

Resistance Orientation in the Foreign Policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran

Mohammad Jafar Javadi Arjmand¹, Ali Mohammadi Masiri*²,
Mohammad Bagher Mokarami poor³

1. Associate Professor, Department of Political Sciences, University of Tehran, Tehran, IRAN.

2. Ph.D. Candidate, Political Sciences, University of Tehran, Tehran, IRAN.

3. MSc. Political Sciences, University of Tehran, Tehran, IRAN.

(Received: February 2, 2020 - Accepted: August 3, 2020)

Abstract

States always attempt to select the orientation in their foreign policy, which provides the best national and security interests. Therefore, the relationship between foreign policy orientation and national security and benefits is one of the complicated issues, requiring extensive research. The Islamic Republic considers the creation and maintenance of regional and international peace and security, subject to adoption and orientation, and discourse of resistance in its foreign policy and in the form of a paradigm of dealing with domination. The resistance orientation in the way of model-based and power-based model of a narrative of the Islamic revolution and its purpose is grounded in authority and international policy relations. In this regard, the present study aimed to answer the question what goals does the Islamic Republic of Iran pursue by adopting resistance orientation in its foreign policy?' the research hypothesis is based on the fact that the most crucial goal of the Islamic Republic of Iran is to take up the orientation of resistance in foreign policy, provide ontological security and sustain revolutionary - Islamic identity, independence, domination, peace, and justice.

Keywords: Foreign Policy, Islamic Republic of Iran, Orientation, Ontological Security, Resistance, Security.

*. Corresponding author: a.mohamadi7171@gmail.com

Introduction

The Islamic Republic of Iran emerged in international interactions in 1978, with a new plan and a political system pattern. The interactive design that was very different from the material and spiritual structures of the international political system was very different in many ways; the foundations of intelligent systems and bases of the political system were built based on the "Religion" variable. A religion that had not played a significant role in the international system and intergovernmental interactions for several centuries. Hence, this newly constituted government's most critical objective was to expand Islamic culture in the area of domestic and external boundaries of the country (Dehghani Firoozabadi, 2013: 12).

The change in the Islamic Republic of Iran's governmental structure provided required conditions for reconstruction and regeneration of foreign policy processes, and the primary indicator of Iran's foreign policy after the Islamic Revolution of Iran could be reviewed in its ideological form and rules. In these times, transnational ends in Iran's foreign policy emerged with romantic nature (Mottaghi, 2011: 40).

Thus, in the Islamic Revolution, a hegemonic discourse was constituted, as embedded in Islamic tradition. This revolutionary discourse redefined the socio-political order in domestic and foreign policy. It provided different and modern criteria for defining and determining themselves and others in national and transnational arenas. It challenged the dominant and governing discourse on international relations and the system and the order established in it. Farther than this point, the revolutionary address discredited and threatened the existing international order and structure and organized various centers of resistance against world powers and poles and then entered new variables and relations into world relations (Dehghani Firoozabadi, 2005: 188). The change of approach in the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy referred to derogating from specific rules between the actors of international relations and a kind of unprecedented political orientation and behavior and independence struggle that included revisionism and lack of preparation to accept international norms on the list. This approach believes that ideology takes precedence over geostrategy, and principles such as justice and ethics are considered the standard of conduct of policymakers and authorities in foreign policy. (Azghandi, 2012: 51).

Consequently, a distinct orientation appeared under the title of resistance orientation from reviewing the Islamic Revolution's discourse context and text. On this basis, in explaining the theoretical and perceptual

frames of Iran's foreign policy, Ruhollah Ramazani addressed ideological signs and declared that: In this view, Islamic ideology can influence the objectives of Iran's foreign policy (Ramazani, 2001: 31). So, it was understood that the nature and identity of the Islamic Republic of Iran and its foreign policy principles were extracted from the religion of Islam and Islamic ideology (Dehghani Firoozabadi, 2012: 130).

Majid Khodouri stated that countries acting based on ideological principles and rules would always confront permanent war manifestations. Correspondingly, the goals of Iran's foreign policy were still under the influence of romantic forms of Islam. This indicated that conflict, contradiction, and struggle would continually keep up between ideological states in the Islamic system and Western structures (Mottaghi, 2011: 41).

In this view, the Islamic Republic of Iran, as a mission-oriented and ideological system, was aimed at challenging the legitimacy of the current international system and reforming it, and also realizing its ideal purposes of formation of a global Islamic single nation by adopting resistance orientation extracted from Islam, moral principles and rules, Islamic jurisprudence, revolutionary and Islamic identity of the Islamic Republic of Iran (Dehghani Firoozabadi and Vahabpour, 2013: 199).

Ultimately, regarding the nature and essence of the Islamic revolution, the mission-oriented nature of the foreign policy of this country and the characteristics and ideals of the Islamic revolution, such as anti-arrogance, third-world, Islamic unity, and particularly the capability of conflict and incompatibility of political Islam with the West, the resistance orientation in the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran should include the declaration of continuous, endless and sustainable struggle with western pluralist countries and their small and big advocators. Accordingly, expressing a desire for tolerance towards foreign relations, in terms of time conditions and specific issues and related to some domestic and global matters, was likely to be cross-sectional and tactical and would not remove the nature of the problem at all (Azgandi, 2012: 59).

Therefore, concerning the fact that "Security" was still known as one of the most noticeable governments' goals and the most fundamental concepts of international relations and strategic studies. Governments always attempted to choose the direction in their foreign policy that provided the maximum national and security interests. According to Hedley Bull, if a person was not secured against the threat of death or injury by others' hands, he could not pay enough attention and energy to other matters and achieve his other objectives (Boll, 1977: 5).

But today, the notion of "Security" and security issues was highly diverse. It expanded regarding the global developments, information revolution and technology and industry revolution, the spread of terrorist groups, etc. Despite the mainstream theories, countries' behavior was not interpreted only based on physical security in many cases and situations. Sometimes, instead of seeking physical safety, many states tried to provide ontological security, meaning self-security and existence and self-identity. In other words, physical security is not the only security pursuing by the countries, but also countries have concerns about their ontological security (Steele, 2008: 10). Existential security, compared to security as survival, represents the security as being. According to Giddens, existential security is recognized as preparing responses to fundamental existential questions that all human beings confronted in some way (Giddens, 1991: 47).

