

Confrontation of Criminal Policy in Iran with Islamic Political Philosophy (The Narrative of Non-existence or Existence of Meaning-Relationship)

Ahmad. Ahmadi¹, Salman. Konani^{1*}, Mohammad Mahdi. Kiani¹, Abdolvahid. Zahedi¹

¹ Department of Law, ST.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: s_konani@azad.ac.ir

Received: 2024-08-23

Revised: 2024-12-02

Accepted: 2024-12-09

Published: 2025-04-01

Discussing concepts such as indigenous criminal policy, indigenous criminology, indigenous philosophy, and others—when considering the existence and essence of scientific or extra-scientific (philosophical) concepts in an abstract space, devoid of interpretative approaches and ideological receptions— is condemned to rejection. Science, extra-science, and philosophy are always and everywhere the same thing! They have a systematic and specific essence and content that cannot be claimed to have various and contradictory kinds or existences based on time and geography. However, all of these can be studied from a specific perspective, a particular theory, or a political, religious, or need-based approach, and different understandings can be expected. These are two distinct categories. When confronted with the concept and application of criminal policy as a limited form of public policy, if the meanings and propositions constructed based on regional perspectives, which today, and historically, have constituted the internal and external structure of what is called Islamic political philosophy, are to be considered as the criterion, it is likely that we will encounter surprising positions in comparison to the concealment of criminal policy science in a scientific and ontological context. Therefore, the preliminary assumption of this article is that if such readings of the interpretations and meanings of the above terms (criminal policy - Islamic political philosophy) become entrenched in the mind, both the understanding of the initial foundations of these meanings (realities) and the narrative of their interaction and the confrontational influence they have on each other will be severely misunderstood and deviated. This paper, through a descriptive-analytical method, attempts to transcend the partisan, sectarian, and nature-averse views of these interpretations and will demonstrate that thoughts suggesting the existence of Iranian criminal policy and the existence of Islamic political philosophy, distinct from the transcendent, time-and-space-independent essence of these sciences, are fundamentally a cognitive and methodological error and a futile attempt to prove a non-existent matter, deserving of rejection and abandonment altogether.

Keywords: Criminal Policy, Islamic Political Philosophy, Interaction of Meanings, Existential and Non-existential Narrative.

How to cite this article:

Konani, S., Ahmadi, A., Kiani, M. M., & Zahedi, A. (2025). Confrontation of Criminal Policy in Iran with Islamic Political Philosophy (The Narrative of Non-existence or Existence of Meaning-Relationship). *Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics*, 4(2), 39-48. <https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.4.2.4>



1. Introduction

Criminal policy is a fragmented and limited branch of public policy, and its meaning and concept vary significantly in the context of the existence or non-existence of current states and societies (Konani, 2021). The primary historical-methodological reason for misunderstanding institutions and terms such as policy-making and political philosophy, and the tendency to define geographically bound, border-specific, and socially acceptable forms of them, is a lack of epistemological, ontological, and methodological understanding. In general, all the concepts that humanity deals with are either based on the necessities and expressions of the abstract and fixed nature of the surrounding world or are the product of something that, from the long past to the present and possibly the unseen future, is called "science" or "scientific meanings" and will naturally continue to be called the same. Neither of these two domains is subject to the conditions of time and place. In other words, they should not be. However, the illogical foundations of reason are often based on them. As long as humanity remains bound by artifacts derived from fabricated and nature-defying concepts such as society, state, public opinion, social norms, the all-encompassing order, the eternally free human, the always-subjugated nature, Iranian science, religious science, political science, scientific-religious politics, local, indigenous, and similar notions, humanity will forever remain incapable of recognizing itself, God, and the world. Consequently, it will forever be lost in concepts unrelated to the necessities of the pure natural system surrounding it (Konani, 2021).

Now, the question arises: when Iranian criminal policy is not meant to be Iranian, nor to claim an Iranian form for it, but is theoretically seeking to view the framework, logic, and scope of what is called Islamic political philosophy, which worldview will it fundamentally, methodologically, and epistemologically adopt? And inevitably, upon what framework of scientific interpretations and understandings will it rely? The answer to this question requires freedom from the conventional legal, criminal, and philosophical interpretations prevalent in the Iranian academic community, which are deeply flawed and constitute an epistemic and methodological deviation.

