

Syllogism as a Method in Political Science

Bahram Dalir¹ , Ali Dalir²

¹ Assistant Professor, Research Institute of Islamic Culture and Thought, Tehran, Iran
(Corresponding author). br.dalir@gmail.com

² Level Three in Islamic Philosophy, Esra Institute, Qom, Iran. dalir.ali.1999@gmail.com



Abstract

The fundamental aim of this research is to elucidate the place of syllogism not merely as a formal tool within the discipline of logic, but as a comprehensive research method in political science. Confronting a general problem (assessing the feasibility of transforming logical discussions into a research method) and a specific problem (how to apply the syllogism in political research), this article seeks to demonstrate how logical structures of reasoning can be used to escape methodological impasses in political science. It appears that such efficacy can be achieved through the syllogistic method; the operational objective of the research is to provide a roadmap that enables the political researcher to attain "rational necessity" and "demonstrative certainty" in various types of research—historical, descriptive, explanatory, and interpretive—instead of relying on conjecture or fragmented explanations. Furthermore, this article is committed to the indigenization of political science methodology by drawing on the rich Iranian-Islamic heritage (the works of Avicenna, Suhrawardī, and Mullā Ṣadrā), thereby strengthening rationality and wisdom in the domains of policymaking and governance. The research findings show that the logical syllogism is applicable in explanatory research through the use of *propter quid* or a priori (cause to effect) (*limmī*) and *quia* or a posteriori (effect to cause) (*innī*) methods, and in interpretive research for reconstructing the internal logic of ideas. In descriptive research, the application of various types of logical propositions (categorical and compound) elevates the description of phenomena from the level of mere reporting to the level of regulated analysis. The syllogistic method is also applicable in the analysis of policymaking processes (such as negotiation or political participation). As far as has been investigated, no prior work with these characteristics has been found.

Keywords

Logic, Syllogism, Political Science Methodology, Causal Explanation, Practical Wisdom, Interpretive Research, Methodological Indigenization.

Cite this article: Dalir, B. & Dalir, A. (2026). Syllogism as a Method in Political Science. *Journal of Islamic Political Studies*, 8(2), pp. 35-52. <https://doi.org/10.22081/jips.2026.80171>

Received: 2025/11/24 ; **Received in revised form:** 2026/02/04 ; **Accepted:** 2026/02/27 ; **Published online:** 2026/07/10

Article type: Research Article

Publisher: Islamic Sciences and Culture Academy

©2026/authors retain the copyright and full publishing rights



1. Introduction

Iranian civilization possesses immense potential for extending rationality and knowledge, one of the most prominent expressions of which is the discipline of logic. The logicians of Iran—such as Shaykh al-Ra'īs (Avicenna), Shaykh al-Ishrāq (Suhrawardī), and Mullā Ṣadrā—each, by founding great schools of thought, left behind a heritage that can be employed beyond a mere formal tool, namely as a "research method" in the modern humanities, especially political science. The logic of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Shifā'* (The Book of Healing), *Al-Ishārāt wa-l-Tanbīhāt* (Remarks and Admonitions), and *Dānishnāma-yi 'Alā'ī* (The 'Alā'ī Encyclopedia) are not merely mental exercises; rather, they provide rules for "correct reasoning" in practical affairs, including political governance (policy of the city). Why do we, as researchers in the field of politics, make so little use of this scholarly heritage to organize our explanations? Genealogically, the syllogistic method has ancient roots in ancient Greece and the works of Aristotle. Aristotle believed that "the syllogism, through the arrangement of correct premises, makes possible access to certain knowledge" (Aristotle, 2021). He distinguished between two types of syllogism: "theoretical syllogism," which is applied in the realm of theoretical wisdom (e.g., metaphysics), and "practical syllogism," which is the primary tool in the domain of practical wisdom, including ethics, politics, and household management (Bagheri, 2020, p. 97). After Aristotle, the syllogistic method was developed by Muslim scholars to achieve definitive conclusions. Avicenna, whom George Sarton considers the most famous scientist of the Islamic world, presented, through his foundational works such as *The Canon of Medicine* and *The Book of Healing*, a method of thinking every line of which can inspire modern research. Avicenna's importance lies in his view of the syllogism as a tool for moving from unknown matters to certain knowledge; this is precisely the need we face in "explanatory political research" for discovering the causes of phenomena. This necessary inference is the main missing element in many contemporary political analyses that suffer from methodological fragmentation. This method was used not only in philosophy but also in the natural sciences and mathematics, serving as the primary tool for organizing knowledge. Alongside the Peripatetics, Shaykh al-Ishrāq (Suhrawardī), with his book *Hikmat al-Ishrāq* (The Philosophy of Illumination) and his classification of "definition, proof, and fallacies," opened a path in which reason and intuition converge. This approach can function as a methodology for reading texts in "interpretive research" and understanding complex political thoughts. Likewise, Mullā Ṣadrā, with his "new logic"