This type of protection is rooted in social, group, and government tendency to have a clear political identity against another, which is mentioned in Schmidt's theories. People needed a sense of security to show who they were or what identity they possessed. The existence of uncertainty threatened this type of identity severely since an agent required a stable cognitive environment. When an actor had no idea or desire about his expectations, he could not make a relationship between goals and tools. Therefore, pursuing the plans would be an ambiguous matter (Mitzen, 2006: 342).

The dilemma posed in this thought was that ontological security might in conflict with physical security. Eventually, governments in their foreign policy would not approve unstable conditions and deep uncertainty. Preferred a specific battle over tension to choose its orientation in their foreign policy, which was a provider of the maximum ontological and identity security as a central issue of their national security.

Since explaining and interpreting the Islamic Republic of Iran's security in its foreign policy was so demanding considering the nature and content of the political system, it was not carefully studied so far. However, the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy in the past thirty years had a wide range of ups and downs and continuity and changes. Some of Iran's foreign policy's fundamental and substantial principles were continued, such as counter-hegemony, anti-arrogance, and the protection of Muslims and the oppressed. While in this framework and underlying principles, the Islamic Republic of Iran showed different behaviors, so Iran's behavioral paradigms, based on each of these principles, were the same in all areas. On the other side, contrary to changes and revolutions at the various individual, structural, institutional, regional, and international levels, some

of the Islamic Republic of Iran's behaviors were perpetuated. The disassociation between Iran and the U.S. and the continuous resistance against this country, persistence in the strategic confrontation with Israel, supporting the Palestinian people, and the insistence on maintaining nuclear power in different periods of foreign policy were the examples and proofs of the mentioned claim (Dehghani Firoozabadi & Vahabpour, 2013: 15). In this aspect, the current paper aimed at explaining the adoption and implementation of resistance orientation in the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy based on the theoretical and conceptual framework of ontological security.

1. Research Theoretical Framework: Ontological Security

One of the most critical topics in the study of the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy is the choice of approach and theoretical approach. Each of these theories based on the distinct principles and principles that select the selection of variables, factors, processes, and concepts in foreign policy analysis. There is no consensus regarding the theoretical framework and the appropriate conceptual framework for the review and study of the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy. These differences arise from the relationship between the theory of international relations and the theory of foreign policy. On the one hand, the Islamic Republic of Iran's nature and identity, on the other, another theoretical limitation, which chooses theoretical framework and appropriate conceptual framework for analyzing foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran, is the Islamic nature of it. Iran is a revolutionary country, following the rebellious foreign policy behavior pattern, but it is an Islamic identity that distinguishes it from other novel systems (Ehteshami, 1999: 204-232).

Therefore, in the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran, various and complex principles and foundations that entangle the study of Iran's dynamism and behaviors in the international environment and concerning other countries, which is based on conventional theories in international relations and foreign policy. For this reason, it seems very difficult and impossible to study the manner of application and provision of security in the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran regarding the materialist theories. Sometimes, the priority of Iran's foreign policy goals is to maximize identity security or ontological security. At the same time, the mainstream of international relations applied the material variables theoretically to examine the position of safety in foreign policy and explain it. There is no describing the immaterial as a social phenomenon (Dehghani Firoozabadi & Vahabpour, 2013: 13). Rationalist theories of

international relations explain different material motives for the behavior of countries' foreign policy. They signalize the realism, power-seeking, and maximization embedded in the decision-making nature of countries. Neorealism observes the security as the primary motivation of countries in the anarchic international system, which minimum seeking of power is inevitable to meet this motivation. Liberalism considers economic profit and prosperity as the most noticeable motivation for countries' foreign behavior, which was complied with wealth provision. All these incentives were characterized in the framework of pursuing and providing physical security, indicating gaining power, safety, and wealth (Steele, 2013: 9).

However, it could not explain mainstream theories generalized these behavioral motivations to all countries, countries' behavior solely based on physical security in many cases and circumstances. So, there is still the fundamental question of 'based on which motivations can the behavior of countries be explained?'

In this regard, postmodernists and constructivists in the field of security and foreign policy criticize the ontology of materialists for not paying attention to semantic and ideological variables, in studying the safety, materialists, including realists and liberals, addressing issues that are not able to present a reasonable answer, at least for the analysis of security behaviors of the Islamic Republic of Iran in recent decades. Regarding these theories, the governments pursue national and security interests, which are defined physically. On this basis, the Islamic Republic of Iran, especially during the crisis periods, must follow rational logic and consider maximizing security and material benefits for proper and profit-oriented management, but this is not always realized in practice. The reason is that the Islamic Republic of Iran doesn't depart from its principles of behavior and identity.

It found its physical and material security in danger (Dehghani Firoozabadi and Vahabpour, 2013: 15). The Islamic Republic of Iran also put its ontological security forwards at the top of its interests. Even it might prefer it over his physical safety and support his identity. Therefore, it is not feasible to illustrate and analyze Iran's foreign policy behaviors to provide national security concerning mainstream international relations approaches and theories.

The theory of ontological security was on a theoretical approach introduced in recent years for clarifying countries' behavior in the international arena. This theory yielded a new conceptual and analytical tool in the security dilemma and the continuation of the conflict between securities governments. There is an ontological security theory in the

framework of a wise actor in explaining the determinants of ontological security in foreign behavior of countries. In such a way, one of the most considerable behavioral motivations of governments in the international arena was the provision of ontological security through stabilizing and strengthening their national identity, honor, and dignity without denying the effect of physical security. States may be more critical to their ontological security by analyzing the cost-benefit analysis than physical safety. In the case of decreasing physical security, behavior that provides their ontological security is chosen and perpetuated. Pursuit and realization of ontological security do not require rejection and denial of material security. Still, it means that countries' actions and actions cannot be explained by security motivations (Steele, 2008: 10).