It has been said that Islamic political philosophy refers to a type of political philosophy based on religious-Islamic teachings, where its premises and goals align with Islamic doctrines (Dawson, 2014). If we accept this notion, the next question is: what does Islam mean and imply in this context? What is the meaning of Islam at this time? Islam for which people, and which God? Analysts who have passionately, childishly, and blindly defended Islamic political philosophy have erred just as much as Western political philosophers, who have read this claimed heritage from a purely imagined and illusory standpoint. Neither of these two has existed in reality. Dividing and analyzing philosophy according to religion, politics, geography, people, God, and so on, is the ultimate ignorance of all existence: ignorance of science, ignorance of God itself, ignorance of nature, and ignorance of the fact that philosophy means existence itself—the entirety of what should be, and what humanity should know, yet will never truly know. Dogmatism, idolization, unreasoned faiths, and historical ignorance have so deeply embedded themselves in the minds and souls of humanity that there is no escape from the grip of ignorance and illusion. Humans are more accustomed to living in ignorance and illusion, and most societies and people are more compatible with this state. If humans strive to know, become, and transform into truths they are part of but unaware of, they will only become more depressed, sad, and withdrawn from the collective life. People were not born to understand the world and its philosophy. To attempt the opposite of this natural necessity, which has left humanity ignorant, subjugated, vulnerable, and harmed throughout all of history, is to traverse an empty and meaningless path. "They didn't know," "We don't know," and "They don't know" are pure actions that reflect humanity's eternal ignorance and longing for knowledge. If humans fully understood the meaning and philosophy of existence, the presence and meaning of God in the world and among the world's people would become futile and meaningless. Therefore, at least for the sake of believing in God in this manner, we should not speak of understanding, philosophizing, and engaging in philosophical discourse (Konani, 2023).

It is said that Farabi was the first philosopher to attempt to reconcile classical political philosophy with Islamic teachings as much as possible. This is an interesting falsehood, because philosophy is fundamentally

incompatible with any religion. Philosophy does not help in understanding religion, nor does religion possess the logic necessary for a correct understanding of philosophy. The language of philosophy is the language of nature—boundless, without borders, and without any specific agenda. Philosophy, in its essence, is about understanding being/becoming through straightforward paths; drawing ends, objectives, and theoretical foundations for it is an insult to human intelligence, an assault on the unwritten laws of the natural order, and aligned with the closure of epistemological and ontological understanding.

We must appreciate the philosophers' characteristic of thinking freely about everything in their reflections and constructing criteria and standards for judgment on various issues. While this approach does not entirely align with the essence of philosophy, it is not necessarily a bad approach, and it can help us, for instance, determine what to expect from something like criminal policy. It is within this philosophical talent of philosophers that we may identify non-criminal criminal policies and those inherently opposed to criminal matters. In the realm of philosophy, to trace various contradictions and paradoxes, which are often expressions of unity and multiplicity originating from one root and source, we need these kinds of imaginations. They are far better than being devoid of philosophy or possessing fragmented and incomplete understandings.

The authors of this article, relying on these viewpoints, aim to demonstrate that understanding human scientific concepts always requires non-scientific insights and thoroughly misguided intellects. However, being misguided and attempting to connect oneself to findings associated with various scientific and illusory schools has never been acceptable and only leads to further confusion. In this context, criminal policy will become a scientific and effective tool available to humanity when it is not necessarily encoded and explained within the rigid frameworks of current social systems, and when it is allowed to sometimes consider humans in isolation from society to derive meaning. In this interpretation, we will show that avoiding partisan, short-term, and sectarian views of philosophy as something beyond all sciences plays a decisive role in helping humanity make better use of what is called science, policy, tools, paths, goals, and so forth.

