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Abstract

This paper explains the construction process of Iranian foreign policy's inimical behavior toward the West through an inside out constructivist approach. The main argument is that to understand this behavior, the domestic meaning system and identity of the Islamic revolution must be deeply considered and comprehended. The study clarifies that the foundational ideas and meaning structures of the Islamic revolution have constructed the West as its ideological other, based on the reconstruction of the encounter between D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-Koufr. At the heart of this meaning system are ideas of independence and freedom, which mean autonomy and emancipation from all forms of Western influence and domination, to act as a free, independent and unrestrained actor in the international system and for attaining self-respect. Such a meaning system has constructed an identity of the Islamic revolution and the interests of the I. R. of Iran in the form of a permanent and irreconcilable enmity between Iran (as the heart of D'ar Al-Islam) and Estekbar-e Jahani/global arrogance/the West (as D'ar Al-Harb or Head of D'ar Al-Koufr). Finally, the paper suggests that such a constructed identity and interests have been manifested in the inimical behavior of Iranian foreign policy toward the West.
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Introduction
This article aims to explain the constitutive role of the Islamic revolution meaning system in construction of the Iranian foreign policy behavior. Understanding Iranian foreign policy after the 1979 revolution has been and still is difficult for both foreign policy scholars and experts. They have usually been surprised by the I.R. of Iran's behavior because they could not explain and predict its actions and reactions in the context of mainstream foreign policy approaches. Such a traditional rationalist approach to foreign policy, which tries to explain states’ behavior based on their pre-assumed rationality, predefined and objective national interests, and concepts like the rational actor, cost-benefit analysis and so on, has a crucial deficiency in understanding Iranian foreign policy. This approach ignores the construction process of a State's identity, interest, and behavior, and it presumes that all rational actors (States) show the same reactions to the same issues and situations based on their pre-assumed, fixed and universal rationality.

In the context of constructivism, the world in which we live is both a physical and a social place. We are physical creatures who are able to live in the world as well as to act on it as social creatures. In other words, the world that we are constructing includes social relations that interpret our physical world. As Onuf says, each of us lives in his or her own world, and at the same time, all of us live together in a single constructed world (Onuf, 2002). We all experience the world actively together. In this context, living in the world means acting "on it", not just acting "in it". Generally, the world that we live in has been constructed through our interactions with others, so there is no a priori and given issue in our world. It means that everything we understand in the social world around us is a social construct resulting from intersubjective interaction between selves and others through material and ideational structures. In this context, normative and ideational structures have a constitutive role in making our world and our identity.

According to the fundamental principle of the constructivist social theory, people/States are acting towards things and objects based on their meanings. Therefore, although objective power and capability distribution affect the foreign policy calculations of States, these calculations and capabilities depend on an intersubjective understanding that is constructed through relations among States and constitutes their conceptions of self and other. Collective interactive and intersubjective meanings constitute ideational structures that frame interactions of States' foreign policies.
Through participating in these meanings and ideational structures, actors and agents construct and achieve their identities, and these constructed identities that have been constituted through meaningful interactions and relations in turn construct bases of interests.

Our ideational structures therefore have a constitutive role in constructing our identity and interests. According to this logic, the nature of our relations with others (the West) in an intersubjective context has determined our identity. It thus follows that our national interests are being determined by such an intersubjectively constructed identity. Actors do not have any given and a priori interests independent from social interactions and relations; rather, they construct their interests in the process of structuration and construct their identities through interactions and relations with other actors.

This constructivist approach is basically different from mainstream studies of international relations and foreign policy. As Wendt explains, the mainstream approach of international relations considers identities and interests of agents as a priori, given, exterior and objective issues (Wendt, 1995: 129-179). Through their superficial objectivist approach, mainstream foreign policy studies pass and ignore issues of identity and interest; these studies simply attempt to explain how agents' behaviors in international relations and foreign policy result in different outcomes. By taking identities and interests as objective and given issues, the constructivist approach reveals the deficiency of mainstream foreign policy studies in describing and explaining States' behaviors in the international arena.

Considering States' identity, rationality and behavior as social and relational constructs produced through a system of meaning and in relations with others provides us with a theoretical basis for better understanding the foreign policy behavior of States like the I.R. of Iran. As Moshirzadeh clarifies, instead of focusing on what States are able to do according to their presumed rationality and status in an international structure, this approach explains what States want to do based on how they imagine and understand themselves and construct and define their identities and interests in relation to others (Moshirzadeh, Dec 2007: 523). This article thus adopts a constructivist approach, wherein meaning, system, and ideational structures are the bases of explaining Iranian foreign policy.

