

Logic and Political Rationality

Bahram Dalir¹

Abstract

The overall objective of this article is to demonstrate the efficacy of logic as a discipline in the political sphere, specifically in enhancing rationality in politics and governance. The primary question of the article is: What is the role of logic in political rationality? Among the sciences, it is logic that safeguards thought from error. By relying on logic, one can make rational political decisions and implement them free from mistakes. The necessity of logic extends beyond philosophy; it is essential for all human, empirical, and industrial sciences, and particularly for disciplines such as law, political science, social sciences, and more. Logical writing, engaging in rational political discourse, making reasoned political decisions, implementing them logically, and acquiring and distributing political power rationally all require serious attention to the study of logic by those in positions of political power. Therefore, it is imperative that researchers investigate logic-related issues pertinent to politics and that political leaders prioritize applying logic in practice. This article will address several logical issues related to rationalizing governance and policymaking. The discussion traces its roots back to ancient Greece and has evolved over time, manifesting in various forms such as dialectical logic, quantum logic, fuzzy logic, and others. It appears that logical propositions significantly influence the processes of acquiring and distributing power, political decision-making, and its implementation. A political system grounded in logic is likely to be effective and garner citizen satisfaction, enabling it to adopt the most efficient domestic and foreign policies at local, regional, and global levels. A competing account might confine logic to purely intellectual (philosophical) sciences or equate it solely with philosophical logic. However, we argue that logic is also the logic of politics. The novel contribution of this article lies in highlighting the need for political leaders to acquire knowledge of logic. The methodology of the article is logical, relying on library-based research and the use of software for data collection. The findings will contribute to advancing political rationality.

Keywords: logic, rationality, politics, signification, the Five Techniques.

Introduction

¹ Faculty Member, Research Institute for Islamic Culture and Thought. Email: br.dalir@gmail.com

Human wisdom and rationality are the greatest advantages over other beings, and in the political sphere, wisdom and rationality require epistemic, attitudinal, and insight-related factors. Among the epistemic factors, the most crucial is the knowledge of rational sciences, particularly logic, which serves as the tool for assessing the correctness or incorrectness of thought. The definition and subject of the science of logic testify to this claim: It is a set of rules that, when applied, safeguards humans from errors in thinking. The subject of the science of logic is to provide a method that leads to correct definitions and sound reasoning. If thought is not protected from the political errors of those in power, their mistakes can be profoundly harmful, sometimes irreparable, and may even lead to war or devastating conflicts. The importance and necessity of addressing the article's topic, and the need for political leaders to engage with it, stem from the critical significance of the political sphere. Political leaders and decision-makers urgently need to learn and apply the science of logic in the political arena. No rational person doubts the importance of applying logical rules in political approaches. Due to its profound impact on society, the political sphere holds double the importance compared to other domains.

Before exploring rationalism and intellectualism in the terminology of political sciences, we begin the article with a hadith from the Prophet relevant to the article's topic. He stated: "Whoever is in charge of ten people must have the intellect of forty, and whoever is responsible for forty people must have the intellect of four hundred" (Payandeh, n.d., p. 573). Political management is more sensitive than other branches of management. For instance, how much intellect and wisdom must the president of a nation of, say, one hundred million people possess? If a leader of ten people is required to have the intellect of forty, then one of the key tools for sound thinking and reasoning is logic. Since ancient Greece, the study of logic has held particular importance for lawyers and rulers. This need is not confined to a specific era; rather, as long as thinking and reasoning exist, the necessity and importance of logic will persist.

The central idea of the article is the application of the science of logic in political spheres and its study within political sciences, as we have no better measure among the sciences than logic for distinguishing correct thinking from incorrect. Therefore, the criterion for determining whether a political decision is logical and rational, and whether its implementation is wise, is the science of logic. Logic serves as an effective standard for preventing the political errors of those in power. Some political decisions may lack intellectual backing and may not appear rational, and it is the science of logic that judges such intellectual errors. Just as logic is the logic of philosophy, it is also the logic of politics. Political science dictionaries have addressed and analyzed concepts such as intellectualism, rationalism, empiricism, and wisdom.

Rationalism is the belief that reason and the individual are the sole criteria and basis for valid human knowledge in discerning realities. Since ancient times, a fundamental

question among thinkers has been whether humans can discover the truths of the universe through the power of reason alone, or whether observation must also be employed in this endeavor. The political sphere is one of thought and understanding, and political positions or decisions without proper understanding are doomed to failure.