2. Correction of Some Foundational-Epistemological Errors

As you may have noticed in the introduction, the choice of the title of this paper and its overall writing and execution have served as an excuse to illuminate the positions of the authors regarding the posthumous attributes attached to the sciences/knowledge, such as criminal policy and political philosophy. These terms, regardless of their boundaries, are inherently and naturally fraudulent, illusory, and absurd!

2.1. *Public Policy is Not the Same as Political Science or the Common Political Sciences*

According to the famous political scientist, Philip Braud, "Public policy is the manifestation of the government's will in action or the abstention from action, and they can be seen as a structured and interconnected set of purposes, decisions, and actions—those that can be related to public authority at local, national, and international levels" (Braud, 1998). On the other hand, some thinkers like "Schwrits and Boric," who have a managerial mindset, believe that "a doctrinal approach" shows that concepts like public policy are more than a conceptual reality; they are a mental construct that represents a wave of thoughts and beliefs, especially in macro areas where political, policy, and public descriptions emerge, but in reality, they are the hidden thoughts of some individuals aligned with their own interests, which are neither important nor clear—what it is, and for whom it is meant (Shafritz & Borick, 2011). In essence, public policies, like any science, management, or program that claims to be public and for the people, do not have any inherent alignment with the true desires of the people nor do they coincide with the natural systems of the ever-neutral environment. No program that claims democracy and liberalism can inherently align with the current world and existing societies. One of the foundations for the formation of states, governments, and laws is the non-public nature of the laws and policies enacted in the name of defending the rights of the people. If a government wishes to be people-oriented and based on the people's votes, it cannot survive for a single day without oppression and injustice. The "people-government" balance is a natural contradiction! Historically, the primary method and tool for the protection and preservation of governments and

their laws is the existence and development of oppression, injustice, and violations of rights. Laws cannot help any legal and social system without oppression. Therefore, true criminal policy, which can help us understand criminal phenomena, cannot be interpreted within the framework of existing public legal policies. If this intellectual perspective is to introduce any valid and sound criminal thought to humanity, it must go beyond social ethics, laws, and the political philosophies defending them (Konani, 2023).

2.2. Criminal Policy; An Aspect of Public Policy and a Concept Beyond Criminal Law Policy

Criminal policy is a source of generating and designing criminal policies (Konani, 2024), and many legal and criminal doctrines are conceptually artificial, referred to as "society" (Konani & Mahdavi Sabat, 2021), whose establishment in social-group relations requires a reconsideration of all existing legal and political structures. Criminal policy is sometimes referred to as the logic of avoiding unplanned action and creating a theoretical framework to guide the community's executive programs or those of specific institutions. The term "criminal" also has a broader meaning than merely penal, and refers to all issues or phenomena that, beyond their potential legal dimensions, are necessarily related to violations of laws, norm-breaking, and civil and criminal disobedience in society (Adamz, 2016).

Criminal policy is a broad science of understanding criminal phenomena through tools such as criminal law policy and systems for preventing social harms, which themselves are studied within smaller sciences like criminology and criminal law. This type of policy is a general and large-scale strategy, and any model of criminal policy in society should be formulated within this framework. In reality, the meaning of criminal policy is much broader than criminal law policy (Konani, previous work, p. 9), and criminal law policy is only a part of the larger concept of criminal policy. In contrast, when comparing criminal law policy and criminal policy, the following distinctions can be made:

1. Criminal policy is never limited to criminal, legal, or criminological issues, but the scope of criminal law policy is confined to penal matters, crime fighting, and prevention.
2. The study method in criminal law policy is specialized, legal, and unidimensional, whereas

the study method in criminal policy is interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and multidimensional, considering not only criminology but also social sciences findings in terms of norm creation and holistic value-driven public health.

3. Criminal policy is broader and more comprehensive than criminal law policy.
4. Criminal policy has visible economic and political dimensions, but criminal law policy is confined to legal literature and concepts, and the term "policy" in its usage has a figurative meaning, beyond political science. Criminal policy, on the other hand, is directly and continuously connected to true political science and governance in society.