Ontological security derives its theoretical foundation. Still, Anthony Giddens proposed structuralism theory, with the difference that Giddens defined this theory on an individual level. Still, ontological theory considers it in international relations in the realm of governments. Giddens characterized ontological security as "A Sense of Continuity and Order in Events" (Giddens, 1991: 243).

He argues that ontological security meant having answers at the practical subconscious level to the fundamental questions and problems of existence that human being dealt with throughout life. The ontological security motive in the behavior of countries' foreign policy is rooted in the strong relation between uncertainty and mistrust of identity. According to this theory, uncertainty and doubt hardened the feeling of self and maintained it (Steele, 2008: 50).

If people could always respond to fundamental questions about themselves, there would be a sense of ontological security in them (Giddens, 1991: 47). In ontological security, the main actions of governments are outlined in three factors: Moral, philanthropy, honorable. These actions observed governments' identity needs, and in avoiding governments from these three actions, their sense of identity would be fundamentally corrupted (Firoozabadi and Vahabpour, 2013: 35).

This type of security was based on the desire of man, group, and government to have a clear political identity against another, which was involved in Schmidt's thought. People required a sense of security to show who they were or what their identity was as a self. The existence of uncertainty threatened this type of identity severely since an agent required a stable cognitive environment. When an actor had no idea or desire about his expectations, he could not make a relationship between goals and tools.

Therefore, pursuing the gothic type of identity severely (mitzen, 2006: 342).

In this regard, in Schmidt's view, one who was not willing to distinguish and recognizing the adversary had no destiny but annihilation, otherwise he missed his readiness to face the possibility of physical violence from others and destroyed his own identity and ontological security. As noted by to distinguish for not ending the conflict between governments, the inherent differences of human beings led to the identification of the "Other" as an adversary. This argument became more interesting when we added another hypothesis. Human beings were inherently wished to create and shape political groupings identified only by their opponents as political adversaries. To this end, groups or governments would not maintain close and friendly relations with all other groups at all times since they needed other (adversary) to make sense of their identity (Khosravi, 2015: 31).

The ontological security is also derived from the individual level as the need of countries to physical protection from a personal level. The resulting state of ontological security also requires the character of a wise agent. However, the governments could not be interpreted accurately as an "Agent." In situations where individuals' agency was in the form of an authoritative representation of the government, it was justified to speak of government as an agent. Thus, ontological security denoted the need of countries as a whole and integrated unit for experiencing the stable and continuous identity not changing to comprehend and realize the meaning and concept of the government agency. Countries must feel secure in terms of originality and existence. It signified that ontological security and physical security were a motivation behind countries' fundamental and primary behavior in the foreign and international policy arena (Steele, 2013: 10).

From the perspective of the theory of ontological security, it is not just individuals who seek to obtain ontological security in their times. Still, all social actors, including countries, strive to provide ontological safety or identity security. Governments seek physical and material security that is, their territory and governance structure, and seek the protection of their identity as a unified legal actor that is the source of sustainable priorities, goals, and interests (Dehghani Firoozabadi & Vahabpour, 2013: 33).

As one of the theorists of ontological security, Brent J Steele attempted to provide answers to these questions: 'Why do governments force themselves to pursue actions that do not provide them with physical security and material benefits?' 'How do these actions help and serve national benefits?' 'How can moral actions be rationally justified?' He responded that this action complied with governments' identity and ontological needs; on the contrary, if governments refused these actions,

their sense of identity would distort. This distortion was such a way that it was at least as significant and preferable as their physical security threats (Steele, 2013: 11).

Thus, acceptance of identity as the main factor in ontological security that owes an actor's existence and uniqueness to the presence and recognition of an enemy and an external threat results in a paradox that, on one side, its identity depends on the existence of that threat. On the other hand, governments attempt to eliminate and counter that threat simultaneously (Khosravi, 2015: 39).

Hence, in most cases, countries took actions and measures that were irrational, but these behaviors and actions were meaningful for government agents and essential.

Countries cope with uncertainty and mistrust by applying strategies of interaction normalization and behavioral procedures with others. Habits controlled extreme tension and overcame the threatening environment under their epistemological and cognitive control, which led to feasible action. The normalization of policies and practices emerges when countries felt a sense of reliable and credible knowledge about themselves. By solving anxiety and confusion, this strategy makes it possible for governments to maintain their meaning and image. Current habits were a mechanism for pursuing and providing ontological security. Current procedures convey the reaction and response to stimuli and motivations that remain unconscious, normal, and permanent (Dehghani Firoozabadi and Vahabpour, 2013: 36).

All countries observe their ontological security by normalizing their social interactions. For this reason, the ontological security of one country might be dependent on conflict, i.e., the countries probably prefer the sustainable and definite battle over an unsustainable state of uncertainty and mistrust, intentionally and practically.

From this view, ontological security theory presents an immaterial approach to individuals' and governments' behavior, including the protection and care of regular daily routines and the most significant identity. Despite the realist view that considers physical security and survival as the most noticeable goals of foreign policy, theorists of the ontological security view declare that "Being" and continuing its insurance was the most critical objective of social and governmental actors. Therefore, it appears that the theoretical framework of ontological security produces a complete explanation of the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy and its relationship with the national security of that country. This matter originates from the foundations by forming theory and is near

consistent with Iran's foreign policy's principles and goals. The authors believe that the Islamic Republic of Iran is using this logic to protect its fundamental revolutionary and Islamic ideas.