(*Al-Lama'āt al-Mashriqiyya*), and Mullā 'Abd Allāh al-Yazdī, with his famous "Hāshiya" (Gloss), provided a structure for reasoning that served as a standard textbook in academic centers for centuries. The necessity of this article lies in showing how this indigenous heritage can be used for the "indigenization of political science methodology," and how the syllogism can be used not merely as a logical formula, but as a method for the "description of political phenomena," "analysis of decision-making processes," and explanation of political events. Today, this method is applied in various sciences, including the formal and theoretical sciences. Since political science is also part of "practical wisdom," the syllogistic method can be effectively used for causal explanations (e.g., why a revolution occurred) or for reading classical texts. As was the case in the history of the philosophy of education, in the 1950s and 1960s, this method predominated over others (Shahriari & et al., 2020, pp. 901–902). The great advantage of the syllogistic method in political science is the strengthening of rationality and wisdom. While being an independent "research method" alongside quantitative and qualitative methods, this method—by providing major and minor premises—can rescue political and policymaking arenas from rationality-averse impasses and contribute to the rationalization of political decisions. The aim of this article is to examine how the syllogistic method can be applied in political science research. This research, through an analytical-logical approach, investigates the foundations of the syllogism in theoretical and practical wisdom and assesses its relationship with modern political science methodology texts. The main question is: how can the syllogistic method be utilized in political science research? To answer this question, the various types of logical syllogisms and their respective applications in political research have been analyzed.

1.1. Research Background

In the methodology texts of political science, few books can be found that have presented the "syllogistic method" as an independent and comprehensive research method. Even in the classical works of this discipline, either this method has not been addressed, or we encounter formal and substantive problems in its logical explanation. Nevertheless, a study of the research conducted in adjacent fields (such as educational sciences) and certain political monographs shows how this method can be employed in practice for causal explanation, textual interpretation, and process analysis. Beheshti (2007), in his work entitled "A Groundwork for the Recognition and Critique of the

Philosophy of Education in the Western World," considers the path to attaining theory to be the inferential and applicative method through three levels: "pre-inferential, inferential, and post-inferential." In political thought research, this model is precisely the path that the researcher takes to "understand a thought"; that is, by extracting the major premises (major propositions) of a philosopher's thought and applying them to political issues, the researcher deduces new implications. Alamolhoda (2009), in "Islamic Theory of Education," considers practical syllogism suitable for deriving educational implications from general philosophical principles. Bagheri (2020), in "Approaches and Research Methods in the Philosophy of Education," emphasizes the efficacy of the "practical form" of the syllogism. In political science, this method is very useful for describing a political phenomenon based on its ends (teleology); because politics has an action-oriented nature, and the practical syllogism reveals the internal logic of political actions. Mohseni (2021) considers the inferential method as a tool for the precise examination and evaluation of beliefs according to logical criteria. In the critique of political theories, this method helps the researcher to refute or prove the internal coherence or contradictions of a theory through logical measures. One of the best examples of the application of this method in politics is the article by Sheikhzadeh & Kamali (2018) on Iran's nuclear issue. They showed how decision-makers use "historical analogies" as mental shortcuts to solve current problems. This approach, in explanatory research and process analysis, demonstrates how a historical event (the source) acts as a major premise and shapes the political decision in the current situation (the target) as the conclusion of the syllogism.

2. The Necessity of Applying the Syllogistic Method in Political Science and the Governance Process

In the realm of politics, a policymaker's "good decision" depends on access to correct data and logical thinking; for the mind constantly attempts to impose false judgments or superstitions. Therefore, grounding the minor and major premises in a political research is the only way to safeguard truth. The syllogistic method can be applied across all fields of political science (justice, legitimacy, sovereignty, security, liberty, and power) so that research in this area moves out of a "haphazard" state and is elevated to the level of "certain science." Prudent citizens readily understand the fundamental harms of populist movements; for the price of irrational and demagogic movements for a society is irreparable damage in financial, economic, and familial domains.