2.3. Political Philosophy

Political philosophy, as a branch of applied philosophy, is generally understood as the analysis of the reflection of political events and systems' goals, the analysis of means to achieve these goals, examining the necessities of political operations and opportunities and political situations, delving into political ideals and requirements, discussing social institutions and their relations with the government and each other, scrutinizing governmental controls and ethical and physical pressures (i.e., local pressure on military and police power) present in any society (Coser, 1997). In a basic definition, one can define the study of the behavior of institutions, organizations, and forms of political life according to Islamic political philosophy in philosophical terms, aiming at the ideal society. Political philosophy is called "Islamic" because it has developed within the Islamic cultural and civilizational sphere. In this context, it does not matter whether the philosopher or theorist is a Muslim or not (Pezeshki, 2001).

Regardless of these positions, political philosophy is not confined to politics or political sciences, nor is it limited to their framework. It does not even have much connection with the natural or historical essence of philosophy itself. It is a fossil in the archaeological science of knowledge, which today is used to obscure illegitimate motives and nature-averse forces that advocate oppression, crime, and insecurity, and for justifying illegitimate entities called the state and society. Such philosophies are inherently methodological errors,

detached from the essence of philosophy. They offer no solutions for human betterment. They are more concerned with concepts and facts like the buying and selling of rights, the trade of oppression and inequality, betrayal of nature, collaboration with what is called God, and the attempt to justify the illegitimate entities called the state and society.

3. Ambiguous Meanings in the Realm of Criminal Policy

In the discussion of criminal policy and its constituent elements, issues and concepts are often referenced that typically have no connection to the general nature and method of this concept. Terms such as justice, rights, and freedoms granted by society to individuals, and progressivism are among the most common expressions that are strongly defended in Islamic political philosophy (Islam), and are mentioned as the objectives and foundations of the criminal policy system from this perspective. However, we believe that this is not the case, and thus understanding the nature and necessity of criminal policies requires moving beyond and abandoning these terms. The following briefly touches on the content of these misleading expressions.

3.1. Justice

Philosophical and legal justice is neither achievable nor useful for humanity. Justice is generally one of the historical foundations and defenses of oppression, despotism, and mankind's transgression against the laws of the natural order. If, under the banner of justice, one steps into matters such as policymaking, only ignorance and criminal delusions will be the results available to humanity (Konani & Mahdavi Sabat, 2021).

It has been argued that based on the necessity of observing justice, public proposals favor those that benefit the poor more and reduce the legal-criminal gaps between people. A uniform reading of crime among the wealthy classes and the underprivileged classes was seemingly intended to be one of the results of this principle and claim. However, the reality is quite different. Today, crime and criminality have become heavily class-based, gendered, and racialized, and criminals are judged and tried not only based on the merits of their actions but also influenced by their social and individual status perceptions. This is the beginning

of the bitter tales, such as Joseph K.'s trial in Franz Kafka's novels, where seeking a reason for the crime signifies a lack of understanding of the philosophy of law, the philosophy of lawmaking, and the philosophy of society. All these philosophies were essentially created to defend and guarantee one thing: injustice, oppression, and social despotism (Konani, 2024).

It is said that God created justice for the stability of the people and as a means of purity from oppression and sin, and for the elevation and dignity of the people (Taheri, 2021). Now, one must ask, what is the basis of this claim? Why should humanity think about the elimination of injustice and oppression when all the theories defending the formation of governments, law, and policies are rooted in the sacred and religious foundations of oppression, inequality, and anthropological misjudgments?

3.2. Public Rights and Freedoms Granted by Governments to Individuals

It is said that based on fundamental principles, such as the principle of self-determination derived from the principle of "no authority over others," and other principles like the protection of one's property, prohibition of interference in another's property without consent, and prohibition of unauthorized investigations, the sovereignty of the public and governmental sections of society are not allowed to turn anyone's fate into a game for themselves (Taheri, 2021). Such claims have a global and historical nature. Mankind has always been receptive to changing conditions and escaping the control of oppressive and illegitimate authorities, but the realities of societies do not allow the realization, even in a limited and relative sense, of these ideals. As long as concepts like state, society, and government exist, humans cannot seek true and natural freedom. Freedom is not a privilege granted by law, society, or supernatural powers; it is a terrestrial truth that stems from the natural order. Therefore, one of the main reasons for governments' unbridled violations of people's rights and freedoms is the passive acceptance of fabricated concepts like public order, which are essentially invoked by governments and many legal scholars and philosophers in this domain to protect oppression and limit the natural rights of humanity. Society and the state have no right to grant any rights to anyone. A granted right essentially cannot be a true right; it is a false

concept of what a right is, which itself always leads to the denial of greater rights (Konani, 2023).