2. Resistance Orientation in the Foreign Policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran

The discourse of resistance was always evident against oppression. Michel Foucault argued that resistance emerged against all intimidation and force and observed the opposition as an effect of pressure and violation of human rights. However, following the time, the resistance was confronted with changes; sometimes, it was dissimulated and sometimes acted covertly and used foreign powers to support itself. Sometimes, it turned into an uprising and a revolution. All heavenly religions called man to resist tyranny and rebellion. Since the middle ages, constitutions founded the recognition of nations' right to fight and resist oppression and tyranny. Wilson's declaration of the Rights of Man included the right of each man to determine his destiny. The Hague Treaties and Conference in 1899 and 1907 were the most noticeable global actions recognizing the legitimacy of the patriotic national resistance against foreign aggression and occupation. The International Declaration clarified the definition of charge set in 1974 in Article VII: Anything that violates the right of opposition of colonized nations or nations ruled by racist regimes or condemned to foreign domination is accepted from the definition of aggression. Such governments were entitled to use any possible tools, including resorting to arms to resist and fight with occupiers and racist or hegemonic states (Rajab & Asadi, 2017: 97).

Labuc (1991) achieves many shreds of evidence in confirming the "Differences in the Threshold and Resistance Level" in different nations. He also illustrates that there existed a national character that specified the way of resisting external threats. Labor believes that some nations' name is "Resist," and others' name is "Surrender." He uses the concept of "Fight or Flight" postulates by Darwin to assert the nations' character ology against the threats. He addresses that some countries founded the secret of their survival and existence in surrender and flight.

In contrast, others observed that their survival resulted after the struggle, resistance, and fight with the adversary. Cultural anthropologists approved Labuc's claim. For example, Bates and Plug (1996) stated that groups living in different geographical areas had a specific historical and cultural background and various characters from other groups. Finally, each reacted variously to pressures and threats. Some of them entered into

pitched battled and were killed but did not prefer to surrender the enemy. Others did not accept any force or threat and kneeled before the enemy and defeated their will (Kangavari, 2015: 160).

Therefore, Iran as a country with a historical and cultural background of more than 2,500 years, a civilized and religious nation with Shiite Islam, a particular geopolitical position, and a missionary and ideological foreign policy, by adopting a resistance approach in its foreign policy, a country with a national character "Resistance" "War and Conflict" is known as the axis of resistance. The resistance against any regional and international threats and pressures and seeks to expand the spirit of resistance among the Muslim nations of the world and create a front of resistance against arrogance and global colonial powers.

The Islamic Revolution of Iran, compared to other revolutions, has a unique ideology. In such a way that points the particular aspects, i.e., the formation of the Islamic Republic and guardianship of the jurist, there were also positive points of other revolutionary ideologies such as freedom, equality, independence, and development. These elements are integral parts of the Islamic Revolution's doctrine (Malakotian, 2000: 290).

The Iranian revolution's academic and Islamic features and the centrality of its Islamic ideology differentiated the Iranian revolution from world revolutions, both in the Third World and in large countries. Actually, in the Iranian process, ideological frameworks are bonded to Iranian cultural and civilizational indicators. This matter eventuated to Iran's appearance as spokesman of a new ideal after the victory of the Islamic revolution of Iran (Torabi, 2006: 60).

In such spaces, Islamic Iran, as the main base of resistance and the cradle of Islamic awakening and mobilization of counter-hegemonic forces, is responsible for creating a new camp of counter-hegemony against the hegemony. Accordingly, the "Resistance Orientation" in the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy possessed its own unique and superior components, indicators, and features. The orientation of resistance has been theorized as a liberating approach in the form of a paradigm of dealing with domination and based on the Islamic Revolution's narrative power from the heart of Islamic tradition, especially Westernization, Iranian culture and civilization, and historical experiences and historical mentality of Iranians. Such resistance is a dynamic resistance and pursues independence and regaining Iran's position and role in international relations.

Thus, adopting an approach and orientation of resistance in Iran's foreign policy could be counted as a reflection of their belief in Islam's role as the only true religion that influences the social, national, political, and

international positions. According to this attitude, they conceive by the global system and the role of America. So, an attitude built regarding which the international system separated into two entirely conflicting areas. This attitude results from the intensification of Iranian society's latent conflicts with the West and the United States societies. Based on this paradigm, America is referred to as the abode of war, as the Islamic Republic of Iran was observed as Amal qari and counter-hegemonic. This attitude increases the perceptual contradictions of political officials (Ramazani, 1992: 295).

Presently, outrageous metamorphosis compared to peaceful and evolutionary progress was the most shaking, resisting, and sustainable phenomenon created since Islamic society was exposed to Western influence. This issue was significantly affected by the revolutionary processes in Iran. As Islamic radicalism was expanded more in the Middle East, the more effective Islamic resistance manifestations would be presented. The literature applied in Islamic resistance was based on the controversies posed against the infidels. So, the resistance illustrates the embodiments of the stability of Islam against non-Muslim countries. The necessity of resistance invoked the continuation of resistance manifestations until the final victory of Islam over infidelity. Therefore, the opposition doesn't have merely political or military nature. Still, it is transferred to the cultural, social, and identity spheres, and then any resistance was seen with ideological nature (Mottaghi, 1999: 222-225).

As a general rule, originating and emerging the resistance orientation is reliant on oppressive powers' willful actions, and resistance is the effect of their oppressive policies and behaviors. In this regard, Manuel Castells stated: "Wherever there is domination, there is also resistance to domination. Wherever we are faced with the imposition of meaning, we also have projects of apposition meaning, and the realm of this autarky resistance extends everywhere" (Shoor, 2011: 225).

On the other side, each country's foreign policy's orientation was a reflection of the subjective and objective conditions ruling in that country, the international system, and regional subsystems. During the victory of the Islamic Revolution, the perceptual and mental conditions prevailing on Iran's political leaders and elites were based on signs of conflict with the West and conduced to the growing conflicts areas with the United States, known as a supporter of the Shah's regime, the factor of anti-imperialist suppression and August 19, 1953 coup leader in the political thought of most social groups, resulting in reactions in the regional and international environment (Mottaghi, 2015: 3). The perception of the political leaders

of the Islamic Republic of Iran was not only under the influence of ideological frameworks, but also the manifestations of Iranian characteristics and the historical experiences of Iranians could be linked to it. Since suspicion of foreign powers is institutionalized in the subconscious of Iranian society and is combined with xenophobia symbols that reflect intervention of the great powers in Iran's internal affairs. Naturally, anti-hegemonic and anti-domination attitudes be institutionalized in the form of resistance orientation and discourse. In this regard, the adoption of resistance orientation in the foreign policy of Iran is known as the echo of the effect of Islamic ideology foundations and belief of the leaders of the Islamic Republic in playing social, national, political, the international role of Islam as the only actual school and religion, and perceptual and mental conditions governing political leaders and elites of Iran and revolutionary, Islamic and Iranian identity.