Rationalists consider reason the most critical factor in any form of understanding, whereas empiricists emphasize the importance of observation and the use of the senses. Baruch Spinoza states that reason, by virtue of its inherent power, creates intellectual tools. It draws strength from these tools for intellectual actions, and from these actions, it again acquires new tools or the driving force for its inquiries, progressing thus until it reaches its destination (Alizadeh, 2007, p. 249).

Whether reason alone is the sole criterion and basis of knowledge, or whether intuition also plays a role, is a matter requiring extensive study. Broadly speaking, each is applicable in its own domain: reason in the realm of rational matters, intuition in the realm of observable phenomena, and empirical observations in experimental fields. However, which knowledge can lead society to rationality, enable political leaders to make wise political decisions, and ensure that the processes of acquiring, distributing, and applying political power are grounded in reason and rationality? It appears that, among all sciences, the science of logic holds significant importance. The history of this discussion predates the debate between rationalists and empiricists. Their dispute primarily concerns the origin of knowledge, and thus, they have not paid sufficient attention to the sources and sciences that contribute to fostering rationality.

Most rationalists believe that sensory experience is the starting point of knowledge, as humans engage their senses only through acquiring awareness. This empirical foundation is considered merely an initial trigger that sets the intellectual machinery and rational faculty in motion. Throughout history, rationalists have relied more on mathematics, while empiricists have leaned toward the natural sciences. The term "reason" in rationalist thought has been interpreted in at least three distinct senses:

- (1) Reason as the application of mental faculties in acquiring knowledge or theorizing, which, in medieval philosophy, stood in contrast to "faith" or the passive acceptance of beliefs and knowledge.
- (2) Reason as the free and exclusive use of intelligence and wisdom in inquiry, which conveys the concept of "being rational." In these two senses, reason is not incompatible with experience but rather encompasses it.
- (3) Reason as an "independent mental faculty" separate from experience and, at times, in conflict with it.

In this context, human reason is sometimes divided into two categories: theoretical and practical. Theoretical reason encompasses the perceptions humans acquire from environmental phenomena—that is, what exists around us and is observable. Practical reason involves understanding what ought to be. In response to rationalist ideas, certain anti-rationalist thoughts emerged. Although opposition to reason is not a new concept and dates back to ancient Greece, anti-rationalism in modern times has reached its peak through forms such as mysticism, materialism, positivism, and the like. Among the most prominent anti-rationalist thinkers are Georges Sorel, Émile Durkheim, Gustave Le Bon, Oswald Spengler, and many positivist philosophers (Alizadeh, 2007, pp. 151-249).

We believe that strong and robust practical reason depends on strong theoretical reason, with theoretical reason supporting practical reason, and there is no dichotomy between the two. The division of reason into theoretical and practical is based on the types of perceptions, but reason itself is a simple and abstract entity. Discussions on these matters should be pursued in comprehensive philosophical texts. Nevertheless, it appears that the application of the science of logic does not conflict with the aforementioned approaches, as every approach has its own specific logic that should be appropriately applied. The political sphere belongs to thinkers, and the governing principle in political decision-making or its execution must be thought. Thought, as defined by early and later scholars, can be traced as follows: Early philosophers defined thought as the movement of the mind from premises to principles and from principles back to premises, with the combination of these two movements being called thought. Every political decision or its implementation has a background of conceptual and propositional (assensual) premises, and one must start from these premises to ultimately resolve political issues.

Later scholars have defined thought as the arrangement of known matters to reach the unknown, considering the known as the rational (Zehni Tehrani, 1987, p. 72). In politics and governance, if thought is not employed, rational decisions cannot be made. Among Muslim scholars, there is no conflict between reason and intuition. Particularly in the approach of Transcendent Wisdom, not only is there no opposition between reason and intuition, but they are aligned and compatible; any apparent inconsistencies arise from illusions, not realities.

The Place of Logic in the Sciences

Scholars have assigned specific ranks and positions to each science, discussing its characteristics and attributes. Figures such as al-Fārābī, Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī, Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī, and others have authored works on this subject. Al-Fārābī states that the science of logic addresses intelligibles in terms of how words signify them, and words in terms of how they signify intelligibles (Fārābī, 1949, p. 59). He believes that logic, as

a science, must encompass all forms of reasoning. Although demonstrative proof (*burhān*) is the primary focus of logical studies, examining non-demonstrative syllogistic methods is also essential. The latter helps one understand what demonstrative reasoning is not, thereby enabling one to avoid methods that lead to error, mere conjecture, or a mere semblance of truth (Fārābī, 1949, p. 73).