If we seek "social cohesion" and the resolution of class fractures, the practical solution lies not in generalities, but in "mastery of logic" and the adoption of "logical decisions" by those in power, as well as logical demands by citizens. As long as we do not employ the syllogistic method (theoretical and practical) in political research, our scholarly situation will remain afflicted by "sloganeering" and "irrational research." As a practical example in explanatory research, consider the issue of "negotiation." Current approaches to negotiation (both negative and positive) often lack logical and well-reasoned explanation. If the political researcher uses the syllogistic method, they can extricate the issue from a bipolar impasse and arrive at a "logical necessity" that leaves no room for denial for anyone. The efficacy of a political system and its legitimacy depend on "logical behaviors." A political system based on logic is free from lies, deception, and the unjust distribution of wealth. In pathological research, if we study collapsed governments, we will see that the main factor has been the absence of "logical interaction" between the state and the nation. Indeed, "justice" itself is a logic, and just behavior is considered the most logical type of political behavior. In political research, if the path of research follows the syllogism, arriving at a practical solution becomes possible. For example, in economic policymaking (cost-benefit analysis), the logical rule of "the more important over the important" (*al-ahamm fa-l-ahamm*) is a necessity. Is it logical to supply fuel at a price far below its production cost, while the state has become destitute and unable to pursue development and administer justice to the nation? The syllogistic method shows that this practice creates a logical disconnect between "resources" and "development goals." Therefore, applying the syllogistic method in political research is an obvious necessity. Philosophically, politics is an instance of "practical wisdom," and wisdom without logic is not wisdom at all. The syllogistic method, as a method of "demonstration and reasoning" rather than "coercion and force," convinces citizens; for the root of many protests and revolutions is irrational and non-transparent behavior. We must define social relations and the state-nation bond through the syllogistic method. This method is our civilizational and religious heritage that protects us from emotional and sloganistic behaviors. We believe that many of Iran's unresolved domestic and foreign issues can be brought to a conclusion, from start to finish, by grounding governance on the basis of logic. Applying the syllogistic method in political research has a fundamental outcome: "bringing coherence" to the research from beginning to end. One serious problem in theses and political science research is "fragmentation" and a "haphazard"

structure; that is, the components of the research lack harmony and connection with one another. The term "t'alīf" (composition) in logic, which means creating harmony and cohesion between the parts of discourse, in political methodology signifies that there must be a firm connection (formal component) between the hypothesis, variables, and conclusion. Just as in a categorical hypothetical syllogism, the minor premise is stated first, then the major premise (Zehni Tehrani, 1987, pp. 306), in a methodical political research, the arrangement of data must be such that the conclusion is the logical offspring of the premises; otherwise, the research will be "sterile." In political science, the syllogistic method can be employed in two forms: "limmī" (a priori, from cause to effect) and "innī" (a posteriori, from effect to cause). In causal explanations, the researcher uses the *limmī* method to move from cause to effect (e.g., analyzing electoral behavior based on class background), and in the *innī* method, infers the cause from the effect (e.g., tracing the roots of a revolution's occurrence). Sadegh Haghighat notes that the application of a method—meaning the type of reasoning (deductive or inductive)—is directly related to the nature of the research; just as the research method of political philosophy demands deductive reasoning (Haghighat, 2008, vol. 1, p. 64). Although some claim that deductive reasoning has limitations because it does not go beyond the scope of its premises (Sanjabi, 2005, vol. 1, p. 9), in reality, this is not a limitation but rather "rule-governedness" that helps the political researcher establish a relationship between theory and observation and make predictions about political phenomena. In effect, the logical syllogism is a method that elevates political explanation from conjecture and speculation to the level of "logical necessity"—a missing element clearly evident in common political science methodologies that lack a precise logical approach.

