A Comparative Study of the Concept of "Global Justice" in Imam Khomeini's Political Thought and Neo-Gramscianism

Javad Haghgoo*[1], Mohammad Jafar Javadi Arjmand[2],
Meysam Aliabadi[3]

DOR:

1. Assistant Professor, Department of History, Civilization and Islamic Revolution, University of Tehran, Tehran, IRAN.
2. Associate Professor, Department of Political Sciences, University of Tehran, Tehran, IRAN.
3. M.A. International Relations, University of Tehran, Tehran, IRAN.

Abstract

The concept of "Global Justice" is a core concept in Imam Khomeini's thought which substantially contributes to a profound understanding of his ideas. However, understanding other thinkers' points of view in this regard, besides Imam Khomeini, may result in a more comprehensive understanding of this concept. Among all the various international relations schools of thought, the most emphasis on the concept of global justice has been held by Critical thinkers. Most specifically, Neo-Gramscian theoreticians such as Robert Cox, Stephen Gill, and Mark Rupert deserve more attention; of them, it is crystal clear that Cox's views are the most important. Cox has come up with many ideas on global justice and challenged the injustice nature of the current international order by proposing power, ideas, and institutions as three critical components contributing to the consolidation of hegemony. The very same challenge is the standard approach in Imam Khomeini's thought and Neo-Gramsci a Theory. Despite fundamental met theoretical differences, there is no conflicting matter in terms of an existing challenge. The present study, considering the importance of addressing this challenge, aimed to review the approximation of Imam Khomeini's political thought and that of Neo-Gramscian theoreticians about the concept of global justice. To do so, discussing Imam Khomeini's and Neo-Gramscian theoreticians' point of view on international relations, general, and global justice, in particular, a comparative method is employed to assess the two ends of ideas. The findings suggest that despite blatant differences in the definition of justice, they both agree on the prevalence of structural injustice in the current international system and, even further, consider global justice a vital prerequisite for the establishment of peace and stability in the world.

∗. Corresponding Author: jhaghgoo@ut.ac.ir

Introduction

Justice, along with some other concepts as Independence, Freedom and Republic System, should be considered a focal axis of the Islamic Republic of Iran. These concepts take a special meaning under the Islamic-Revolutionary interpretation of Imam Khomeini. This purpose is undoubtedly far different from what was in the mind of the revolutionaries of France and Russia in the respective 18th and 20th centuries. However, some approximation is apparent. Such approximations are more elaborated when, for example, the concept of justice is addressed in both domestic and global spheres. When justice is discussed as an ideal situation under the spectrum of Rightist and Leftist schools of thought, the need to change it and the way and logic for it are also attended. The very same issue is highlighted explicitly in the view of the founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran (IRI). However, when the ideas and opinions of the theoreticians criticizing the current capitalist system are addressed, considerable similarities are found between them and Imam Khomeini. Among these critical theoreticians, such thinkers as Robert Cox, Stephen Gill, Mark Rupert, and Giovanni Arighi, all considered under Neo-Gramscian Theory, are prominent.

Here, discussing the approximation between the political thought of Imam Khomeini and Neo-Gramscian theoreticians, mainly Cox and Gill, tried to pave the ground for a comprehensive study of Imam Khomeini's ideas as a critic of international relations. Performing such research would contribute to introducing the indigenous Theory of International Relations primarily based on the teachings of the founder of the Islamic Revolution.

The article has three parts. First, Imam Khomeini's views on international relations focusing on the concept of global justice are studies. Then, Neo-Gramscian Theory and its thinkers' views on the concept of global justice are explored. Finally, a comparison between Imam Khomeini and Neo-Gramscian theoreticians is conducted in terms of global justice.

1. The Place of Global Justice in the Thinking of Imam Khomeini

The concept of justice has a special place in Imam Khomeini's viewpoint on international relations discussions, in a way that it seems pretty crude to speak of international relations without justice. In his eyes, justice is a human value, and all human beings call innately for it. For Imam Khomeini, justice is a fundamental pillar of human society's laws. All divine prophets and their endeavors and teachings have implemented justice, equality, and peace in society. Conceptually, the concept of justice has been employed by Imam in different situations for different meanings, including:

A) Bestowing no privilege upon a particular group or class of the society except for their human values;

B) The popular uprising against tyrannies and plunders;

C) Rescuing the oppressed from the oppressor and cutting the hands of the oppressor;

D) Toppling unrighteous rulers, as well as advancing independence, freedom, and fair distribution of wealth.