Effective domestic and foreign policies are grounded in reasoning, and reasoning must be logical. How can those in power, if ignorant of the science of logic, construct arguments that their audience will find convincing? In international negotiations, a strong negotiator is one who is proficient in various forms of logical reasoning. The language of logic is a universal language. When the minor and major premises of a syllogism are correctly constructed, they yield the same conclusion across all times and places; neither time nor place alters the outcome of a valid syllogism. Logical propositions are universal: everywhere, the whole is greater than its part; everywhere, the conjunction of contradictories is impossible; and everywhere, the conjunction of contraries is impossible. Demonstrative proof is universally accepted. The foundation of political discourse must be logic, as there is a profound connection between language and logic.

Al-Fārābī introduces logic and language as two closely interrelated sciences. This intimate connection is reflected in the Arabic language itself. The word used for logic in Arabic, "mantīq," is etymologically related to the word for speech, "naṭāqa." Al-Fārābī considers logic a kind of universal grammar whose validity is accepted by all people. He provides two reasons to support this claim (Bakkār, 2002, p. 167).

The connection al-Fārābī establishes between logic and language is undoubtedly correct, and we believe there is also a connection between logic, politics, and political speeches. The discussion of terms in logic has a profound link with political analysis because, in political science, political discourse, and especially political analysis, we deal with signifiers, conceptions (*taṣawwur*), and assents (*taṣdīq*). By relying on the discussion of terms in logic, we can analyze political propositions and remain immune to errors in political analysis. Political speeches must be grounded in logic, as the philosophy of logic serves to safeguard against errors in thought and speech. Therefore, political speech should be tied to the science of logic to ensure that political speeches are free from error.

Al-Ghazālī offers multiple classifications of the sciences, such as dividing knowledge into theoretical and practical, presential (*ḥudūrī*) and acquired (*ḥuṣūlī*), individual (*ʿaynī*) and collection (*kifāʾī*) obligations, and rational and religious, among others. He categorizes rational sciences into mathematics and logic, placing natural sciences, medicine, meteorology, mineralogy, and alchemy as subcategories of logic within the rational sciences (Bakkār, 2002, p. 255). In al-Ghazālī's view, logic is a rational

science, and we believe that rationality and wisdom in politics are realized through the science of logic. Political analyses must be grounded in logic to eliminate much of the folly in politics and establish wisdom as the guiding principle. Some scholars, such as Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī, consider logic a philosophical science (Shīrāzī, 1938, vol. 1, pp. 71–98). Given its philosophical nature, logic can serve as a valuable tool in fostering rationality and promoting wisdom in the political sphere.

Mullā ‘Abdullāh, in his *Hāshiya*, considers logic the science that measures error and prevents it. In commenting on al-Taftāzānī’s phrase, “and it may fall into error” (*wa qad yaqa‘u fī al-khaṭā’*), Mullā ‘Abdullāh explains: “[This means] sometimes error occurs in thought. Error in acquiring the unknown from the known may occur either in the form of thought, that is, in the arrangement of the known, or in the matter [content] of the known. The method of safeguarding against both types of error is learned from the rules of logic. Since error is an undeniable reality, and to prevent error and distinguish it from correctness, logic is necessary. Thus, [it is said]: ‘Since error occurs in thought, we need a rule that protects the mind from error in thinking, and that is logic.’ Therefore, in explaining the need for logic, its definition is also clarified: [logic] is a rule that, when observed, protects the mind from error in thinking. This rule is a universal proposition applicable to all particulars of its subject” (Yazdī, 2015, p. 57). Now, in the political sphere, can anyone claim that those in power are immune to error or do not err? It seems that the likelihood of their error is greater than that of others, and the harm caused by their errors is more significant and destructive than the errors of others.

How can political authorities be safeguarded from political errors through the science of logic? It appears that this goal can be achieved through three approaches: first, by political leaders learning the science of logic; second, by applying it in all areas of political processes; and third, by disseminating the content of logical knowledge throughout society. This ensures that society remains free from superstition and myth-making, unaffected by leaders driven by a thirst for fame, and unswayed by propagandistic manipulations. It also enables society to distinguish between sensationalist, journalistic policies and those grounded in wisdom.

The Place of Politics among Sciences

Politics is a highly systematic science that organizes governance, sometimes referred to as social engineering. The subject of politics, or what al-Fārābī calls the civic science (*‘ilm madanī*), is happiness. According to al-Fārābī, the civic science examines various types of voluntary actions, lifestyles, human inclinations, ethical principles, and temperaments that lead to these actions and lifestyles, as well as the ends for which these actions are performed and how these actions should exist in humans (Fārābī, 1949, p. 102). Al-Fārābī distinguishes between ends that constitute true happiness and those

that are mistakenly thought to be true happiness. Accordingly, al-Fārābī's civic science appears to be a highly comprehensive discipline.