In this view, the Islamic Revolution attempted to fundamentally deconstruct the game's structure and rules dominated by the international system. It could never have the strategic permanent peaceful coexistence with the domination system that is continually seeking colonization, exploitation, arrogance, oppression, and humiliation of other nations. In such cases, Islamic Iran, as the main base of resistance and the cradle of Islamic awakening, and the mobilization of counter-hegemonic forces were responsible for the leadership of a new camp of counter-hegemon against the hegemon (Kangavari, 2015: 6).

On this basis, the Islamic Republic considers the establishment and maintenance of stable and genuine regional and international peace and security to be subject to adoption and application of direction and discourse of resistance in its foreign policy, in the form of a paradigm of dealing with domination. Because maintaining the militant approach and aggressive approach of the revolution, that is, anti-hegemony in general and anti-Americanism and anti-Zionism in particular, are considered an integral part of the Islamic Revolution's identity. Identity plays an essential role in determining the goals, interests, priorities, and orientation in the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy.

3. The Goals of Resistance Orientation in the Foreign Policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran

3.1. Providing Ontological Security

The Islamic Republic of Iran grounded its foreign and security policy orientation to defend its identity and norms and then expand these values. It was in such a way that the foreign policy orientation of Islamic Iran was

established concerning cognitive and normative ontological basis (Dehghani Firoozabadi and Vahabpour, 2013: 54).

Accordingly, the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy is observed many ups and downs and changes in recent years. In the meantime, some of the fundamental and substantive of Iran's foreign policy, namely counter-hegemony, fight with arrogance, and supporting Muslims and the continuously oppressed, existed continually. In this regard, the most crucial cause of Iran's foreign policy behaviors in sustained conflicts was the pursuit and provision of ontological security. In other words, the most significant reason of adopting and applying the resistance orientation in Iran's foreign policy is to diminish existential anxiety and ontological threats in foreign policy and to strengthen, provide and stabilize its Islamic-revolutionary identity. Therefore, the "Resistance Orientation," as extracted from Islam, principles and moral rules and Islamic jurisprudence, and Iran's Islamic-revolutionary identity, conflicted with interests and goals of world's dominant and oppressive, and anti-arrogance was one of the constant and durable goals considered in the behavior of foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Preserving the Islamic Republic of Iran's anti-arrogant identity in the form of the paradigm of resistance is incredibly crucial. This anti-oppressive and anti-arrogant identity rebuilt the basic trust system of Islamic Iran. That way, the anti-arrogance, anti-authoritarian, and anti-oppressive identity of the Islamic Republic provided the ontological security of this country. It is necessary to preserve the identity of the Islamic Republic. Any standstill in conflict and counter with the arrogant and colonial powers would threaten the Islamic Republic's identity and ontological security. Hence, orienting resistance in the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy should be regarded as a declaration of continuous and interminable struggle and fight against colonial and hegemonic powers.

Correspondingly, as a counter-hegemonic and anti-dominant power, the Islamic Republic of Iran attempted to challenge the settled international order and create an order based on Islamic discourse in conflict and opposed to the hegemonic power, i.e., America. Accordingly, the Islamic Republic of Iran, as an anti-hegemonic and anti-hegemonic power, seeks to challenge the established international order and to establish an order based on Islamic discourse that is in conflict and incompatible with the hegemonic power of the United States. Based on the discourse of Islamic resistance and foreign policy, the Islamic Republic of Iran's mission, struggle, and confrontation with the United States as a symbol of arrogance, has become part of the Islamic Republic's identity. The Islamic

Republic of Iran cannot maintain and continue its Revolutionary-Islamic identity without confronting the United States as a symbol of arrogance. (Mottaqi, 2008: 14).

The interests of identity, material, spiritual and ideological interests of the Islamic republic as a regional power and the United States as a global economic power in deep conflict and intense conflict, the continuity of competition and its expansion in relations between them are increasing exponentially as issues. The interests of the two countries are growing exponentially. Therefore, any optimism, decision-making, and originality to normalize relations between the Islamic Republic and America would not succeed as long as the two countries too conflicting identity and ideological interests. Otherwise, both countries would confront a severe threat to ontological security and identity insecurity. Therefore, the Islamic Republic's basic trust system is determined and established based on pessimism, suspicion, xenophobia, and a symbol of oppression, colonialism, arrogance, and the adversary concerning America. From this standpoint, the Islamic Republic's basic trust system concerning the United States is sclerotic and inflexible and consequently provided it's ontological and identity security.

3.2. Independence

Iranians always are sensitive and prejudiced to their religious, ancient, and civilizational foundations. Unlike many countries in the region that readily accepted integrating and conforming to world powers, Iran's religious and national strata showed stubbornness in taking this conformity. Iran's geopolitical and economic approach is directed towards world powers on the one hand. On the other hand, there is a tendency not to mix and conform to the tremendous and Western influences.

The intellectual, religious, and enlightenment movement in Iran is also formed around this encountering and conflict. Therefore, a degree of confrontation with the West is vital for the sensitivity to independence and preserving the religious identity (Sariogham, 2000: 34-35).