3.3. Progressivism

In management science, efficiency is understood as the transition from a bad situation to an optimal one (Eivazlou, 2010). In this view, even a concept such as religion is introduced as having a progressive nature (Aliakbarian, 2014). However, the reality is quite different. The terms "progress" and "development" are not aligned with the natural processes of "becoming" and transformations of human beings in the context of natural events in the surrounding world, because all of them have a preconceived notion about the current conditions and are more idealistic and imaginative than realistic, making humanity always await change and transformation. While, often, the future is a mere repetition of today's bitterness. For millennia, societies and many philosophers and governments have talked about fighting crime and insecurity and establishing peace and justice, yet no tomorrow has come where humanity has witnessed less insecurity, crime, and war. Therefore, defining progressivism for scientific concepts is fundamentally incorrect and an epistemological mistake. Humanity is neither forced nor conventionally inclined to always think about progress and change. Many things never change because they should not change. Change and progress are desirable only to the extent that they align with the natural order, not because they are desired by politicians, people, or governments. Hence, most progressive theses in the social and human sciences, such as controlling behavioral deviations, which is a common issue in criminal policy systems, have either been proposed due to ignorance of scientific and natural truths and from an unbiased, yet ignorant standpoint, or based on deviant and self-serving mentalities that seek to create a profitable market or industry, such as in the area of deviation correction. Thus, we view progressivism as a profound misunderstanding of nature and an inherently deviant effort across all sciences and social domains (Konani, 2021).

4. Deviations in Criminal Policy in Iran Affected by Political Philosophy (Islamic)

Contemporary criminal policy has been significantly affected by the concept of religion, leading to tensions and challenges when trying to incorporate it into public and natural spheres that are not particularly welcoming to religious ideologies and the normative consumption regime based on them (Zorinkof, 2011). Most of the analyses and opinions related to the principles and rules of criminal policy in Iran are often absorbed in religious and dogmatic concepts, and have not been effectively manifested in the space of free scientific debate or in respect for the demands of the surrounding natural system. This is why, in the current situation in Iranian society, the science/tool/process or approach known as criminal policy has become more aligned with crime escalation, rights violations, judicial despotism, legal-administrative corruption, and attacks on authentic but non-social-non-local values, rather than achieving what it claims, such as legal-criminal justice, protection of public order and security, and reduction of behavioral-criminal deviations—issues that fundamentally cannot be prioritized in many societies, especially in those where any weakness, any innovation, and any assault on God and nature is justified under the guise of God, religion, ethics, poverty acceptance, and otherworldliness (Konani, 2024). In the formulation, specification, and endorsement of the propositions in this section, the assumption has been that Islamic political philosophy should be considered exclusively and entirely as religious-Islamic thought, without defining its boundaries or clarifying which definition of religion and which geographical scope of Islam is being referred to by those theorists and scholars advocating the link between criminal policy and political philosophy. These theorists claim that relying on political philosophy principles in criminal policy can enhance its normative, deterrent, and order-creating capabilities, though it remains unclear what exactly they mean by "norm-creating," "deterrence," and "order-creation."