In summary, civic science addresses a broad domain encompassing the human being and human society. Al-Fārābī divides civic science into two parts. The first part examines various types of human actions and ways of life, focusing on understanding their ends and the ethical characteristics of humans. This part operates under the premise that the ultimate goal of human life is supreme happiness and judges these ends accordingly, stating that true happiness can only be achieved through virtues, goodness, and moral excellence. True happiness does not consist in considering wealth, honor, or sensual pleasures as the sole ends of life; such thinking is merely illusory. Thus, the first part of civic science deals with the theory of happiness and human virtue.

The second part of al-Fārābī's civic science focuses on describing the creation of suitable conditions for promoting virtuous habits and traditions in cities and among nations. It also includes defining the governmental duties through which virtuous actions and traditions can be established and preserved among people. Al-Fārābī then enumerates the types of non-virtuous governmental actions, explaining their various forms and characteristics. He refers to the performance of governmental duties as "politics." Thus, politics holds a significant place in his civic science. He describes civic science as practical or human philosophy, distinct from theoretical philosophy, which includes mathematics, natural science, and theology (Fārābī, 1949, p. 110; Fārābī, 1992, p. 20; Bakkār, 2002, p. 179). Politics is crucial in civic science, and logic is important across all sciences, but its significance is doubled in civic and political science.

Unlike al-Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā, Quṭb al-Dīn does not consider the study of the science of prophecy and divine law as complementary to political science (Bakkār, 2002, pp. 306–308). The necessity of applying logic extends to all sciences and affairs. If the science of logic governs the relationship between the state and the nation, a robust interaction between the two is achieved. Politics grounded in logic enjoys legitimacy in domestic affairs and becomes a significant actor on the international stage. In the governance of cities, from statesmen to citizens, all must engage in logical interaction to ensure that wisdom prevails throughout society. The application of logic in governance enhances the efficiency of the political system. We will now refer to some logical concepts preserved in the texts of this science and highlight their connection to political science, political power, and especially political culture.

Conceptions and Politics

Conception and assent are two logical terms. Logic is an instrumental science intended for use in the realm of thought. Conception refers to a mental form that does not involve attributing one thing to another, such as the mental images we have of the moon, sun, earth, sky, governance, politics, angels, or God. Conceptions are divided into self-

evident and non-self-evident, complete, acquired, and incomplete conceptions, which can be studied in books on logic and logical terminology (Khansari, 1997, pp. 59–61). Understanding each of these terms can aid in comprehending and analyzing political propositions. Many political disputes arise from incorrect or mistaken conceptions of political subjects. Often, in the process of analysis, conceptions are journalistic, incorrect, and far from reality, leading to political division and fragmentation. For example, incorrect conceptions of domestic, and regional, transregional policies, as well as international conventions result in devastating conflicts that undermine national interests and cause irreparable missed opportunities. Such disputes are opportunity-destroying and threat-generating, reducing political bargaining power in foreign policy and causing fragmentation in domestic policy. First, one must become familiar with the term "conception" as defined in the science of logic and then apply it to political analysis, decision-making, policymaking, and other relevant areas.

If knowledge consists of certainty regarding the relationship between two things, it is assent; otherwise, it takes the form of conception. Assent is divided into self-evident and speculative, and sometimes we fall into error, necessitating a means to measure error (Ḥusaynī Yazdī, 2010, pp. 14–119).

The majority of sciences consist of knowledge of conceptions and assents, each divided into self-evident and speculative. Therefore, we must understand what knowledge is, especially since in political discussions, everyone claims to act in alignment with science. To improve the political sphere, a scientific approach must be adopted in all matters and sciences. This makes it doubly important to address the nature of knowledge. In logic, due to the realization of three aspects in the act of cognition, we encounter three definitions of knowledge: first, the form produced in the mind, which belongs to the category of quality; second, the presence of this form in the mind, which belongs to the category of relation; and third, the soul's acceptance of this form, which belongs to the category of passion.