The existence of anti-colonial and independent nature in a discourse of the Third World was mainly under the influence of domestic contexts and experiences of Iranians that were aligned with the semantic system and anti-colonial approach of countries trying to modify and adjust the existing established international order. It could be deduced that the identity and conceptual structure of revolutionary resulted from independence, and revolution in the based global system was aimed at supporting the oppressed and fighting against the arrogance (Nouri & Malakooti, 2012: 3). Independence was taken into consideration as one of the resistance

discourse elements, which frequently was one of the most notable concerns of foreign policymakers and decision-makers in contemporary Iran. Independence in Iranian culture was due to the presence and penetration of foreigners inside the country and their interventions in internal affairs and Iran's occupation by significant powers in different historical periods, and Iranians' liberal spirit. On this basis, the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy and the constant distrust of foreign powers, especially Western powers, were extremely sensitive to the country's sovereignty and independence and usually benefited from resistance against foreign pressures. As previously mentioned, this tendency was, in reality, posed as a product of the imperialist interventions and forces of the major powers in recent centuries. The government of the Islamic Republic of Iran booted many mechanisms such as Islamism, nationalism, and revolutionary to succeed in this way. So, this country's foreign policy mainly focused on the rules of equality of governments, non-intervention of governments in each other's affairs, and the right to specify nations' fate (Ghanbarloo, 2012: 65). Independence and struggle with foreign intervention are one of the main slogans of the Islamic revolution. Independent policy of freedom in the Islamic republic's foreign policy is followed as one of the sources of the Islamic revolution.

3.3. Denial of any Ascendance-Submission

As it originates from the Islamic Revolution's narrative power, the resistance orientation contradicts and denies any ascendance-submission. In reality, the denial of ascendance-submission is stemmed from the "Rule of Nafy Sabil" (denying the domination of unbelievers over believers). In the rule of Nafy Sabil, any power and ascendancy of infidels over Muslims are legally rejected. In this context, the Muslims are respected and dignified and are banned from submitting to the humiliation of infidels and ascendancy. The connection with the infidels is not denied, but any relationship leading them to ascendance-submission is forbidden. Two objective assumptions were embedded in this rule: One, if this rule is practiced, the self-esteem of Muslims remained, and the grounds for progress and development of Islamic societies would provide. Second, the relation with infidels and their submission conduce to scientific and technological dependence on developed countries, finally resulting in backwardness, petrification, and cultural invasion (Rayegan & Ghasemian, 2014: 139).

The elements and features lied in the foreign policy regarding denial of foreign domination could be inspected in Article 52-54 of Chapter 10 of the Constitution under foreign policy title. It is stated in this rule that: "The

foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran is appeared based on the denial of any ascendance-submission, the preserving all-round independence, defending the rights of all Muslims, non-commitment to the ascendant powers and peaceful reciprocal relations with non-combatant states. Observing this rule, the Islamic Republic rejects any domination by other states or subjugation to them and have no prospect of further government's resources or is not aimed at imposing its predominance on other countries. Still, on the contrary, Iran's foreign policy is based on realizing the capabilities of the oppressed and their mobilization to counter with global arrogance" (Azghandi, 2012: 76).

In this regard, the rule of denying any domination and submission not only enforces the application and adaptation of the resistance policy against the Western and Eastern powers and non-commitment to them but also entitles the oppressed states and is intended to cooperate support them to achieve this goal.

As an anti-authoritarian and anti-colonial revolution, the Islamic Revolution did not aim only at overthrowing the imperial regime, but from the very beginning raised the banner of confrontation and struggled against all world domination and tyranny under the title of fighting global arrogance and supporting the worlds oppressed. Inspired by the school of Islam, it has explicitly stated and established the idea of leadership and the struggle against global arrogance and a system of domination. Rule 153 subjected the Islamic Republic contracts to this feature that was not entitled to provide the condition for a foreign power; otherwise, it would be null and void. Any contract causing foreign domination of the country's natural, economic, cultural, military resources, and other conduct is forbidden. In this matter, two decisive historical examples could be mentioned, such as "Reggie Event or Tobacco Boycott¹" and "Capitulation Law."Inspiration of external revolution in the form of resistance and rejection of any sovereignty based on such divine-human values and the other hand, Iranian - Islamic reading of peace and international security is directed to the implementation of such matters. (Kangavari, 2015: 68).

Therefore, one of the most essential and primary principles of resistance orientation in the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy was denial and refusal of any domination, oppression, and oppressed. The dignity, wisdom, and practicality of the Islamic system were given meaning in light of intelligent resistance, denial of authority, and any ascendance. Put

1. In fall of 1891, a Fatwa was Issued by Mirza Shirazi about the Event of Tobacco Boycott, and Declared that: The Use of Tobacco to be Tantamount to War against the Hidden Imam, Mohammad Al-Mahdi.

differently, Islamic Iran neither accepts tyranny nor is oppressed and doesn't even prefer to be indifferent to the oppression of oppressors to others. Based on Islamic beliefs, the Islamic republic should be avoided in its foreign policy of relations and domination - based relations. In such a way that dignity and respect of nation can be preserved and value in the international arena. It does not mean to have a relationship but must also engage in international interactions based on national interests and identity with regional and global powers. However, this did not imply having any relations; instead, it requires international interaction with local and global authorities regarding its national and identity interests.

3.4. Pacifism

At first glance, those who are not familiar with theoretical foundations and resistance orientation components are the first image of the resistance approach to their minds, violence, terrorism, invasion, etc. As western powers and the international system's main actors, against the resistance approach in Islamic countries, are trying to make Islamic resistance to the term of terrorism through media and communication power. For example, the resistance movements such as the Hamas movement, the Islamic Jihad, the Hezbollah, and the like, who agree with the Palestinian liberation ideals are known as terrorists. In such a way, perhaps the first thing that western man is listening to the term "Islamic Resistance" in their minds is violence. Despite the knowledge of "Islamic Resistance" with power, there is nothing but an "upside-down" or in terms of highlighting. In a better expression, it must be said that Islamic spirit and Islamic resistance, with political violence and the creation of terror among people and innocent nations, is vehemently opposed. But Islamic resistance as a divine and humane religion cannot and should not be "Anti-Human" (Kangavari, 2015: 137). Therefore, the Western world's brawl against Islamic countries and movements

Radical damage can be considered a reactive action due to the lack of actual perception of the processes impacted in Islamic society. Bobby Saeed believes that Western theorists' evaluation is entirely unfair and unrealistic than the Islamic world's internal operations. He emphasizes this until the time of such perceptual; the West's world will have a reactive and instinctive behavior against the Islamic world's political and social waves (Mottaqi, 2008: 51). It is while the peaceful elements of Islamic resistance discourse are. It means that the resistance discourse derived from Islamic principles demands friendly relations in the shadow of justice, dignity, and dignity with all nations of the world and far from war, violence, and

continuing peace. Of course, as long as the nations' fate is respected, and the ruling order is not in discriminatory and unfair international relations.