For Imam Khomeini, establishing justice, fighting the oppression, and rescuing the oppressed underpin all policy-making of the Islamic system and government. In his eyes, divine prophets' primary duty and objective have been to establish a fair social system via the implementation of religious rules and to regulate social relations based on justice.

To better comprehend the place of global justice in Imam Khomeini's political thought, we should discuss the concept in two axes; first, we should draw the coordinates of the unfair international system, and then the way out of it needs to be addressed. In other words, initially, the quiddity and then the way out of this situation should be discussed.

1.1. The Coordinates of Injustice in the Current International System

Saying, "The United States is worse than the United Kingdom, the United Kingdom is worse than the United States, and the Soviet Union is worse than the two.[2]"

Imam Khomeini has defied the state-centric Westphalian system West-East bipolarity from the very beginning days of his uprising. He classified all bullying regimes under the arrogant powers, while anti-bullying states, the majority of world inhabitants, come together as "The oppressed." Along these lines, proposing "Neither East nor West- but the Islamic Republic" slogan, Imam Khomeini stood against Nationalism structures as colonial identities and called for not only equality but fraternity (Tahaei, 1388: 104).

Imam Khomeini always rebuked intellectual foundations of the West and arrogant powers for their negligence to the fundamental concept of justice. In his eyes, Marxism, Secularism, Liberalism, and Nationalism, as manifestations of intellectual and thinking basics of the bullying camp, either do not believe in justice or, even if they pretend to defend it, as Marxists do, do not thoroughly digest the concept.

According to Imam Khomeini, the colonial powers have uniformly imposed an unfair political-economic system on the world; people can recognize two groups of people through their puppets: the oppressive minority and the oppressed majority (Khomeini, 42-43). He believed that the Islamic Revolution led to the victory of Iranian people over an imperial regime and triggered a global anti-oppression movement underpinned by the oppressed nations' awakening and uprising (Mohammadi, 1387: 50).

---

2. Imam Khomeini's Speech Against Capitulation on 25 October 1965

Imam Khomeini fundamentally opposed the ruling order of the global system as unjust. He not only rejected the mainstream theories of international relations, which propose "MIGHT IS RIGHT" (ibid: 50) but also believed that would not achieve the ultimate peace and security in the world unless the bullying arrogant powers are wiped out (Khomeini (a), 1370: 262).

As mentioned, Imam Khomeini argued that the world is the scene of an increasing alignment of nations in two conflicting blocs, namely the oppressor and the Anti-oppression. These two blocs have their characteristics, classifications, and objectives and have introduced their novel definitions of international relations concepts. While the leading actors of the oppression bloc endeavor to maintain the status quo and unjust Westphalian world order, the other bloc's agents are after breaking the taboo of a several-hundred-year-old system of domination. They also design new plans, objectives, and rules for the international community (Mohammadi, 1387: 51-52).

For Imam Khomeini, global justice is the prerequisite for the establishment of world peace. Since the dominant world powers would never give up their interests for justice, it is inevitable to fight and force them.

1.2. Approaches to Create a Fair World System

Profound evolution in domestic policies has always brought about significant changes in foreign policy, especially regarding Iran, in which changes were sponsored by a rich culture. There is lots of evidence pointing to Imam Khomeini's views on international relations and foreign policy are indigenous and deeply rooted in Iranian history. His approach to international relations and foreign policy is based on two axes: self-awareness of the past and courage to change the policies of the world system (Tahaei, 1388: 90-91).

Relying on these two axes, Imam Khomeini transformed the unfair international system as a primary objective of his Islamic Revolution. Along these lines, jurisprudential and doctrinal foundations of his approach can be enumerated as follows:
- Negation of ascendancy of aliens over Muslims or Nafy-e-Sabil Rule (Non-Dependency Rule);
- Negation of oppression in any form;
- Maintenance of independence of the country and avoiding its reliance on foreign actors (neither East nor West principle);
- Preservation of territorial integrity;
- The principle of relationships based on mutual respect and non-interference;
- The principle of fulfilling the covenant;
- Reinforcing relationships with Muslims and supporting their unity;
- The principle of Export of Revolution;
- Defending the oppressed (Haghgoo and Ketabi, 1398).