4.1. Crime Trade Under the Banner of Religion and Ethics

One of the risks of attempting to align the logic of policy systems in societies with the rules of what is called

religious political philosophy is the possibility of this system becoming corrupted by illegitimate and sectarian functions, aimed at achieving the financial, political, and criminal goals of those who have historically used religion and ethics as easier and quicker means to achieve their inhuman and illegitimate objectives. Religious, jurisprudential, and ethical channels and tools have been developed to counter mechanisms such as systemic deviation by governments and societies, valuing natural principles, and creating suitable platforms to gradually reduce behaviors that, for any reason, have been labeled as behavioral deviations. However, current evidence shows that, in today's Iran, the abuse of religious and ethical norms and the dominance of security-oriented thinking has created vast individual and collective opportunities for the emergence of crimes with economic aspects and has even led to the development of an industry called the trade and exchange of crime and deviation in political-party networks.

Many opportunists, without any real understanding or belief in religious and ethical concepts, have become supporters and enforcers of these norms solely to advance their personal and economic agendas. From an outside perspective, it may seem that they truly believe in their own lies. This reality indicates that if the approach of criminal policy does not distance itself from such innovations, crime will, at best, remain an economic value or opportunity, continually increasing in scale. This situation diverts the people's focus from the harsh truths of real criminal events in society, making trivial issues associated with the prevailing criminal justice system the focus (Konani & Mahdavi Sabat, 2021).

Religious deviants have historically been involved in significant financial and organized crimes in various societies. They have effectively demanded from society and innocent people the price for their religious façade and have always been forced to participate in revolutionary and political arenas to achieve their goals. Therefore, these deviants have always held high positions in the political structures of various societies. The discourse of "religion for power and money" in the popular interpretation refers to this bitter and pervasive reality. One of the best defenses historically against the emergence of financial crimes and corruption in most societies has been the use of religious institutions and concepts, which, due to their social immunity and fear-

inducing power, are less critiqued (Konani, 2024). Therefore, as long as the role of religious teachings in societies remains unclear and unbounded, it will never be possible to hope for the removal of the cultural foundations for the trade of crime in these societies.

4.2. *Legal, Judicial, and Criminal Despotism Under the Pretext of Defending Governance*

When the attempt is made to influence criminal policy systems through the principles of religious political philosophy and push them toward concepts that advocate for despotic governance, in the guise of security demands, it essentially strips the system of its content and contributes to the development of "legalized illegalities" and structural deviations based on the corrupt administrative frameworks of society. Therefore, in the planning stages of implementing criminal policy programs, such possibilities must always be avoided. Otherwise, this system will change direction and become a tool for amplifying further deviations (Konani, 2023).

When Plato introduced governance as a prerequisite for political and managerial power in society centuries ago (Safarian & Emam Jom'ezadeh, 2017), he likely did not foresee that later eras would demonstrate that people and nature are generally incompatible with any form of authoritarianism, and that such components would, instead of providing social functionality and order, adopt a systemic, state-driven deviation and exacerbate both small and large crises in social relations. If the price of achieving governance, especially the desirable and society-friendly kind, involves infringing on the nature and people's needs through lawlessness and disorder, it would have no value and would lead to tyranny, despotism, and stagnation.

Authoritarian governance, contrary to some views (Safarian & Emam Jom'ezadeh, 2017), has never been a people-centered diplomatic process and has always been a breeding ground for various forms of despotism, whether in relation to the domestic population or in dealing with the global community. Therefore, it is necessary to avoid defining goals such as maintaining public order and security for the criminal justice system, which is part of the larger logic of criminal policy in achieving the policymakers' grand strategies. Instead, practical revision must be initiated. Modern societies need, to a considerable degree, natural disorder rather

than the claimed normative orders, events that neither harm individuals nor the public (Konani & Mahdavi Sabat, 2021).

4.3. *The Public-Elite Divide in the Understanding of Criminal Issues*

Historical, cultural, and social contexts in Iran suggest that, unlike most parts of the world, the concepts of elite and common people are still unclear in this region. Many individuals who have never attended formal schools have reached the highest positions of legal, judicial, and criminal affairs in the country, while many intellectuals, in their genuine quest for knowledge, have been dragged to trial for establishing unlawful relationships with science and knowledge.