In Islam's political culture and jurisprudence, two words, "Hello" and "Peace," are of particular importance. Islam in international relations and the Prophet (PBUH) in their mission and politics, the principle of peaceful coexistence as one of the ruler's essential principles between their followers and their relations with other nations because human guardianship in ties and relationships with their synergy is coexistence and peaceful. Hence, in the view of Islam, war and conflict are not natural and permanent (Kuhkan, 2016: 15) that is, the Islamic Republic of Iran, as a country that regulates its foreign relations based on resistance discourse, in the international dialogue and interaction with other countries, including Muslims and non-Muslims, a peaceful and peaceful behavior has exhibited that the Islamic Republic has not only achieved the development and assaults but also denounced it. In other words, based on the principle of peaceful coexistence and peace, Iran has merely defended itself and tried to resolve all disputes peacefully. The direction in the Islamic Republic's foreign policy is regional and international peace and stability, and war is an exception (Dehghani Firuzabadi, 2012: 135).

Peaceful searching should be considered the reason of Islamic ideology and Islamic teachings. Contrary to the archaeologists' withdrawals and asset, Islam will bring their followers to peace and abstinence from the assaults unless they are in the right way and are hostile to Muslims. In this case, jihad is a general duty, and resistance is permitted and necessary for the survival and preservation of human dignity. Therefore, fair peace is one of the pillars and elements of the resistance discourse in the list of the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy, in the form of a paradigm dealing with domination and follow up.

3.5. Seeking Justice and Seeking Rights

The origins of justice, fight against oppression and colonization, simultaneously with the Iranian culture and ideology, could be Islamic. Seeking justice and the right to a place in Iranian culture has been considered as Iranian national identity (Rouhani, 2001: 370). One of the values in Shiite political culture is justice. The acceptance of the principle of "Justice" has always been the groundwork for justice movements among Shiites (Aboutalebi, 2005: 13).

Thus, Iranians have always sought to gain their rights and seek justice at domestic and foreign levels. By forming resistance culture in the inside story, the essential ideas of the Islamic revolution, the realization of social justice, the low-class distance, the elimination of cruel discrimination and

support of the deprived, and in the foreign dimension, have been challenged the unfair international system and establishing of a proper order governing international relations.

According to Iranian narratives of justice in the international system, significant countries such as the United States and its allies are based on dual standards. Other actors in particular such as third world countries, face their relentless pressures. So, the demands pursuit of the Iranian nation reproduces the concept of justice, which has always been noted in the Shia political jurisprudence. For example, the Islamic Republic has never been subjected to a discriminatory approach to its nuclear case. The lack of international pressures is a means of ensuring the continuation of justice in its foreign policy. One of the main principles in the Iranian nuclear file that shapes and influences the Islamic Republic of Iran's identity is the concept of "Resistance" (Dehghani Firouzabadi & Vahab pour, 2013: 198).

All groups that have organized their activities in the form of political Islam emphasize the manifestations of conflict over the international system's rules. In general, justice is one of the main concepts of Islamists' campaign. They are deemed unfair international law, and what has been raised as international regimes is considered an unfavorable and inappropriate issue for Islamic countries. Introducing concepts in political thought at the domestic level is now expanded to international arenas. One of the main symbols in the Islamic world's political challenges with the West by relations with concepts of identity and derived meanings centered on justice. As long as the international system's structure has a discriminatory nature, justice is considered a political thought to be the Islamic world's conflict and the West. Islam-oriented groups, which emphasize concepts such as jihad and monotheism, do not know such effects of behavior to fulfill justice. Therefore, western theorists consider justice the central axis of some Islamic groups' political action, which their socio-economic conditions lack desirability (Mottaqi, 1999: 298). Thus, Islamist judge will affect the emotional sense, the spirit of the soul, and the goals of a reformist testimony. Whatever the nature of the Islamic groups' growth and these groups have long-range objectives in their schedule, they have a greater readiness to accept the persecution arising from the Justice and Justice Campaigns (ibid, 1999: 306). Therefore, justice in foreign policy involves and requires the fight against the arrogant and the oppressors while supporting and defending the oppressed.

The objective and practical translation of these two requirements in Iran's foreign policy behavior is the confrontation with the United States

as the tip of the arrow of domination and arrogance on the one hand and immediate support for the Palestinian cause. (Dehghani Firuzabadi, 2012: 518). The Islamic Republic, relying on the principle of justice and the right to the form of resistance culture and as a revolutionary state, has a critical approach to the international system and believes that the order of the ruling on international relations is accompanied by western powers, which is illegitimate and unfair. Thus, it has resisted the pressures and sanctions made by western and multilateral. Therefore, the application of discourse of resistance seeks to delegitimize the international system and replace a just and desirable order based on Islamic principles and demands. Hence, as long as the West treats Iran's revolutionary and Islamic system unfairly, Iran will not give up its "Resistance" policies. On this basis, justice and the pursuit of rights are essential principles in the direction of Iran's foreign policy, which is persuaded in the form of resistance discourse.

Conclusion

The theoretical and conceptual framework of ontological security by underlining concepts such as identity, pride, honor, uncertainty, independence, and procedures and the trust system of nations and governments have been emphasized the benefits of identity and cognitive existence in addition to the physical interests of the Islamic Republic of Iran. It has originated from the foundations that constitute theory and following the principles and objectives of Iran's foreign policy. The authors believe that the Islamic Republic of Iran has been using this logic (ontological security) to protect its revolutionary and Islamic revolution's fundamental assumptions. In this direction, the protection of the ontological and the preservation and continuity of the Revolutionary-Islamic identity, independence, anti-Semitism, peace, and justice are the most important goals that the Islamic Republic of Iran is pursuing in the form of discourse and resistance in its foreign policy. Accordingly, the orientation of Iran's foreign policy is based on identifying and normative cognitive existence. Identity plays an essential role in determining the goals, interests, priorities, and adopting orientation in the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy.