The division of knowledge into conception and assent means that knowledge belongs to the category of quality, as the form produced in the mind is either affirmative or negative, in which case it is assent, or it is otherwise, in which case it is conception. Some have defined knowledge, as belonging to the category of quality, as the form of a thing produced in the intellect, which is primary in the intellect, as previously mentioned. That is, a form produced in the intellect is knowledge. Consequently, the form of a thing that is not produced in the intellect, such as the form of particulars that are not produced in the intellect but in the faculties, would not be considered knowledge. However, these are indeed knowledge, contrary to the notion of "in the intellect," which is broader, encompassing that which exists in the intellect by way of capacity or in an instrument, present to the intellect (Yazdī, 2015, p. 53).

Whether knowledge is defined by the three definitions previously mentioned or by other definitions found in various schools and approaches, in transcendent philosophy (*al-hikmat al-muta'aliya*), knowledge transcends categories and is considered an existential reality. A scientific approach, regardless of perspective, is commendable in all matters and sciences, especially in the political sphere. A political system, with all its powers, requires a scientific approach to political phenomena. If a political system intends to join an international convention, all political actors and decision-makers must thoroughly understand the nature of the issue before expressing opinions. If they lack knowledge of the matter, their silence is more beneficial to national interests and political cohesion than uninformed speech.

In Iran, discussions about the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) have persisted for days, weeks, months, and even years. Do all these discussions follow a scientific approach? Is there a correct logical conception of the issue to yield a valid assent? If someone ignorantly causes societal stress on this matter, is it considered a crime? Is there a mechanism to prevent unscientific claims on critical political issues? Due to the absence of a scientific approach, some unconditionally accept FATF, while others unconditionally reject it. Some believe that Iran's failure to join FATF has a greater impact on its economy than U.S. sanctions. They argue: why should Iran not be a member when 198 countries worldwide are involved, either directly or through the nine regional groups, of which 37 are major developed economies that are full members of the organization?

In this article, we emphasize a scientific approach and a correct conception of issues, considering uninformed statements on any political matter to be illogical. We believe that such uninformed and illogical discourse harms national interests, social cohesion, and political power, leading to societal fragmentation. It is both necessary and appropriate to adopt a scientific approach and maintain a complete conception of political issues. The positive and negative consequences of a country joining or not joining an international convention or global organization must be analyzed with a scientific and logical approach, leading to a firm and well-founded political decision based on a correct and logical conception.

In most political phenomena, emotions and political fervor dominate behavior more than logic does. If we were to interview individuals who don shrouds and protest a political decision, we would find that they lack a scientific and logical approach to the issue, suffering from a poverty of knowledge and information, and are unaware of the very matter for which they have gathered. This is not exclusive to the masses but is also prevalent among political leaders, which is truly regrettable. Until conceptions are corrected, assent cannot be reached. The consequence of an incorrect conception is an incorrect assent.

Political assents held by rigid individuals are undoubtedly not preceded by correct conceptions. Following the discussion of conceptions in logical texts, there are valuable logical discussions on significations, which can have a close connection to the field of politics. Additionally, the discussion of simple and compound terms—where our conceptions are either of simple or compound entities—can be applied to the political domain. Furthermore, the divisions of simple and compound terms are helpful in political analysis. In logical texts, a chapter is dedicated to the concepts of universal and particular, which are rooted in the foundations of logical knowledge. Each of these topics warrants a separate article to explore them in detail (Yazdī, 2015, pp. 65–115).

Assents and Politics

In logical terminology, assent refers to attributing something to another thing, either affirmatively or negatively, such as assenting that “the earth is spherical” or “the earth is not stationary.” Every assent requires three conceptions: first, the conception of the subject, that is, the thing about which a judgment is made; second, the conception of the predicate, that is, the thing attributed to the subject; and third, the conception of the relation between the predicate and the subject. Assent is divided into self-evident, speculative, and acquired (Khansari, 1997, pp. 58–59). In all political matters, we also deal with a subject, a predicate, and the relation between the predicate and the subject. A logical process must be observed among these to ensure that the resulting policy is logical.

In the discussion of assents, the focus is on arguments and propositions, which are components of arguments. For this reason, the science of logic primarily addresses propositions. A proposition is defined as a statement—that is, a compound expression—that can be true or false (Yazdī, 2015, p. 116). This is a fundamental logical principle in dealing with propositions, and it applies to all political statements as well, since all political statements are propositions that can be true or false. Learning this logical terminology can help us avoid being rigid in our approach to political propositions. We would not treat the statements of political leaders as infallible but instead consider the possibility of their being true or false, thereby making our behavior logical. Consequently, we would not sacrifice our religion, faith, or humanity for any political authority. By relying on the logical concept of compound expressions, we can analyze and dissect compound political propositions.