Wilfredo Pareto, in Italy, once discussed the concept of the "circulation of elites" (Coser, 1997), considering it a sign of societal dynamism. However, it seems that in some societies, we can never truly talk about elitism. What is often presented as elitism is, in fact, nothing more than the talk of the common folk, and revolutions and popular changes follow one after another! Evidence shows that today, in Iran, one reason for the misunderstanding of criminal incidents is that anyone can speak freely on such matters, while the majority of the public have no right to have specialized debates or express opinions on such issues. The theoretical disorganization in this area is so widespread that it is impossible to claim any substantial understanding of various criminal sciences, let alone originality and creativity, in today's Iran. One minimal result of these disturbances is the ongoing increase in events like law buying and selling in society, the trade of deviation backed by official channels, and aimless legal-criminal negotiations about the non-existence of order and deviation prevention!

In political philosophy, it is narrated from the great Farabi that "in a communicative and social structure, those who possess greater skills in communication and who present better quality and quantity of actions rise to higher ranks" (Farabi, 1992). This statement is certainly true from various perspectives, but when we explore the historical and foundational basis of such thoughts in certain segments of the population, we realize that the existence of a mindset of "upper vs. lower" or "illiterate vs. literate" or "influential vs. marginalized" in the definition and classification of people is, in fact, one of

the historical causes behind the prevalence of various forms of abnormal behavior and human ignorance today, which are now referred to as "crime," "social deviation," and "social harm." These mindsets prevent us from understanding criminal issues in their true sense, let alone their legal ramifications!

5. **The Entrapment of Criminal Policy in Iran by the Absence of Islamic Political Philosophy and Its Stances**

Political philosophy, as a subset of philosophy in its common sense, exists and is present in the academic discussions of the country, not as an independent philosophy. Philosophy is always one thing, and that's all!! On the other hand, it is impossible to attribute value and legitimacy to categories such as Islamic political philosophy, Eastern political philosophy, or Western political philosophy. These boundaries and divisions are entirely fabricated, without foundation or substance, and have had no other effect than to deviate from the course and interpretation of philosophy and its countless functions. Therefore, any attempt to present a specific legislative or policy-making approach in the realm of criminal policy as connected to such philosophies—asserting its legitimacy, scientificness, or rationality—is essentially an illegitimate and unscientific movement that has led the process/knowledge of criminal policy, more than anywhere else in the world, into a state of passive approach and logical stagnation in Iran's academic-political and legal decision-making systems. As long as there is no effort to resolve this confrontation between concepts such as criminal policy and various political philosophies, including its Islamic variant, there can be no hope for the effectiveness of such concepts in Iran's present and future society (Konani, 2024).

6. **Conclusion**

There is no such thing as Islamic political philosophy; however, there are many Islamic political philosophies (i.e., attributed to Islam). These are meaningless, incoherent, and truncated!! The same applies to the meaningless expressions such as Eastern or Western political philosophy, and similar terms. The difference between these and genuine philosophy, and the philosophical nature, is as significant as the difference between "Salmā" and "Ṣalmā": one (Salmā) signifies health, while the other (Ṣalmā) denotes the absence of an

organ like the ear, either naturally or congenitally missing from the human body.

Criminal policy, whether regarded as a science, pseudo-science, or discipline, is not something that has been correctly addressed in academic or ostensibly research-based texts in Iran. The meaning of this concept has not been properly explained or clarified in any work so far in Iran. It is often confused with criminal law, which is itself a narrower concept. Apart from these bitter terminological disputes, whatever the case may be, criminal policy, in the institutional and conceptual sense aimed at dealing with unnatural behavioral deviations—those described as criminal—remains ineffective in society as long as it relies on a set of biased, unscientific, and unnatural presuppositions. It offers nothing to society and should be consigned, like most concepts in criminology in Iran, to the dustbin of history; as a non-historical and valueless process, it does not even deserve to occupy a place in the annals of history.