The orientation of resistance as a liberating approach in the form of an attitude of domination and based on the power of Islamic revolution narrative from the heart of Islam, especially Shiite religion, Iranian culture and civilization, and historical experiences and historical mentality of Iranians with the aim of the anti- westernization of powers have been

theorizing. Therefore, the most crucial reason for adopting resistance in Iran's foreign policy is to discount the existential anxiety and threat of the cognitive and existence of the foreign policy and strengthening, supplying, and consolidation of Islamic identity.

The article seeks to advance independence and restoring the role of Iran in international relations. Therefore, resistance orientation in Iran's foreign policy has its components, indicators, and unique features. Central orientation resistance is Islam. As a religion with a comprehensive program in all political, economic, social, and cultural spheres, Islam has been found in the form of an objective resistance discourse, and by challenging the existing international order, we seek to create the desired and desirable order. Hence, although the bitter experiences of historical and the presence and influence of aliens, tyranny, culture, and the soul of Iran have been grounded of formation of resistance discourse in the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic, but the shape and forming of resistance discourse are following Islamic principles and foundations. Accordingly, Iran's foreign policy is mission-oriented rather than goal-driven and follows the logic of appropriateness and demands instead of the sense of the results.

References

- Aboutalebi, M. (2005). "The Role of Shiite Culture in the Islamic Revolution of Iran." *Journal of Knowledge*. Vol. 14, no. 98, pp. 13-17.
- Azghandi, A. (2012). *Foreign Policy of the Republic of Iran*. Tehran: Ghomes Publication.
- Boll, H. (1977). *The Anarchical Society*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dehghani Firoozabadi, J. (2005). "Structural Barriers to Regional Superiority of the Islamic Republic of Iran." *Encyclopedia of Law and Politics*. Vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 44-58.
- (2012). *Foreign Policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran*. Tehran: Samt Publication.

- (2013). *Identity and Interest in the Foreign Policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran*. Tehran: Research Institute for Strategic Studies.
- Dehghani Firoozabadi, J; Vahabpour, P. (2013). *Ontological Security in the Foreign Policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran*. Tehran: Research Institute for Strategic Studies.
- Ehteshami, A. (1999). *Iran's Foreign Policy during the Construction Period*. (E. Mottaghi; Z. Postini. Trans). Tehran: Islamic Revolutionary Documentation Center Publications.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. London: Cambridge Polity.
- Kangavari, R. (2015). *Theory of Resistance and Western Theories of International Relations*. Tehran: Audience Publishing.
- Khosravi, A. (2015). *Security and Identity*. Tehran: Iranian Civilization Publications.
- Koohkan, A. (2016). "Islamic Revolution and Expanding Positive Peace." *Quarterly Journal of Political Thought in Islam*. Vol. 3, no. 10, pp. 7-27.
- Malakotian, M. (2000). "Ideology and Leadership and its Influence on Rapid Victory, Lasting Stability, and Global Reflection of the Islamic Revolution of Iran." *Political Quarterly*. Vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 287-305.
- Mitzen, J. (2006). *Ontological Security in World Politics and Implications for the Study of European Security*. Oslo: The Cidel Workshop.
- Mottaqi, E. (1999). *Contemporary Western Confrontation with the Islamic World*. Tehran: Publications of the Institute of Islamic Culture and Thought.
- (2008). *Review of the Pattern and Processes of Iran-US Confrontation*. Tehran: Strategic Research Center.

- (2011). *Model and Process in Iran's Foreign Policy*. Qom: Mofid University Publication.
- (2015). "Islamic Revolution, Resistance, International Relations." *Mosallas Weekly Magazine*. Vol. 25, no. 300, PP. 3-6.
- Nouri, V; Malakooti, M. (2012). "The Position of Justice in the Sources of Identity Formation of the foreign Policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran." *Foreign Policy Quarterly*. Vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 7-32.
- Qanbarloo, A. (2012). "External Security Threats and the Development of Independence in the Foreign Policy of Iran." *Journal of Political and International Knowledge*. Vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 49-66.
- Rajabi, H; Asadi, H. (2017). "The role of Resistance Culture in Iran's Internal Security." *Political Quarterly*. Vol. 2, no. 16, pp. 87-104.
- Ramazani, R. (1992). "Iran Foreign Policy: Both and South." *Middle East Journal*. Vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 295-297.
- (2001). *Analytical Framework of Iran's Foreign Policy*. (A. Tayeb. Trans). Tehran: Ney Publication.
- Rayegan, M; Ghasemian, R. (2014). "The Role of Rule for God's Sake in the Development of Islamic Societies." *Journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran*. Vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 139-140.
- Rouhani, H. (2001). "U.S. Explosions and the Interests of the Islamic Republic of Iran." *Strategy Quarterly*. Vol. 9, no. 21, pp. 7-52.
- Sariolghalam, M. (2000). *Foreign Policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran*. Tehran: Strategic Research Center of the Expediency Council.
- Shoor, F. (2011). *Dying Empire: U.S. Imperialism and Global Resistance*. (A. Tayeb. Trans). Tehran: Abrar Moaser Publication.
- Steele, J. (2008). *Ontological Security in International Relations Self Identity and the I.R. State*. London and New York: Routledge.

————— (2013). *Ontological Security in International Relations*, (J. Dehghani Firoozabadi; F. Rostami; M. Ghasemi. Trans). Tehran: Research Institute for Strategic Studies.

Torabi, T. (2006). "Ideological Resistance in the Sacred Defense Era." *Zamaneh Magazine*. Vol. 5, no. 53-54, pp. 59-68.