3. Methodology and Logic

Sadegh Haghighat, in his book *Methodology of Political Science*, establishes a firm connection between methodology and logic. He divides logic into two types: "formal or theoretical" (examining the form of propositions) and "practical or material," the latter of which, citing Félicien Challaye, he calls "methodology" itself. Haghighat distinguishes between innate logic and theoretical logic, considering logic as a tool that prevents the mind from error—a view that Mullā 'Abd Allāh and other logicians also emphasize. He identifies the two main characteristics of science as being "descriptive" and "methodical" (Haghighat, 2008, vol. 1, p. 56). On this basis, logic is not

merely a prerequisite for philosophy, but is itself a "research method." If we understand political research as an effort to avoid bias and error, the logical syllogism is precisely the tool that guarantees the validity of political explanations. In explaining how this application works, one can refer to the book *Writing Like a Philosopher* by Martinich. He frequently employs the syllogistic method and, by outlining the characteristics of "good reasoning," shows how precise writing is grounded in logic (Martinich, 2024, pp. 35–77). In political research, this "logical writing" can be used in reading classical texts or understanding a political thought; namely, by extracting the hidden premises in a thinker's text and arranging them syllogistically, the researcher arrives at conclusions that are not apparent at first glance. Likewise, Ali-Asghar Jafari-Valani, in his book *Methodology of Philosophical Research*, considers discussions such as the "Eight Topics" (Ru'ūs al-Thamāniya) as the historical locus of research method and emphasizes the syllogistic method (Jafari-Valani, 2018, pp. 42–44). This approach, in descriptive-analytical research in politics, helps the researcher to describe a political phenomenon not in a fragmented manner, but as a coherent and logical whole. Julian Baggini and Peter S. Fosl, in their book *The Philosopher's Toolkit*, consider the syllogism as the most robust form of reasoning; because if the premises are true, the conclusion will necessarily be true (Baggini & Fosl, 2022, vol. 1, p. 9). This feature is crucial in causal explanations in political science and international relations. For example, to explain why a phenomenon occurs (the conclusion), the researcher links it to a general political law (the major premise) and a specific event (the minor premise). Such reasoning, due to its alignment with human reason, achieves the necessary solidity and cannot be easily refuted. Our concern in this article is to demonstrate precisely this "methodological" aspect of the syllogism—that is, the syllogism not merely as a formal template, but as a technique for organizing historical, explanatory, and interpretive research in political science.

4. Syllogistic Method in Political Science

Reasoning in philosophy, logic, and the rational sciences is based on the syllogism, for the syllogism is considered the primary tool of inference. In political research, the syllogism is used to prove scientific propositions, analyze philosophical problems, and even for persuasion in political oratory. The syllogism has a demonstrative nature, and in research methodology, it signifies the creation of new knowledge through the collection of relevant data (premises) and prior knowledge. As Popkin and Stroll state: "Inference is the

act by which we can prove the truth of a certain proposition, which is called the conclusion of the argument, by means of other propositions which are the evidence and proof for that conclusion" (Popkin & Stroll, 1996, p. 340). In political science, this definition means that if we have a "general political law" and a "specific case," the result of our research is necessarily generated from them. Mohammad Javād Zahabī Tehrānī, in his commentary on the logic of Mullā ‘Abd Allāh, also defines the syllogism as a composite discourse that "by its very nature necessitates another discourse" (Zehni Tehrani, 1987, p. 304). Although a complete explanation of a political problem within the framework of the syllogistic method requires the scope of a thesis or book, the operational application of this method in various types of political research is entirely possible through the selection of the appropriate logical tool from among the diverse types of syllogism (such as conjunctive (hypothetical), disjunctive, *reductio ad absurdum*, a priori (*limmī*), and syllogism of equality). In explanatory research, the researcher, through a thorough investigation of conceptual and assenting principles, formulates the problem in the form of a robust syllogism. For example, in the analysis of a macro-issue such as "relations with the United States," the power of the syllogistic method lies in elevating the explanatory process from matters of subjective taste to the level of logical necessity. In this model, whether in a positive approach one argues that "negotiating with the US secures the national interest (minor premise), and everything that secures the national interest is obligatory (major premise)," or in a negative approach one claims that "relations with the US entail harm (minor premise), and everything that entails harm must be avoided (major premise)," the ultimate validity of the research rests on the truth of the premises. Once the premises are proven, an undeniable and unavoidable conclusion is reached. Similarly, in descriptive and predictive research, the syllogistic method acts as the link between "general political laws" and "empirical findings." For example, in analyzing the issue of "political participation," the researcher first assumes a general rule as the major premise (e.g., that political participation strengthens legitimacy). Then, by applying it to a specific event as the minor premise (e.g., 80% participation in the recent election), the researcher arrives at a methodical and predictive description of the "stability of the political system's legitimacy." This mode of analysis demonstrates how the logical syllogism, through the precise arrangement of data, prevents fragmented explanations and provides political research with a well-reasoned foundation and a coherent structure.

