people have prevented their realization. [In such cases,] had the obstacle been removed, these ideas would have been realized. But, in fact, the issue is not as we have deemed it to be. These concepts have a history, i.e. they have not been there since time immemorial. They have been formed at a historical juncture and have had a special historical progression. In other words, these concepts have not been abstract and fabricated. They did not emerge in people's minds at random and accidentally. These were facts that emerged throughout history in the minds and intellects of the thinkers. It was not an act of omission that these concepts were not mentioned in philosophy and religion for thousands of years. Of course, such words as freedom and tolerance existed in the language of those in the past. But these words had other meanings. The new meaning of these words, did not exist in the thoughts of the people of the past. These meanings have emerged in

modern history. That is, for example, the concept and reality of freedom have simultaneously emerged in the world of politics, human relations, and also in the thoughts of thinkers. It is not within the scope of this editorial to focus on the relations between the thoughts of thinkers and the realization of historical facts. Suffice it to say that the thinkers have not formed political concepts (and for that matter all the concepts) with their subjective thought. The thinkers are spokesmen and trainers. These concepts of freedom and human rights with which we are more or less familiar, were not created by the writers. Rather, they had emerged in the thoughts of the thinkers and on the horizon of the modern era. For the concepts of freedom and human rights to stand on their feet and advance towards their destination, it was necessary that they would be defined in the works of thinkers. We see that books are written about freedom, human rights and tolerance. Now when these concepts are discussed, we imagine that these ideas belong to all the eras and all the people.

The human being of the present era needs to know—and failure to do so would render all his efforts exercises in futility, and cause further confusion for him—that there is a Western time and history in which many things have emerged and grown to become meaningful, desirable and acceptable to all in all places, but this history is not an absolute history. Before the modern Western history, in no period, even during the Greek democracy, freedom meant what it means in modern times. If we come across such concepts as tolerance these ideas were included among the ethical and mystical concepts...

Political tolerance is concomitant with freedom of thought and expression. It is no