Imam Khomeini, since the outbreak of the uprising and especially after the victory of the Islamic Revolution, has repeatedly explained the characteristics of the ideal world system in terms of Islam and Islamic Revolution, at this moment listed:

1.2.1. The oppressed nations can only survive by their awareness and awakening, and, contrary to Marxists, nothing is predetermined. To change should act, and predestination does not rule over history (Khomeini (a), 1370: 259);

1.2.2. The establishment of sustainable world peace does not require balance-of-power and other western solutions, but it is conditional upon defeat and eradication of oppressive powers and advance of global justice;

1.2.3. The oppressed nations are not limited to Muslim communities, but it includes all under oppression people across the globe (ibid, 213);

1.2.4. Contrary to previous systems underpinned by secularism and humanism principles, Imam Khomeini's favorite system relies on return to religious values and rule of Almighty God and seeks happiness injustice.

The fraternity of Muslim nations, which the proximity of Muslim governments will follow, is a core ground for Imam Khomeini to advance its policy of change in world politics and establish a good system. He considers the very same issue as a primary objective and mission of the Islamic Republic system and its efforts on all domains (Tahaei, 1388: 104).

In Imam Khomeini's eyes, maintaining existing international order and conducting fair relations with other actors is subjected to the prevalence of justice in international interactions. Referring to change in the global balance of power after the victory of the Islamic Revolution and the outbreak of the Iran-Iraq war, he says: "We hope the world balance would not be endangered since we do not incline to the East or the West, and conduct uniform and fair relations with others as far as they respect justice in relations with us." (Khomeini (c), 1370: 199)

According to Imam Khomeini, the anti-oppression bloc comprises masses of people in the developed countries, non-Muslim nations of developing countries, the world of Islam and World of Shias, and Iran at the top of them. In contrast, the pro-oppression bloc consists of Islamic and developing states under western dominance, developed countries that accompany the West, and western powers, with the United States at the top of them (Tahaei, 1388: 104). Imam Khomeini believes that the unity of Muslim states and communities may lead to their alliance against the Superpowers, disruption of current unfair interactions, and establishment of global justice (ibid, 105). Struggle with oppression and oppressor is not limited to the Islamic world, but non-Muslims can also contribute to the fulfillment of this objective.

As Imam Khomeini assumes, Iran has taken the leadership of the anti-oppression movement to reconstruct international relations based on new foundations, which is both structurally and conceptually different from what is currently known in the literature of global politics and relations (Mohammadi, 1387: 37) It is clear cut that in such a view, justice, not power, prevails.

Imam Khomeini believes that the third world war has already been triggered, far different from its two antecedents in terms of both form and content. According to Imam Khomeini, this war is a cultural, political, economic, and sometimes military one out broken between the two blocs mentioned above. Assured of God's promises, Imam Khomeini daresay that the anti-oppression nations would ultimately overcome.

2. Global Justice in Neo-Gramscian Theory

Before discussing global justice in terms of Neo-Gramscian Theory, it seems necessary to deal briefly with Antonio Gramsci's ideas in this regard. However, he must be considered a sociologist rather than an international relations theoretician (Talei Hoor et al., 1397: 23). Although changing the level of analysis from domestic to international makes understanding Gramsci's ideas difficult (Germaine and Kenny, 1998), he, when developing a significant discussion on hegemony, plays an essential role in comprehending the concept of global justice in Neo-Gramscian Theory, sociologically addresses justice. According to Gramsci, the dominant class reproduces the hegemony through civil society institutions to teach and impose their own favorite moral, political, and cultural values and norms across the society and subordinate clauses. Albeit, as mentioned, Gramsci's Theory of hegemony covers the domestic sphere. Still, his followers extended his ideas to the international relations and international political economy sphere and, promoting a global interpretation of hegemony, proposed a theoretical approach known as "Neo-Gramscian Theory." (Talei Hoor et al., 1397: 23)

Undoubtedly, a proper understanding of hegemony both in domestic and international spheres can aptly contribute to explaining the place of injustice in these spheres.