In explanatory and policy-oriented research, understanding the differences

between theoretical and practical syllogisms is vital for the political researcher:

1) The major premise in the practical syllogism is a "value judgment" or a political goal (e.g., "Preserving national security is a necessity"). Unlike the theoretical syllogism, where the major premise is descriptive, in politics this premise entails an "ought".

2) The minor premise in the practical syllogism is a "descriptive proposition" about the existing reality, which introduces the means of achieving the goal (e.g., "Negotiation" or "military reinforcement" is the means to achieve security).

3) The conclusion of the practical syllogism is not a mere description, but a "practical decision" or political prescription whose realization depends on the will of the actor (Bagheri, 2019, p. 66). Of course, in a complete syllogism, first comes the minor premise, then the major premise, and finally the conclusion.

Therefore, the practical syllogism in qualitative political research consists of a normative premise (major) and a descriptive premise (minor). Using this method, the political researcher can show how a political decision (the conclusion) has been derived from the ontological foundations and values of a system (the major premise) and that system's understanding of existing reality (the minor premise) (Shahriari & et al., 2020, pp. 901–902). This method even includes the sensory perception of the "availability of means," which Aristotle calls the final minor premise (Bagheri, 2020, p. 98). In international relations and strategic studies research, syllogistic reasoning provides a way to solve unfamiliar problems. When facing new crises, researchers draw inferences through a syllogistic connection between the current event and past experiences (Sheikhzadeh & Kamali, 2018, p. 112). Here, the mind moves from the general and universal to the particular (Shahriari & et al., 2020, p. 901). For example, in analyzing the necessity of negotiation in international relations, the researcher should not be content with slogans; rather, based on the practical syllogism, they should explain: if the major premise is "striving to secure the national interest" and the minor premise is determined as "negotiation as the only available means," then the logical conclusion (whether with a positive or negative approach) will be "to engage in negotiation" (Bagheri, 2020, p. 99). The inference process in qualitative political research is a gradual and evolutionary path that begins with data reduction, proceeds to the stage of organization and presentation, and is completed in the interpretation stage (Torkzadeh, 2009, p. 128). In effect, syllogistic logic, as a "criterion for detecting error," prevents the researcher from deviating in the

analysis of political phenomena. By moving from generalities (political theories) to particulars (the specific case study), the researcher reveals the truth of the phenomenon (Rezaei, 2020, p. 93). Ultimately, the validity of the syllogistic method in politics is such that its conclusions are accepted by all rational people. If the premises (minor and major) are correctly accepted, avoiding the conclusion of the syllogism is impossible, unless the actor knowingly resorts to fallacy or denial of reality—something that lies outside the realm of scientific research and political rationality.

5. Analysis of the Terms in the Definition of Syllogism within the Research Process

Avicenna, in *The Book of Healing* (*Kitāb al-Shifā'*), defines the syllogism (*qiyās*) as a discourse in which "premises are arranged so that a conclusion, previously unknown, is necessarily deduced from them" (Avicenna, 1994). Examining the terms of the definition of syllogism leads us to the practical mechanism of "constructing political research." The term "discourse" (*qawl*) in syllogism includes complete and incomplete compounds. According to Taftāzānī, the syllogism is "composed of propositions." By using this "composition," the political researcher, in effect, transforms their "research design" from scattered propositions into a coherent whole. In political research, propositions are either complete compounds (e.g., constitutional laws) or analytical propositions. The syllogistic method can cover all these propositions from beginning to end and guarantee the internal coherence of the research (Zehni Tehrani, 1987, p. 307).

In the definition of syllogism, the term "propositions" (*qadāyā*, plural of *qadīyya*) has methodological significance. Propositions in a political research can be divided into 15 types (8 simple and 7 compound), which the researcher uses depending on the type of research (descriptive or predictive):

- Simple propositions (e.g., absolute necessary or general conditional): Used in descriptive research to express fixed political truths.
- Compound propositions (e.g., specific conditional or non-necessary existential): Used in complex analyses and conditional causal explanations (e.g., "Democracy is achieved on the condition of sustainable development") (Zehni Tehrani, 1987, p. 308).

Using the syllogistic method and arranging these propositions in the form of minor and major premises, the political researcher brings the research to its conclusion. For example, in the "syllogism of equality" (*qiyās al-musāwāt*), which is frequently used in diplomacy and international law, we say:

- Contract (A) is legally equal to contract (B).
- Contract (B) is equal to contract (C).
- Conclusion (by means of the proof that "everything equal to something equal to itself is equal"): Contract (A) is equal to contract (C).