Due to the constructivist focus on the role of international ideational structures in constructing States’ identities, it may seem that constructivism in general, and system level constructivism in particular, does not consider
any role for domestic meaning structures in the social construction of foreign policy within States. As Moshirzadeh explains, however, there is no theoretical constraint in constructivism that limits this approach to international structures and rules and ignores the constitutive role of domestic ideational structures in constructing a State's identity and its foreign policy behavior (Moshirzadeh, Dec 2007:522). In other words, in the context of constructivism, identities and interests are not constituted merely through relations and interactions in the international society; rather, the basic constitutive characteristics of a State, before its interaction with other States, form through a structure that is constructed by the domestic society (Wendt, 1995: 129-179). Put differently, in the first stage, foundational structures (which are mainly ideational) are constructed by the national/internal society, after which States enter into the process of interactions and relations with other actors in international society and thereby define their identities, interests and behaviors in foreign policy.

According to this approach, our meaning system interprets and implies different meanings to material structures around us. The meaning system can be described as articulated and interrelated structures and concepts that define and redefine self and other and determine the nature of relations between them based on foundational ideas that arose from a historical process of relations with others; these relations construct the identity and interests of the State and its foreign policy behavior. The main argument of the article is that the meaning system of the Islamic revolution based on the foundational ideas of independence (autonomy against the West) and freedom (emancipation from the West) has defined the nature of the relations, identity and interests of the I.R. of Iran, in addition to its foreign policy behavior toward the West as its ideological other in the form of the reconstruction and redefinition of enmity between D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-Koufr.

This article focuses on the constitutive role that domestic/ideational (as opposed to international/material) structures play in the construction of the I.R. of Iran's identity and its foreign policy behavior. It is true that the identity of the I.R. of Iran and its inimical behavior towards the West have been constructed through both material and meaning structures, but as Wendt has explained, ideational structures, not the material ones, have a constitutive role in constructing identities (Wendt, 1999). This article therefore demonstrates the role of meaning structures in this regard; although the identity and interests of the I.R. of Iran have been mutually
constructed through a relational process with others (mainly the West), we focus on the role of the domestic structures of the Islamic revolution in the construction of its identity and Iranian foreign policy’s inimical behavior toward the West.

The article is divided into three sections. The first section outlines a theoretical basis to explain the meaning system of the Islamic revolution, the nature of its relations with the world, and the construction process of the I.R. of Iran's identity and interests. The second section discusses and demonstrates how these ideational structures, identity and interests have manifested in Iranian foreign policy’s inimical behavior toward the West, and the third section offers some concluding thoughts.

Meaning System and Identity of the Islamic Revolution
The Islamic revolution has been a fundamentalist movement for reviving Islam and bringing it into the whole of the Iranian people’s social, cultural and political life. The main meaning structure of this movement was constructed through the idea that Islam is a complete religion with full material and ideational programs that guarantee both worldly and heavenly happiness of human beings for all time. According to this ideational structure, the backwardness of the Muslim countries originated from Western colonial influence, and most importantly, from the dominance of Western thought on the material and spiritual life of the Muslims. Within this framework, the only way for solving this problem is through emancipating the Muslims from the ideational and material dominance of the West on their life. Therefore, the Islamic revolution was basically an anti-Western movement for terminating Western influence through reviving Islamic foundations. Breaking free of foreign dependency, overthrowing the corrupt regime of the anti-Islam and Western-dependent Shah, and terminating the Western modernization programs and exposure to Western thought with the Western thoughts (liberalism, socialism, communism and even nationalism)⁴ became the main meaning structures of the revolution.

Some Iranian scholars like Mahmoud Sariolghalam believe that during the past 400 years, the dominant mentality in Iranian intellectual life has been formed based on the manner of Iran’s relations with the West, which has usually assumed two forms: dependency (Satellite State) or encounter (Sariolghalam, 2005:55). Also, a discursive analysis of the I.R. of Iran's foreign policy shows that the Islamic revolution’s aim has been uprooting Pahlavi discourse in all of its ideational and material forms. The revolution
tried to constitute a counter-discourse against the Western-oriented foreign policy of the Shah through emancipation from both the Shah's regime and influence of the US in Iran. As Mohammad Reza Tajik explains, the Shah's foreign policy discourse was constituted based on the three main structures: Nationalism, a Pseudo-modernism and Secularism; these three constitutive structures of the Shah's foreign policy have been rejected and denied by the Islamic revolution because they had defined Islam as their ideological other (Tajik, 2004:34). The Revolutionaries believed that through the three aforementioned structures and based on a relation of dependence, a full conformity with the West has dominated on Iranian foreign policy. Such a conformity to and dependency on the West was aggressively criticized by the founding fathers of the Islamic revolution. One of the Islamic revolution’s main aims was to terminate such a dependency on the West. Therefore, the West and Western modernization have been defined as the other of the Islamic revolutionary identity; in other words, in the process of constructing its identity and foreign policy behavior, the Islamic revolution has defined the Shah's foreign policy discourses (Nationalism, Pseudo-modernization and Secularism) and the whole Western international system as its other.