Similar to Gramscianism, Neo-Gramscian Theory is considered among Marxist-affiliated theories classified as a critical theory in terms of metatheory. As mentioned, within this theoretical framework, such thinkers as Robert Cox, the most prominent ones, Stephen Gill, Mark Rupert, and Giovanni Arighi, attempt to employ Gramsci's ideas and mixing them with Marxist teachings. By conducting a critical approach to the current world situation, they propose a novel analysis of hidden strata of power interactions in the field of international politics (Talei Hoor et al., 1397: 23). In his famous "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relation Theory," Cox

takes advantage of Gramsci's ideas to employ a novel approach to deal with injustice and oppression in international scenes under such topics as "Hegemony and World Orders" and "Social Forces, Hegemony and Imperialism" (Cox, 1981: 138-146) which will be at this moment discussed.

The same as the previous section, hereby it is tried to explore global justice in the thought of some of the most prominent figures of Neo-Gramscian Theory as Robert Cox and Stephen Gill under two axes: the quiddity of the current unfair system and the way of changing it.

2.1. The Coordinates of Injustice in the Current International System
International hegemony is one of the focal topics addressed by the Neo-Gramscians. Upon scrutiny of this concept, it is just upon scrutiny that one can understand the coordinates of injustice in the current international system. The idea means that the power of dominant classes is not merely based on coercion but also consent because it enables them to propagate and teach in subordinate classes' tenets and ideas that meet the interests of a specific group. In Cox's eyes, international hegemony is rooted in domestic domination; namely, dominant ruling classes have shaped it. Then, the hegemon gradually expanded and exercised influence on its peripheral countries. The peripheral countries adopted technological-cultural-economic patterns of this hegemon, heedless of its political model (Moshirzadeh (a) 1384: 232).

According to Cox, the birth of such hegemony requires the alignment of three components of thinking, material power and institution (Cox, 1981). So, we can only understand the current injustice in the international system upon comprehension of these component's functions and their interrelations.

Gill argues that the current world order comprises a set of historical structures which have become more liberal and material due to capital restructure and its inclination towards the right pole of the political spectrum. This trend takes in territorial expansion and social deepening of liberal economic definitions of society and its objectives and individualist and possessive patterns of action and politics (Gill, 1385: 235). Gill believes that the domineering bloc is apt for a market-centric and trans-national free economy whose existence depends on a spectrum of state-civil society institutions in the current era. Such a system is both within and out of the state. It is a part of "Local" political structures and a contributor to a "Global" political and civil society. So, according to Gill's portrayal of global power politics structures, there is a trans-national historical bloc whose central system is composed of organizing elements of the G-7 group and trans-national capitalism. Capitalist policies in the form of neoliberalism have brought about hierarchical and contradictory results that can argue that turning to neoliberalism is a manifestation of government's crisis of authority and credibility and the problem of

governance in a group of societies. This crisis points to the very same issue highlighted by Gramsci as "The gap between the masses and the rulers."

The efforts by post-industrial governments to accelerate the globalization process are assessed by Neo-Gramscians a plot by such governments to consolidate the current unfair situation for their benefit. They argue that neoliberal political-economic principles and institutions A disciplinary dimension is exercised both at the macro level and the micro-level and in the form of supervision of newly-born international agencies on national institutions and management on local identities.

According to Gill, disciplinary neoliberalism is institutionalized at the macro level in the form of quasi-legal restructuring of government and international frameworks: "The New Law-Abidance." This discourse of global economic governance is reflected in conditional policies of Bretton woods organizations, quasi-legal regional arrangements such as NAFTA or Maastricht treaty, and regulatory frameworks of some other newly-born trade organizations. It can be defined as a political program to make trans-national liberalism and, if possible, capitalize liberal democracy the unique model of development in the future. Hence, law-abidance closely relates to the emergence of market-oriented civilization (Gill, 1385: 254-55). The new law-abidance has turned into the practical discourse of conduct in a significant part of the world political economy (ibid, 259).

This bloc, nowadays manifested in the form of neoliberalism, resists any attempt of change. While the critical knowledge is after salvation, it has employed all its efforts to wipe out all manifestations of injustice and re-configure justice (Moshirzadeh (a), 1384: 248). Critical Theory is after rescuing humanity from unfair structures of global politics and the global economy under hegemon powers' dominance. It aims to unveil the hidden strata of the supremacy of the affluent North over the poor South (Jacson and Sorenson, 1997: 233-234).