The truth of a proposition or political statement lies in its correspondence with reality. For example, if we hear that Iran is negotiating with the United States, and this aligns with reality—meaning negotiations are indeed taking place—then this political news is true. Conversely, its falsity lies in its lack of correspondence with reality. False political news and statistics, especially in the age of social media, are often more prevalent than

true ones. Therefore, we should not readily believe many political statements or news and must not accept them without logical analysis.

A proposition is a statement that can be true or false, meaning that a news agency reporting a story may convey it in accordance with reality or contrary to it. Therefore, we should not approach political news or statements from those in power with an attitude of universal affirmation or universal negation. Instead, it is necessary and appropriate to reflect and deliberate on them using the science of logic before taking a stance. Numerous examples from domestic and international politics illustrate this. If we properly understand and internalize the principle that “every proposition can be true or false,” many political disputes would dissipate. Some consider propositions to have four parts, while others regard them as having three (Yazdī, 2015, p. 117). In political matters, all components of a proposition must be subjected to logical scrutiny: What is the subject of the proposition? What is its predicate? What is the relation between the predicate and the subject? And what is the overall message and meaning of the proposition? This ensures we avoid errors and political conflicts.

Many political propositions, particularly in foreign policy, are conditional. For instance, if a country does not interfere in another’s internal affairs, if a country does not support violent groups, if a country respects another’s territorial integrity, and countless other conditions that exist in international relations. Conditional propositions have specific characteristics that must be understood. The philosophical meaning of conditional propositions and their cause-and-effect relationships should be carefully studied before entering the political arena, signing or terminating a contract, and so forth.

In logic, categorical or predicative propositions have been extensively analyzed, explained, and categorized, such as personal and natural propositions. A proposition is called quantified because it restricts the scope of individuals. Ultimately, quantified propositions are divided into four types: universal affirmative, universal negative, particular affirmative, and particular negative (Yazdī, 2015, p. 120).

In political propositions, we often conflate all the aforementioned types and fail to distinguish between them, leading to erroneous judgments. This is because the judgment for a personal proposition differs from that for a natural proposition, as each has its own quantifier and scope. Not all propositions can be judged in the same way, and a judgment about a legal entity cannot be extended to everyone. Each proposition has its own specific quantifier. In political matters, each type requires its own particular judgment and analysis. If this is not observed, we will witness an anarchy of political judgments and analyses.

In political judgments and analyses, one must exercise utmost care regarding the semantic weight of words and terms to minimize errors. In political discussions, it is crucial to distinguish between mental and external entities. An external (*khārijīyya*)

proposition involves a judgment about external individuals that have been realized, whether they exist at the time of the judgment, before it, or after it. A factual (*ḥaqīqiyya*) proposition involves a judgment about external individuals, whether realized or hypothetical. A mental proposition involves a judgment about mental individuals. Can a political analyst extend the analysis of mental individuals to external ones? Is there no difference between abstract and concrete individuals? Do affirmative and negative matters not differ?

In political matters and their analyses, many concepts and terms are conflated. For instance, we mistake contraries for contradictories, consider factors synonymous with causes, or fail to correctly conceive the relation between propositions. If we carefully consider the quality of the relation between predicate and subject in political matters, our judgments will differ, and the resulting necessities will also vary. These topics have been thoroughly addressed in logical discussions (Yazdī, 2015, pp. 123–124). In any case, assenting to a political proposition should not be taken lightly or reached without adhering to the principles of conception and assent. The relationship between each logical concept and term and political rationality requires a separate article to thoroughly explore its dimensions. Unfortunately, in many contemporary political discussions, the science of logic is absent and not applied. To achieve political rationality, engaging with and applying logic is an essential necessity.

The Five Techniques and Politics

Familiarity with the five techniques (*ṣanā'āt khams*) is beneficial to political science. Although the term "syllogism" is a logical concept, its application across all sciences, particularly in political science, is clear and indisputable. All domestic and foreign policies, willingly or unwillingly, take the form of a syllogism, which is either demonstrative or dialectical, each with its own specific characteristics. We will briefly address these characteristics.

A demonstrative syllogism is formed from certainties, and certainty is a firm, unwavering belief that corresponds to reality. Principles such as axioms, for example, "the whole is greater than its part," are also prevalent in political propositions. For instance, no country has the right to invade another, or the rights of citizens must be recognized.

Second, there are observations (*mushāhadāt*), which are propositions judged through the senses; these are called sensory propositions, such as "the sun is illuminating" or "fire is burning." If the judgment arises from internal senses, these propositions are called intuitive (*wijdāniyyāt*), such as the recognition that we experience fear or anger. Numerous examples of such propositions can also be found in political matters.