The meaning system of the Islamic revolution has been constructed through the ideas of Independence and Freedom, which were the main and most popular mottos of the revolution. Independence and freedom have been the most important historical demands of Iranians during the past two centuries. They believed that their independence and freedom have been lost through their involvement in the modern world because of the Western ideational and material domination as well as its influence on their social, political, economic and cultural life. Iranian political movements have thus sought independence and freedom as their main aims. These two principal and constitutive ideas have been reinterpreted through the Islamic narration of independence and freedom by the Islamic revolution’s meaning system.

Independence in the context of the revolutionary ideational structures means emancipation from all forms of Western influence and domination as well as independence from the international system, norms and rules that, in the context of the revolution, were considered a means of continuing and reproducing Western dominance of Islamic countries. Also, freedom in the context of the revolution has a different meaning than it has in liberalism, civil rights and civil society contexts; as Ramezani explains, it means autonomy against the West (Ramezani, 2001); to act as a free, independent
and unrestrained actor in the international system, to attain self-respect, which was degraded by Western dominance over the destiny of the Muslims. In other words, Autonomy in this context means optimizing free action in the international system; i.e., a country could follow its aims and policies with maximum disengagement from the influence and dominance of the other countries in the international system. Free and unrestrained action in the international system, disengagement from the West and reviving the internationally degraded self-respect of the country, through encounters with the West, the other of the Islamic revolution, are other ideational structures of the Islamic revolution that have had constitutive roles in constructing Iranian foreign policy behavior.

The founding fathers of the revolution believed that the only way of achieving independence and freedom was to reject the West and the Western way of life through relying on and reviving Islamic ideals and thoughts in all aspects of a Muslim’s life. Surveying the speeches of Ayatollah Khomeini, the leader of the Islamic revolution, and also the text of the Islamic Republic of Iran's Constitution enables a proper examination of the process of constructing enmity with the West as the basis of the Islamic revolution identity. On May 5, 1978, a Le monde journalist asked Ayatollah Khomeini, in an interview, what is your stand and policy towards the Soviet Union? He answered:

*The same policy we have toward the US. The super powers have exploited our people. I do consider both of them the same and there is not any difference between them and the UK in this regard. When Iran really became independent, then it could make proper relations with all other countries of the World (Foreign Policy and International Relations from Imam Khomeini’s Perception, 2002: P.16. and Sahifehy-e Noor, Vol.2, PP.49-50).*

The deceased leader of the revolution considered autonomy from the great powers and full independence as a precondition of Iran's proper relations with the world. These ideas later became the most important sacred tenets of the I.R. of Iran's identity and its foreign policy behavior. On November 1, 1978, in a speech about the Shah's land reform and Great Civilization plan, Ayatollah Khomeini said:

*We want independence, we want to govern our country by ourselves; we do not want to be under the control of others (the West); this country, for better or worse, belongs to us. We do not want the others intervene in our country (Foreign Policy and...*
Gradually, after the victory of the Islamic revolution, these interrelated ideas constructed an integrated meaning system that constituted the identity and interests of the I.R. of Iran in the form of a permanent enmity with the West. Basically, neither the East nor the West, as an unchangeable principle of the I.R. of Iran's foreign policy, manifested this powerful will for autonomy and emancipation from and against the West as the ideological other of the revolution. Ayatollah Khomeini has said in this regard:

*You saw that the Islamic Republic of Iran since the day of its founding was based on the neither the East nor the West principle for achieving independence, freedom and establishment of the Islamic republic*....(*International Relations and Foreign Policy from Imam Khomeini's Perception, 2002: 33. and also, Sahifehy-e Noor, Vol. 15., P.185*).