In this method, the collection of syllogisms is, in fact, the collection of scientific reasons and proofs that make political research "well-reasoned". The use of various types of syllogisms (disjunctive or adversative [*istithnā'ī*], conjunctive/hypothetical [*iqtirānī*], etc.) in the analysis of political phenomena demonstrates that terms such as "discourse" and "composition" are not merely logical terminologies, but rather prove the article's hypothesis that the syllogism is a comprehensive research method. This method helps the researcher avoid subjective explanations and achieve "logical certainty" in political analyses.

6. Indicators of the Syllogistic System in Designing Political Research

For the logical syllogism to function as a "research method" in political science (whether descriptive or explanatory), it must possess three fundamental characteristics, which Larijani Nabavi has pointed out in his book *Foundations of Modern Logic*. These characteristics are, in fact, the criteria for the validity of a "political theory" or "research design":

a) Consistency: A syllogistic system must not lead to contradiction. In political research, if the axioms and inference rules of a theory (e.g., realism in international relations) lead to two completely contradictory conclusions, that system loses its value. Consistency means that the research design must be such that, regardless of other qualities, if it involves contradiction in inference, it loses its scientific validity.

b) Independence: The axioms in a political research must be independent; that is, none of the fundamental variables or main hypotheses should be derivable from another (avoiding circularity and infinite regress). Independence means the logical impossibility of deriving one axiom from another.

c) Completeness: This means that the researcher's syllogistic system must have maximal explanatory power; that is, it should be possible to prove or refute any proposition within that domain. The more rulings a political syllogistic model covers, the greater the value of that system (Nabavi, 1990, pp. 29–30).

7. Types of Syllogism and Their Practical Function in Political Analysis

Logicians and philosophers have divided the syllogism into various types—such as conjunctive (hypothetical), disjunctive, and rhetorical—based on the structure and arrangement of propositions. In political research, knowledge of these types is essential for selecting the "model of reasoning" appropriate to the type of research (descriptive, explanatory, or interpretive).

7.1. The Disjunctive Syllogism in Conditional and Processual Explanations

This syllogism, in which a word of exception (e.g., "but") is used, is an effective tool for explanatory research and policy analysis. In this model, the conclusion is explicitly mentioned in the premise. For example, the political researcher can use this pattern to explain a phenomenon: "If political development occurs in this country, then political stability will be established, but political development has occurred; therefore, the conclusion is that political stability has been established." Mullā 'Abd Allāh emphasizes that in the disjunctive syllogism, the subject and predicate of the conclusion are present in the premise (Zehni Tehrani, 1987, p. 317). This method is applicable in "path analysis to prove the occurrence of a political phenomenon based on available evidence."

7.2. The Conjunctive (Hypothetical) Syllogism in Descriptive Research and Classification

In political research whose aim is the precise description of phenomena or the linking of macro-theoretical concepts to micro-concrete instances, the "conjunctive syllogism" (*qiyās iqtirānī*) plays a pivotal role; because in this model, the components of the conclusion are connected through a "middle term" as the mediating link of explanation. By precisely identifying this "middle term," the political researcher will be able to connect two seemingly unrelated political phenomena in a logical and robust manner. Based on the nature of the propositions, this method is divided into two fundamental types, each having a specific function in political methodology:

First, the categorical syllogism (*qiyās ḥamlī*), which is an efficient tool for the "classification of political systems" and the typology of phenomena. For example, by attributing the quality "democratic" to a specific regime and applying it to the general rule that "the separation of powers is necessary in every democracy," the researcher arrives at the systematic description that the

regime under study necessarily entails the separation of powers. Second, the conditional syllogism (*qiyās shartī*), which is primarily used in "temporal, situational, and processual analyses." For example, in a chain analysis of events, the researcher explains the connection between phenomena as follows: "Whenever a legitimacy crisis occurs, protests emerge," and "Whenever protests emerge, the government is compelled to reform," ultimately reaching the explanatory conclusion that the occurrence of a legitimacy crisis will entail the government's obligation to implement reforms. Mullā 'Abd Allāh summarizes the elements of this reasoning in five terms: "minor term" (*aṣghar*), "major term" (*akbar*), "middle term" (*awsaṭ*), "minor premise" (*ṣughrā*), and "major premise" (*kubrā*) (Zehni Tehrani, 1987, pp. 317–320), the precise observance of whose arrangement guarantees structural coherence and demonstrative validity in any political research.