Third, there are experiential propositions (*tajribiyyāt*), which are judgments made by the intellect based on repeated observations, such as “scammony (a plant extract) is a purgative for yellow bile.” In political science, it has been established through experience that power is corrupting, and there is no doubt that power is corrupting.

Fourth, there are intuitional propositions (*ḥadsiyyāt*), which are judgments made based on intuitions. An intuition is the rapid transition from premises to the desired conclusion, such as “the light of the moon comes from the sun.” In political matters, future-oriented analysis is often based on intuitional propositions.

Fifth, there are mass-transmitted (or mass-reported) propositions (*mutawātirāt*), which are judgments that the intellect deems impossible to be false, such as the existence of Mecca. Political actions should not be based on rare or exceptional matters but rather on mass-transmitted propositions that are acknowledged by the general public or the majority of the nation to ensure the legitimacy of the political system is not challenged. In political propositions, numerous examples of mass-transmitted propositions can be found, such as when it is widely reported that one country has invaded another or that one country has been defeated by another. When all news agencies report such news, it becomes part of mass-transmitted propositions.

Sixth, there are speculative propositions, which are judgments assented to immediately upon conceiving the subject. In political science, the conception of a country’s aggression is equivalent to its condemnation. Similarly, the conception of the killing of people in Palestine, in Gaza or Sabra and Shatila, is equivalent to the condemnation of Israel.

Seventh, there are innate or evident propositions (*fiṭriyyāt*), such as the proposition that four is an even number because it can be divided into two equal parts, and this does not escape the mind when conceiving of four and evenness (Yazdī, 2015, pp. 209–210). In political science, the exercise of sovereignty requires political legitimacy, and the need for security, freedom, and justice, particularly in a religious political system, is considered among the innate propositions.

Political leaders must recognize that policies grounded in demonstrative reasoning are always defensible. Even historically, those in power whose policies were based on demonstrative reasoning have not been reproached. Such policies possess the necessary legitimacy, particularly among elites. Undoubtedly, if rationality is widespread in society and sufficiently pervasive, political legitimacy will also be secured from the masses. The rationality of a nation depends on the rational behavior of its government, as people follow their leaders. If integrity prevails among rulers, their subjects will also act with integrity. Similarly, rationality among political leaders fosters rationality and wisdom among the masses, creating a foundation for the emergence of a just government. Policies grounded in demonstrative reasoning eliminate political folly.

Because such policies are rooted in rationality, they are defensible and respected in all forums and possess legitimacy. Demonstrative reasoning is divided into *limmī* (causal) and *innī* (effectual), which can be studied in the science of logic (Yazdī, 2015, p. 211).

As for the dialectical syllogism, it is formed from commonly accepted (*mashhūrāt*) and wide acknowledged (*musallamāt*) propositions. Most populist policies fall under this category, along with other non-demonstrative syllogisms. Commonly accepted opinions are propositions that the intellect judges based on their widespread acceptance among people, such as “justice is good.” Widely acknowledged propositions are those accepted by an opponent or adversary, used as a basis for argumentation in debates. In foreign policy, conflicts, and international negotiations, employing dialectical syllogisms can often be beneficial and safeguard national interests. However, in domestic policy, no government should engage in dialectical contention with its own people, as the result of such a policy is the loss of political legitimacy, leading to stubbornness and mutual obstinacy, which serves neither the interests of the government nor the welfare of the nation.

As for the rhetorical syllogism, it is formed from accepted opinions (*maqbulāt*) and conjectural propositions (*maznūnāt*). Accepted opinions are those attributed to figures like prophets and saints, who are widely accepted. Conjectural suppositions are statements such as: “So-and-so is a thief because he wanders at night, and everyone who wanders at night is a thief; therefore, so-and-so is a thief due to his night wandering!”

In governance, one must never abuse the trust of the people. It is both necessary and appropriate for political leaders to recognize that governance is not based on speculation, as many speculations are unjust, and most people follow nothing but conjecture, yet conjecture cannot suffice for the truth (Quran, Yunus, 10:36). It is also stated: They have no knowledge of it, merely following conjecture, and indeed, conjecture avails nothing against the truth (Quran, Najm, 53:28). Governments should not rely on conjecture, nor should nations follow it.