The anti-Western thought and mentality of Khomeini and other founding fathers of the revolution were integrated in the context of the Islamic Republic of Iran's constitution and played the most important constitutive role in constructing the anti-Western behavior of Iranian foreign policy. In article 152 of the constitution, the foundation of the I.R. of Iran's foreign policy is defined as follows:

*The I.R. of Iran's foreign policy has been established based on rejecting any kind of domination (both being dominated by the others or exerting domination on the others), protecting full and comprehensive independence and territorial integrity, defending the rights of all Muslims and nonalignment against hegemonic powers and peaceful relations with non-belligerent States* (*The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran,1993: 22*).

After establishing the Islamic Republic, these anti-Western ideas and meaning system have been embedded through continual assertions by Ayatollah Khomeini and other high ranking decision makers of the I.R. of Iran on the abovementioned concepts on the basis of autonomy and emancipation from the whole Western international system for achieving self-respect. For example, on October 27, 1981, in a speech for members of the Amal Movement, Ayatollah Khomeini said:

*We will not make any compromise with the super powers; we do not accept the dominance of the US or the Soviet Union. We are Muslims, and we want to live (freely). We want to be free and*
independent, even if we are forced to live in poverty. We do not want such (material/Western) progress and civilization which makes us dependent on foreigners …..the super powers want to capture the humanity of human beings, so we and you should resist against them and not compromise... (Foreign Policy and International Relations from Imam Khomeini's Perception, 2002: 33. And also Sahifehy-e Noor, Vol. 15: 209).

As this section has indicated, the Islamic revolution has constructed its meaning system through an Islamic reinterpretation of independence and freedom as interrelated ideas. These ideas constructed the identity and interests of the I.R. of Iran in the form of autonomy and emancipation from the whole Western world as the ideological other of the revolution. The I.R. of Iran has been so assertive in rejecting Western influence and dominance in all of its material and ideational forms because the full denial of an encounter with the West, as the other of the Islamic Republic, is the basis of the Islamic revolution meaning system that has constituted the I.R. of Iran's identity and interests following the 1979 revolution. In the next section, I will show how this identity and these interests, through redefinition and reinterpretation of independence and freedom in the system of meaning of the Islamic revolution, have been constructed in an inimical form against its other and manifested in the hostile behavior of Iranian foreign policy towards the West.

**Construced Enmity eith the West**

The social world constructed through the Islamic revolution includes both material and ideational structures. Material structures that have had confirmative effects on the ideational structures were imposed on the Islamic revolution through revolutionary struggles with the Shah's Western-backed regime, political conflicts after the victory of the revolution, political tensions with the West, the imposition of economic sanctions by the US, supporting Saddam Hussein in the Iraq-Iran war, etc. The material structures have not had a constitutive role in constructing the identity and interests of the I.R. of Iran because such a reactionary identity against the West had been forming through the meaning system of the revolution that preceded the material structures.

The confrontational nature of the ideational structures partly resulted from the Western domination of Third World countries, but it mainly originated in fundamentalist Islamic thought, which reinterpreted
independence and freedom to construct a meaning system of the revolution based on an Islamic narration. It also developed from other anti-Western mentalities circulating within Iranian society, which attributed all problems of the Islamic countries to Western domination and attempted to fully reject the Western international system through reconstructing a permanent and irreconcilable encounter between D'ar Al-Islam (good) and D'ar Al-koufr (evil). These religious missionary meaning structures constitute the relations, identity and interests of the I.R. of Iran through redefining and reinterpreting the global encounter with D'ar Al-koufr, which manifested in the inimical behavior of Iranian foreign policy toward the West, as the head of D'ar Al-Koufr.

Actually, Islamic foundational thought has strengthened and reinforced these encountering meaning structures. According to this interpretation of the Islamic thought the only solution for terminating problems of the Muslim countries once and for all is rejecting the West and its domination. In such a context, it was obvious that constructive relations based on peaceful coexistence could not be produced between Iran and the West. The thoughts and ideational structures derived from the Islamic revolution, such as criticizing the territorial separation of people in the form of Nation-States and the belief that the only criterion for delimiting people is the Islamic faith. According to such an ideational structure, the world is divided into two parts, introducing the possibility of an irreconcilable encounter between D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-Koufr. In his famous book Tazkareh, Allameh Helli has delineated the boundaries of D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-Koufr as follows:

\textit{D'ar Al-Islam includes territories in which Muslims have constructed buildings in them and made them habitable and also territories that have captured and possessed through war. D'ar Al-Koufr includes territories which had belonged to Muslims but been captured and possessed by infidels; also territories, which have been established and made habitable and possessed by them} (Rashid, 1974: 118-119).