8. The Four Figures of Syllogism as Tools for Political Analysis

In line with answering how the syllogism is operationally applied in the research process, it should be noted that the placement of the "middle term" (the mediating element of explanation) within the premises gives rise to four figures of reasoning, each of which has a specific function at some level of political science research (Zehni Tehrani, 1987, p. 321). The first figure, which is the most obvious and direct type of inference, is used in general and certain explanations. For example, the researcher, observing that "the Middle East is changing" and applying this to the general rule that "every change requires crisis management," arrives at the certain explanation that "the Middle East requires crisis management." In contrast, the second figure is a key tool in comparative research and in methods for distinguishing systems from one another, where the researcher, relying on a shared attribute (the middle term), delineates the conceptual boundaries between systems. For instance, by proving that "every parliamentary system is accountable to the parliament" and that "no absolute system is accountable to the parliament," a structural distinction is achieved, and the researcher concludes that "no absolute system is parliamentary." Furthermore, in critical and theoretical research, the third figure of the syllogism is used to find exceptions to general theories and to challenge the comprehensiveness of political laws. For example, to critique the claim of absolute transparency in democracies, the researcher argues that "some democracies suffer from corruption" while at the same time "all democracies claim transparency," reaching the exceptional proposition that "some claimants to transparency suffer from corruption." Although the fourth

figure has the least application in political research, it is still used for certain specific and complex logical classifications. The application of these four figures of the syllogism causes political research to rise above the level of a mere "description" and report-like account, achieving a "well-reasoned foundation" and a demonstrative basis. In fact, the strongest evidence for the possibility and efficacy of this method in political science is its actual occurrence in prominent and successful research, which we will analyze in what follows.

9. Conclusion

The investigations of this article have shown that most common research methods in political science, despite their instrumental multiplicity, suffer from a poverty of logical propositions and often lead to fragmented results lacking demonstrative coherence. In contrast, syllogistic methodology—not merely as a formal tool, but as a comprehensive research strategy—is capable of filling the structural gaps in political research. Within this framework, the "how" of applying the syllogism in political science research can be analyzed at three fundamental levels:

First, in explanatory and causal research, the syllogistic method prevents unscientific conjectures and speculations by grounding the inference process. In this model, macro-concepts of political knowledge—such as "how power is acquired," "the just distribution of power," and "the foundations of legitimacy"—play the role of the major premise (general law). Alongside these, concepts pertaining to field realities—such as "level of efficacy," "political cohesion," "rationality of agents," and "popular support"—are considered as the minor premise (the specific case). The result of this logical connection is a conclusion that not only explains the phenomenon but also presents the political solution as a "rational necessity."

Second, in interpretive research and the reading of classical texts, the syllogistic method allows the researcher to reconstruct the "internal logic" of a thinker's thought. By extracting the ontological foundations (major premise) and applying them to the issues of the time (minor premise), the researcher deduces the political implications of that thought without falling into arbitrary interpretations. This process guarantees the "internal coherence" of the research and prevents the study from turning into a "haphazard collection of knowledge" or a set of unrelated data (methodological fragmentation).

Third, in the domain of political thought and practical wisdom, this method has a unique ability to analyze and resolve fundamental dichotomies. On the

basis of this composite reasoning, one can provide a precise explanation of the connections between "individual and society," "Iranian and Islamic identity," "this world and the hereafter," "justice and liberty," "religion and politics," "republicanism and Islamicity," and finally "political power and spirituality." The syllogistic method, relying on principles such as consistency, independence, and completeness, demonstrates that these dichotomies are not theoretical dead-ends, but rather components of a single logical system that can be synthesized and explained through the proper arrangement of premises.