Emphasizing continuous historical evolution and interaction between different areas, Gill argues that the official system of the ruling government, which has been once reinforced and consolidated by previous forms of international economic activities, is now gradually diminishing as the result of the prevailing economic rivalry and convergence, which is far more profound. According to Gill, the structure of world political power is composed of a trans-national historical bloc of local varieties with G-7 countries' trans-national capital at its core.

In Rupert's eyes, the historical bloc explains and articulates an ideology rooted in a specific socio-political situation and production relations and bestows ideological content and integrity on its social power (Rupert, 1993: 81-82). The successful historical bloc is

organized around a set of hegemonic ideas that bestow its composing components a type of strategic orientation and integrity. The creation of a new historical bloc requires a "Conscious and planned struggle" which criticizes the international relations and political economy, namely the system of ruling states and the global division of labor (Moshirzadeh (a), 1384: 247), and paves the ground for the establishment of proper order in the international sphere.

As explained, critical theoreticians, in general, and Neo-Gramscians, in particular, not only deal with injustice in the world and the role of hegemony in it but simultaneously provide approaches to modify the situation. This significant issue would be dealt with in the following.

2.2. Approaches to Create a Fair World System

Getting rid of injustice is the focal point of Neo-Gramscians. Along these lines, the main topics emphasized by these thinkers can be classified in the following axes:

- Developing meta theoretical discussions (epistemology and ontology);
- Challenging the mainstream of international relations;
- An alternative description of international relations;
- Possibility of change in the international relations and system (ibid, 215).

Meta theoretical discussions are a primary consideration of such thinkers as Cox. This emphasis on epistemology and ontology, which many mainstream international relations theoreticians have criticized, has a close connection with the other topic attended by critical theoreticians, namely, change in the international relations, and so is considered an inseparable part of its theoretical schema (Moshirzadeh (b), 1384: 225). Since critical Theory is obsessed with norms in international relations, it inevitably includes a change in its program (Moshirzadeh (a), 1384: 60-61).

Despite mainstream international relations, namely Realism, Neorealism, Neoliberalism, Scientists, and generally what is known as the stream of nationalistic ideologies in the international relations, which is concerned with order and stability, such thinkers as Cox, Gill, Rupert, and Arighi attempt to not only show historicity (changeability) of the status quo but the consequences of its unfair nature. They try to include any factor contributing to change and diversity in their studies. Mark Rupert, as an example, believes that one may enjoy a un-reductionist understanding of the system of ruling states and capitalist global economy by employing Gramscian historical ontology. In his eyes, international politics is a second-degree alienation since it deals with the mutual separation of communities that are themselves brought up within alienation-based relations. In other words, the existing social links, inclusive of the

compound system of states and international political economy, have
been constructed historically and can be politically challenged.

Neo-Gramscians criticize the meta theoretical dimension of the
mainstream for its very conservative nature and heedlessness of the
possibility of change in social life and international relations. In Neo-
Gramscian's critical view, such mainstream axial propositions as "The
current world must be considered the fixed framework and structure"
are fundamentally criticized. Rejecting such proposals that ignore any
change and believe that the future is the same as the past, Neo-
Gramscians emphasized possibility, and beyond it a necessity, of
change in the current unfair world order. Considering a fundamental
role for social forces in the process of change, Robert Cox argues that
the mainstream theories have not taken proper heed of these forces
and have reduced their capacity to change under the concept of state
(Moshirzadeh (b), 1384: 226-228).

A primary objective of critical studies is to weaken the dominant
security discourse by revealing the contradictions within the existing
order and criticizing ruling security regimes. The other aim of such
thinkers is to modify the regulating and composing norms of the
international system so that states desist thinking and behaving based
on realistic models (Abdullahkhani, 1383: 69-70). Hence, the
followers of critical theory favor a system in which justice prevails
and the marginalized groups are regarded.

Cox continues that the mainstream theories and thinkers are merely
obsessed with maintaining the status quo and so do nothing to modify
the current order and establish a fair system, and subsequently divides
international relations theories into two groups:

1) Critical Theory: this Theory believes that the current international
order is unfair and seeks to change the current situation in favor of
establishing global justice;

2) Problem-Solving Theory: these theories operate within the existing
system to solve its problems and have a conservative approach
(Moshirzadeh (a), 1384: 220).

In general, Neo-Gramscians favor the following issues in their
aspiration for change in the international order:

- Returning to moral norms in international relations;
- Decreasing global inequalities;
- Establishing international justice;
- Respecting diversity, pluralism, and difference.