Nonetheless, it must be recognized that neither crime, nor social deviance, nor concepts like order, security, or crime prevention, have ever been accurately applied in Iran, free from the irregular and contradictory imitations of Eastern and Western beliefs, nor from the false, powerful owners of the realms of science, politics, law, and rights. Many things that have been called crimes are, by their very nature, norms and human nature! It is sorrowful why these things have been falsely labeled, when it is the society and its authorities' approach to naming and interpreting them that is ugly and misleading. If criminal policy can at least gain relative insight into these truths and emerge from its cocoon of illusion, it may have something to offer in the realm of social sciences and humanities (in the natural and ontological sense of community and society). However, if it does not fully distance itself from these location-based philosophies, it will only continue to slide into the pit of theoretical deviation. Thus, we must avoid forming inherently negative relationships in its confrontation with domains like political philosophy. Politics has never, throughout history, been a scene for the presence of science, refinement, or humanism, even when humanity and the global community found themselves writing documents such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Human rights are just a word, devoid of meaning and content! If humanity is to have rights in this world, it must first possess a natural, superior will, and

this will must be recognized. However, all religious, ethical, philosophical, and political schools cannot endorse humanity's natural and dominating sovereignty over everything. Humans, by nature, can reign independently and autonomously, without needing other kings or gods in any regard. If we understand this, we may find a human and natural reason to discuss concepts such as science, knowledge, and religion in general. Otherwise, the truth is that we will remain enchanted by the sight of green desert trees growing, trapped in our search for the softness of dew and the delicate green leaves that humans can only imagine reaching; this is where we may ask "André Gide," why did you want your bare feet to feel the softness of the sands? From yesterday to today, and even tomorrow, everyone will come to understand the story and philosophy of this softness by the means of inner knowledge and intuition!! Human beings need no more experience, effort, or understanding than this.

Authors' Contributions

Authors contributed equally to this article.

Declaration

In order to correct and improve the academic writing of our paper, we have used the language model ChatGPT.

Transparency Statement

Data are available for research purposes upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to all individuals helped us to do the project.

Declaration of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

Ethical Considerations

In this research, ethical standards including obtaining informed consent, ensuring privacy and confidentiality were observed.

References

- Adamz, T. (2016). *Policy-Making in Criminal Justice*. London: London University Press.
- Aliakbarian, H. (2014). Challenges of Effectiveness in Legislation Based on Jurisprudence and Their Solutions. *Semi-Annual Journal of Governmental Jurisprudence*, 1(2).
- Braud, P. (1998). *Sociologie Politique*. Paris: L.G.D.J.
- Coser, L. (1997). *The Lives and Thoughts of Great Sociologists*. Tehran: Elmi Publishing.
- Dawson, E. T. (2014). *Public Policy and Political Philosophy*. London: Sage Publications.
- Eivazlou, H. (2010). An Overview of Social and Economic Justice Criteria in Accordance with the Framework of Islamic Sharia. *Semi-Annual Journal of Islamic Economic Studies*, 2(2).
- Farabi, A. N. M. (1992). *The Ideas of the Residents of the Virtuous City*. Translated by Seyed Jafar Sajjadi, Tehran: Association of Wisdom and Philosophy.
- Konani, S. (2021). *Decriminalization and Reduction of Criminal Titles*. Tehran: Official Gazette Publishing.
- Konani, S. (2023). *An Introduction to Iran's Criminal Policy Toward Children and Adolescents*. Tehran: Legal Publishing.
- Konani, S. (2024). *Criminal Policy*. Tehran: Majd Publishing.
- Konani, S., & Mahdavi Sabat, M. A. (2021). *Criminology of Reform and Rehabilitation*. Tehran: Sociologists Publishing.
- Pezeshki, M. (2001). The Essence of Islamic Political Philosophy. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 5(17).
- Safarian, R., & Emam Jom'ezadeh, S. J. (2017). The Model of Good Governance: Social Capital and Comprehensive Development. *Quarterly Journal of Government Research*, 3(12).
- Shafritz, J. M., & Borick, C. P. (2011). *Public Policy in the United States*. Translated by Hamidreza Malek Mohammadi, Tehran: Imam Sadiq University.
- Taheri, M. (2021). Jurisprudential Foundations of Freedom and Its Dimensions. *Semi-Annual Journal of Jurisprudential and Ma'arifi Findings*(2).
- Zorinkof, G. (2011). *Public Policy*. London: Hamilton Press.