Finally, this article has proven that syllogistic methodology, relying on the profound logical and philosophical foundations (derived from the Iranian-Islamic heritage), is the best theoretical support for actualizing wisdom in governance and rationality in political research. The application of various types of syllogisms (from demonstrative and disjunctive to *limmī* and syllogism of equality) depending on the type and orientation of the research, guides the researcher toward an output that is not a shaky claim, but a well-reasoned and persuasive truth that blocks the way for any denial or discord in major political decision-making. From this perspective, returning to syllogistic logic is not a historical regression, but a necessity for the indigenization of methodology and the enhancement of scientific precision in modern political science research. The syllogistic method is the method of "demonstration and reasoning" that can cover all aspects of governance and all dimensions of political science research. The necessity of applying this method arises from the fact that politics is a clear instance of "practical wisdom," and wisdom without logic will lack rationality. Strong arguments arising from the syllogistic method increase the power to persuade citizens and replace ambiguity in political duties with transparency. Accordingly, it is suggested that political science researchers, through a precise study of the rules of logic, make use of this civilizational and religious heritage to explain dichotomies such as justice and liberty, or religion and politics. Applying the syllogistic method from "zero to one hundred" of research not only makes the research well-reasoned and logical, but also lays the groundwork for wise governance in which political decisions are built upon accurate data and robust inferences. This method is the only way to escape emotional, sloganistic, and populist behaviors in the realm of political research and practice.

References

- Alamolhoda, J. (2009). *Islamic theory of education* (Vol. 1). Tehran: Imam Sadeq University Press. [In Persian]
- Aristotle. (2021). *Aristotle's logic (Organon)* (S. Adib Soltani, Trans., Vol. 1, Fourth ed.). Tehran: Negah Publications. [In Persian]
- Baggini, J., & Fosl, P. S. (2022). *The philosopher's toolkit: A compendium of philosophical concepts and methods* (K. Shahbazi, Trans., Vol. 1, Fourth ed.). Tehran: Kargadan Publications. [In Persian]
- Bagheri, K. (2019). *An introduction to the philosophy of education of the Islamic Republic of Iran: Goals, foundations, principles* (Vol. 1). Tehran: Elmi va Farhangi Publications. [In Persian]
- Bagheri, K. (2020). *Approaches and research methods in the philosophy of education*. Tehran: Institute for Cultural and Social Studies. [In Persian]
- Beheshti, S. (2007). *A groundwork for the recognition and critique of the philosophy of education in the Western world*. Tehran: Ettela'at Publications. [In Persian]
- Haghighat, S. (2008). *Methodology of political science* (Vol. 1, Second ed.). Qom: Mofid University Press. [In Persian]
- Ibn Sina, H. (Avicenna). (1994). *Al-Shifā': Selected passages* (M. Ghavam Safari, Trans., Vol. 1, First ed.). Tehran: Fekr-e Rooz. [In Persian]
- Jafari-Valani, A. A. (2018). *Methodology of philosophical research* (Vol. 1). Tehran: Qoqnoos Publications. [In Persian]
- Martinich, Y. P. (2024). *Writing like a philosopher* (L. Minaei & F. Minaei, Trans., Vol. 1, Seventh ed.). Tehran: Hermes Publications. [In Persian]
- Mohseni, M. A. (2021). The capacities of the inferential method in the philosophy of education. *Journal of Educational Management Essentials*, 1(1), pp. 3–28. [In Persian]
- Nabavi, L. (1990). Methodology of analogical sciences. *Modares Journal: Comprehensive Humanities Portal*, 1(2), pp. 27–39. [In Persian]
- Popkin, R. H., & Stroll, A. (1996). *General philosophy* (J. Mojtavavi, Trans.). Tehran: Hekmat Publications. [In Persian]
- Rezaei, M. (2020). An explanation of the inferential research methodology: Rational necessity in the philosophy of Islamic education. *Research in Islamic Education Issues*, 28(49), pp. 85–119. [In Persian]
- Sanjabi, A. R. (2005). *Methodology in political science and international relations* (Vol. 1). Tehran: Ghoomes Publications. [In Persian]
- Shahriari, M., Beheshti, S., Imani, M., & Mahroozadeh, T. (2020). An investigation of

- mental existence in the ontology of knowledge of transcendent theosophy and its implications for the philosophy of Islamic education. *Epistemological Studies in Islamic University*, 24(4), pp. 895–914. [In Persian]
- Sheikhzadeh, S., & Kamali, Y. (2018). Syllogistic reasoning and foreign policy making: A case study of historical analogies used by foreign analogizers regarding Iran's nuclear issue. *Political Science Quarterly*, 13(4), pp. 105–133. [In Persian]
- Torkzadeh, J. (2009). Cyclical process analysis research method: A method for collecting, analyzing, and inferring from multi-dimensional qualitative data in the development of Islamic management knowledge. *Methodology of Humanities*, 15(61), pp. 123–142. [In Persian]
- Zehni Tehrani, M. J. (1987). *Al-Āthār al-Bāqīya: Persian commentary on Hāshiya*. Qom: Hazegh Publications, second edition. [In Persian]