Cox has the most revolutionary approach to change in the international
system. He is after discovering and uniting the opposition forces
within the global structure. To achieve such a goal, he believes one
may take advantage of internal contradictions of the current order to
challenge it and bring about fairer world order. In his eyes, social
movements and anti-hegemonic forces can be the most potent
challengers of the ruling political and institutional arrangements. Cox

admits that this political project requires the creation of a new historical bloc whose prerequisite is conducting a conscious and planned struggle that would conquer the power centers and enjoy ideological and economic power and convincing argument. Although Cox thinks any mutual hegemony in the current international system is farfetched, it seeks its possibility within the communities, not at the international level. In other words, he believes that making a change in the global system is feasible through new historical blocs at the national level. Considering the current order as historical, not natural, Cox believes that would modify this unfair order if some special conditions are provided. Discussing internal contradictions of the current international order, Cox refers to social movements that can take advantage of such contradictions to further efficient challenges against the order and achieve a fairer world system.

According to Gill, these are anti-hegemonic forces that defy ruling political and institutional arrangements. To advance this challenge, it is necessary to develop the "Anti-Hegemony" in terms of a set of alternative values, concepts, and considerations (Stean and Pettiford, 2011: 117). Anti-hegemonic forces do not have a peculiar nature and may or may not be progressive (Gill, 1993: 143). As mentioned, struggling with the hegemony requires creating a new historical bloc that is not merely a coalition of classes but contains political, economic, and cultural dimensions of a specific social formation (Moshirzadeh, 1384: 247). Albeit, it should be noted that thanks to the artistic view of Gramsci, any discussion concerning change in international relations are mostly tinted with cultural dimensions. For Gramsci, a pervasive change in social reality is achieved via creating a "Mutual Culture," (Rupert, 1993: 79) an issue that Neo-Gramscians undoubtedly emphasize.

Conclusion

As mentioned, the concept of justice is a focal point in Imam Khomeini's political thinking and behavior so that it can be considered the "Keyword" of his political literature. On the other hand, neo-Gramscian theoreticians of international relations have emphasized justice in a way that takes this concept away from the critical theory, in general, and Neo-Gramscian Theory, in particular, there remains nothing of it.

Despite some differences in the definition of "Justice," Imam Khomeini and Neo-Gramscians have the same opinion on the existence of injustice in the current international order. In common with the monotheistic approach of Imam Khomeini, many critical theoreticians maintain that the establishment of justice is the mere remedy for developing sustainable peace in the world. Along these lines, Cox argues that any effort to achieve sustainable world peace

without paving the ground for the establishment of justice and removal of existing injustice would be in vain. Global justice is a prologue for sustainable world peace.

According to these two approaches, structural violence prevails in relations between the units of ruling international system, which is rooted in the oppressive nature of such relations (between dominance and subordination) and embraces colonization, exploitation, and oppression. The best description for the heart of the international system during the last decades has been nothing but structural violence. It has been confirmed for both western and eastern blocs. In other words, during the Cold War era, there existed two kinds of structural violence in the world; vertical violence exercised by Superpowers against each other and a horizontal one imposed by the Superpowers on their subordinates and especially the third world countries. A primary objective of the Islamic Revolution, like Neo-Gramscian Theory, was to put an end to this situation and propose an improved new way of interactions between the international system units. The Islamic Revolution and Neo-Gramscianism have a common critical approach to the unfair and oppressive status quo.

Considering the structural violence in an international system with several blocks of power, all these blocs are composed of three components: the core, semi-peripheral, and peripheral states. In this classification, power is distributed top-down, and Superpowers are the ultimate decision-makers. The farther the area (Semi-peripheral or Peripheral) from the core, the less participation in decision-making. The peripheral regions have fundamentally turned into a scene for the core states to settle their accounts with each other. In other words, the peripheral areas are the victims of conflict of interests of core powers, while they don't make a considerable profit from such rivalries. It has just been propagated that the security of political units depends on their joining in one of the blocs of power. In contrast, the very same security dilemma has deceived countries into tolerating such structural violence.