These words presume a clear separation and boundaries between D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-Koufr, and they tacitly delimit the whole world between these two poles. Islam does not accept delimiting the world based on the nation-State formation. Regarding the Islamic government and its boundaries in the modern world, Allameh Tabatabaei has said:

\textit{The boundary of the Islamic government is determined just by the}
faith and belief; it is not a geographic or political-based boundary... [In the modern age] each group of people took possession of part of the world and designated that territory/land as homeland and has defended it by all available means. Although this [territorialization of the world] has partly originated from the natural needs of human being, at the same time it's in contrast with another natural need of people (i.e. integration). These nation-States which have arisen from (the territorialization process in form of homelands), integrating people of a nation but at the same time, disintegrating them from other people of the world...Islam has eliminated these dispersions and separations in human society and instead has established the basis of integration among human beings according to the faith and belief [in god] not based on the race, territory, language, etc.... (Tabatabaei, vol.7: 157-158).

This foundational Islamic thought, which denies and rejects the nation-State's boundaries, substituting for them by dividing the world into two parts - D'ar Al-Islam as Muslims' territories and D'ar Al-Koufr as non-Muslims' territories - is one of the most important bases of the Islamic revolution’s ideational structures. These fundamental structures have made constructive interaction between the I. R. of Iran and the West almost impossible. According to these ideas, the Islamic government has defined global duties for itself to support Islamic movements against the West on a global scale because its identity and interests have been partly constructed through defending Islamic movements (as part of D'ar Al-Islam) against the West (the head of D'ar Al-koufr). The inimical character of the Iranian foreign policy towards the West in supporting Hezbollah, Hamas and other Islamic movements could be considered as a manifestation of the I.R. of Iran's identity and interests. This framework has been constructed through the Islamic revolution’s meaning system, which is based on the constitutive ideas of independence and freedom that redefined and reinterpreted hostility against the West through the Islamic ideas regarding D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-koufr.

According to Islamic thought, bifurcating the world into D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-Koufr is not a neutral separation. It means that in the long term, Muslims and infidels cannot live in these two separated geographical places in peaceful coexistence. This is because the Islamic government believes that it should not only defend the Islamic homeland but that it also has a
holy duty by its nature to expand Dar Al-Islam throughout the world. The natural outcome of such an Islamic duty is an encounter with the West. In a joint statement in 1964, Grand Ayatollahs Khomeini, Milani, Najafi Mar'ashi and Tabatabaie have declared in this regard:

*We are ready for defending Islam, Islamic countries and their independence in any situation. Our plan is (reviving) Islam, uniting Muslims, integrating Islamic countries and (strengthening) brotherhood among Muslims all around the world against Zionism, Israel and colonialist powers.* (Foreign Policy and International Relations from Imam Khomeini's Perception, 2002:38-39, and Sahifehy-e Noor, Vol.1, 84).

These words of four grand ayatollahs express an irreconcilable struggle between Dar Al-Islam and Dar Al-Koufr. These ideas, which played a constitutive role in constructing the meaning system of the Islamic revolution, have been manifested in Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's attitudes towards the US and Israel and the practical behavior that follows from his foreign policy. In regards to constructing enmity with the West in the Iranian foreign policy behavior, the abovementioned statement, which was made 15 years before the 1979 revolution, show that the anti-Western ideational structures have preceded the material structures symbolized in anti-revolutionary operations by the West, sanctions against the I.R. of Iran, supporting Saddam Hossein in the Iraq-Iran war, etc. that have since the revolution. Actually, the material structures of the physical world contributed to meaning structures of the Islamic revolution, and they have converted the nature of ideas like independence, freedom, Dar Al-Islam and Dar Al-koufr from encounter to enmity with the West. The following speech by Ayatollah Khomeini on September 5, 1981, supports this explanation:

*O Muslims and oppressed nations of the world, raise, unite and defend Islam and your destiny and do not be afraid of the West's uproar, because if God pleases, this century is the century for victory of oppressed nations and sincerity over arrogant powers and deceitfulness. The world (West) should know that Iran has found its way towards God and has an irreconcilable struggle with the arrogant US... we have started a difficult and relentless war with the US... we ask our Muslim brothers all around the world to join us (in this struggle) for terminating the West's plundering and domination of the Islamic countries (Foreign Policy and*
International Relations from Imam Khomeini's Perception, 2002: 40-41, also Sahifehy-e Noor, Vol. 15, 125-126).