As for the poetic syllogism, it is formed from propositions rooted in imaginative fancies, such as when a person’s mouth waters upon hearing about something sour, or when imagining their beloved evokes feelings of joy and delight. It is quite clear that governance is not about lofty imaginative fantasies but about wisdom.

As for the sophistical syllogism, it is formed from illusions and semblances. Illusions, for example, include the notion that everything that exists can be pointed to, whereas abstract and separate entities exist but cannot be pointed to. Politics is a part of practical wisdom and is not sophistry. Sophistical governments do not endure, and their collapse is swift. Semblances, for example, include saying about a picture of a horse painted on a wall: “This is a horse, and every horse neighs, so the picture of the horse neighs.” Any political system that bases its governance on illusions and semblances will not last.

The article, which claims that logic plays a role in fostering wisdom and rationality in politics, also addresses the method of teaching this claim and cultivating rationality in politics through the instructional method, which is the eighth component of the eight topics (*ru'ūs thamāniyya*), known as instructional methods (*anhā' ta'līmiyya*). These methods are divided into four types: first, the method of division, where division involves multiplication; second, the method of analysis, where analysis is the opposite of division, meaning multiplication; third, the method of definition; and fourth, the method of demonstration. Each of these requires its own detailed discussion (Yazdī, 2015, pp. 225–228).

Conclusions

Logic is the balance that distinguishes sound thought from unsound, and when applied, it safeguards thinking from error. This article briefly elucidated the role of the science of logic in politics with this premise. Regarding conceptions, it emphasized that political leaders should not engage with political issues unless they have a correct conception of them, as an incorrect conception leads to an incorrect assent. In political assents, one should not affirm political propositions without considering the conditions and principles of conception and assent. The article then discussed simple and compound terms, as well as propositions, stressing that all political propositions come to us either as simple, compound, or in the form of propositions. In political judgments and analyses, one must distinguish between personal, factual, and natural propositions to avoid an anarchy of judgments and analyses. The article concluded by addressing the five logical arts and their relation to politics, emphasizing the method of teaching political rationality as part of the eighth component of the eight topics. Several principles from the science of logic and its available texts can be applied to the political sphere, including: the principle of conception, the principle of assent, the principles of terms, the principle of signification, the principle of the five universals, the principle of propositions, the principles of the five techniques, and the principle of the eight topics. The article addressed some of these principles in connection with politics. Logic education should be incorporated into political science curricula and considered a core subject. It is both necessary and appropriate for political leaders to first study this science and then apply it in practice. One of the key factors in fostering wisdom and rationality in politics is the education and application of logic in practice.

References

- The Noble Quran.
Alizadeh, H. (2007). *Specialized dictionary of political science* (3rd ed.). Tehran: Rozaneh. [In Persian]
Bakkār, 'A. (2002). *Tabaqa-bandī-yi 'ulūm az naẓar-i ḥukamā'-i Muslimīn* (J. Ghasemi,

- Trans.). Mashhad: Islamic Research Foundation, Āstān Quds Raḡavī. [In Persian]
- Fārābī, A. (1949). *Iḥṣā' al-'Ulūm* ('A. Amīn, Ed.). Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-'Arabī. [In Arabic]
- Fārābī, M.b.M. (1992). *Al-Tanbīh 'alā sabīl al-sa'āda* (J. Āl Yāsīn, Ed., 1st ed.). Tehran: Hekmat. [In Arabic]
- Ḥusaynī Yazdī, M. 'A. (2010). *Al-Ḥāshiya 'alā tahdhīb al-mantiq li-l-Taftāzānī*. Beirut: Dār Aḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī. [In Arabic]
- Khansari, M. (1997). *Farhang-i iṣṭilāḥāt-i mantiqī* (2nd ed.). Tehran: Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies. [In Persian]
- Payandeh, A. (n.d.). *Nahj al-Faṣāḥa* (11th ed.). Tehran: Jāvīdān. [In Arabic]
- Shīrāzī, Q. (1938). *Durrah al-tāj li-ghurrah al-dībāj fī-l-ḥikmah* (Vol. 1, S. M. Meshkat, Ed.). Tehran: Majlis. [In Arabic]
- Yazdī, M. 'A. (2015). *Tarjuma-yi ḥāshiya tahrīr al-mantiq* (M. Hosseini Shahrestani, Trans.; A. Ghanbarian & A. Nikjeh Farahani, Ed. & Annot.). Tehran: Ṣabā. [In Persian]
- Zehni Tehrani, M. J. (1987). *Al-Āthār al-bāqīyah sharḥ fārsī bar ḥāshiya* (2nd ed.). Qom: Hazegh. [In Persian]