Another dimension of structural violence concerns with North-South relations, primarily economic, which has been lamented by all Neo-Gramscian theoreticians as well as Imam Khomeini. In such a relation, a small number of countries (the North) exploit and oppress so many countries. This trend is still one of the prominent characteristics of the international system. The nature of North-South relations, characterized by unbalanced trade and economic relationships, is so that it brings about the backwardness of the South and accelerated growth of the North. Accordingly, the Southern states have consistently called for the establishment of economic balance in the form of a new economic order.

After all, the Islamic Revolution led by Imam Khomeini emerged in such a context and aspired to modify the environments suffering

from structural violence. In other words, change was the focused objective of the Islamic Revolution, which was sought through the transformation of minds and thoughts. None of the leading trustworthy carriers of the idea of the Islamic Revolution have ever been after modifying and transforming the structural violence through force and occupation. Instead, they have favored the transformation of thoughts (preparing mental conditions) through increased awareness. The majority of Neo-Gramscians, as well, have emphasized on cultural approach for changing the current unfair situation and establishment of just order.

The revolutionary movement of Imam Khomeini considerably trembled the foundations of the international system, especially in regional subsystems. Although the bipolar system could hardly keep its trembling structures for a few decades, it was inevitably doomed to failure. The collapse of the Soviet Union put an end to the bipolar system, but the structural violence continued to survive in a different form. Nowadays, the world witnesses two blocs of dominance and subordination. The subordinate nations and groups are trying to defy the authoritarian powers in any possible way and establish justice in the world. It is a very significant issue that Neo-Gramscians have focused on, emphasizing such concepts as social forces (Cox, 1981). The increased number and diversity of groups who reject and criticize the current world order is evidence of this claim.

References

Abdullahkhani, A. (1383). *Theories of Security: An Introduction to Planning National Security Doctrine*. Tehran: Abrar Moaser International Studies and Researches Institute Publications.

Cox, R. (1981). "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relation Theory." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. Vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 126-155.

——————. (1986). "Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relation Theory." *Neorealism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

——————. (1987). *Production, Power and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Germain, R; Kenny, M. (1998). "Engaging Gramsci: International Relations Theory and New Gramscians." *Review of International Studies.* Vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 3-21.

Gill, S. (1993). "Epistemology, Ontology and Italian School." *Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——————. (1385). "Globalization, Market Civilization, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism." *Cited in Key Concepts of International Relations: Marxism*. Tehran: Office of Political Studies and International Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

——————. (1988). *The Global Economy: Perspectives, Problems, and Politics*. New York: Harvester.

Haqgoo, J; Ketabi, A. (1398). "Exploring the Consequences of Transition to Independent Foreign Policy in Contemporary Iran: Proposing an Analytical Framework Based on Text of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran." *Islamic Revolution Researches Quarterly*. Vol. 8, no. 31, pp. 49-65.

Khomeini, R (a). (1370). *Sahifa Nour* (Vol. 11). Tehran: Institute for Compilation and Publication of Imam Khomeini's Works.

——————. (b). (1370). *Sahifa Nour* (Vol. 15). Tehran: Institute for Compilation and Publication of Imam Khomeini's Works.

——————. (c). (1370). *Sahifa Nour* (Vol. 4). Tehran: Institute for Compilation and Publication of Imam Khomeini's Works.

——————. (n.d.). *Velayat-e Faqih*. Tehran: Kaveh Publications.

Jacson, R; Sorensen, J. (1997). *Introduction to International Relations*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moshirzadeh, H (a). (1384). *Evolution in Theories of International Relations*. Tehran: Samt Publications.

——————. (b). (1384). "A Review of Critical Theory in International Relations." *Politics Quarterly*. Vol. 67, no. 516, pp. 225-249.

Mohammadi, M. (1387). "Clash of Civilizations or Clash with Domination System." *Islamic Government Quarterly*. Vol. 5, no. 16, pp. 11-42.

Rupert, M. (1993). *Producing Hegemony: The Politics of Mass Production and American Global Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stean, J; Pettiford, L. (2001). *International Relations: Perspectives and Themes.* London: Longman.

Tahaei, J. (1388). "Imam Khomeini and Fundamentals of the IRI's Foreign Policy." *Foreign Relations International Quarterly.* Vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 77-111.

Talei Hoor, R; Omidi, A; Shafie, N. (1397). "An Analysis of the US Hegemony Based on Neo-Gramscian Theory." *Political Studies Quarterly*. Vol. 11, no. 41, pp. 21-48.