These meaning structures and inimical identity are institutionalized in the constitution of the I.R. of Iran. According to the introduction of the constitution, the Islamic revolution was a movement towards victory of all oppressed nations of the world against the “arrogant powers”. It provides the basis of permanent revolution in the world and supports Islamic movements in order to pave the way for establishing an integrated global Ommat (global Muslim society), based on the following Quranic verse, which has been exactly repeated in different parts of the constitution (The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, 1993:11): "And /O, messenger/! verily, the religion of you /messengers/ is one /based on the divine unity and submission to Allah's will/ and I am your creator & nurturer, so worship me and be obedient to me"(The Holy Qur'an, 2001, Sura Al-Anbia, Verse 92).

All of these principles have been institutionalized in the approaches, aims and behaviors of Iran's foreign policy in the form of concepts such as: neither the East, nor the West, supporting Islamic movements and exporting the revolution which also has been manifested in the constitution. Regarding the abovementioned principles of Iran's foreign policy, Ayatollah Khomeini has said:

*It has been declared several times that in our Islamic foreign & international policy we are attempting to expand the influence of Islam in the whole world and diminish the dominance of the arrogant powers. We do not care if the US and its followers called our attempt expansionism for establishing an Islamic empire. Our aim is eradicating the corrupt roots of Zionism, Capitalism and Communism. If God pleases, we have decided to annihilate all (political) systems which have been established based on these three foundations and expand the Islamic system in the current arrogant global order.... I am declaring that the Islamic Republic of Iran, by all available means, will attempt the revival of the Islamic identity of Muslims all around the world....*(Foreign Policy and International Relations from Imam Khomeini's Perception, 2002:57. also Sahifehy-e Noor, Vol.20., PP.232-233).

There are numerous cases demonstrating the abovementioned principles and ideas in the form of the inimical behavior of Iranian foreign policy toward the D'ar Al-koufr (both the East and the West) in general and toward
the West in particular. Examples include supporting Afghan Mujahidin after the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and also the Palestinians and Lebanese movements against Israel and the US, supporting domestic opposition of Arab allies of the US in the Middle East, and establishing close relations with US enemies around the world (Cuba, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Venezuela, North Korea and anti-US groups in Iraq and Afghanistan). As Seyed Sadegh Haghighat says, according to these principles, it seems that the main mission of the Islamic government in its foreign policy has been determined based on the Islamic delimitation of the world (D'ar Al-Islam vs. D'ar Al-Koufr) in the form of supporting Islamic movements and oppressed peoples of the world (Haghighat, 1998:64), and other missions and responsibilities of the Islamic government as a nation-State have been secondary priorities.

The dominance of these confrontational ideational structures in relation to the West on Iranian foreign policy has been symbolized in the concept of Estekbar-e Jahani (Global Arrogance/the US/the West) and the necessity of permanent struggle with it, which is the revival of the D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-Koufr concepts in the current international system by the Islamic revolution. Javad Mansoori defines the whole dominant political system of the world as Estekbar-e Jahani/Global Arrogance because he believes that according to Islamic thought, this system has characteristics of Koufr/Blasphemy (Mansoori, 1999: 22).

According to Islamic thought, Koufr/Blasphemy means concealing and denying the truth, and in this context, struggle with global blasphemy/global arrogance/Estekbar-e Jahani is analogous to a war between D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-harb (as part of D'ar Al-Koufr, which clearly is in hostile relations with D'ar Al-Islam). Based on such an understanding, the international system is a blasphemous totality, and Islamic countries cannot and must not accept its principles, norms and rules. There are many cases of Iran rejecting the international system and its norms and rules through its foreign policy behavior, such as denying United Nations security Council resolutions on Iran's nuclear crisis and also rejecting UN resolutions on human rights issues in Iran in the past three decades. Ayatollah Khamenehei, the supreme leader of the I.R. of Iran, has claimed that the international organizations and norms are means for the US to pressure the countries that oppose American domination of world affairs. He said in a speech on May 22, 1990:

*The United Nations, Human Rights Committee and other (international) organizations all around the world just wait to*
see who is encountering the US, and then imposing pressure on it in the name of human rights (Sheydaian, 2006: 54).

According to the Islamic revolution meaning system, in such a blasphemous international system there are some infidel powers that are more powerful than others. These powers are referred to as Estekbar-e Jahani/Global arrogance. Javad Mansoori explains that Estekbar-e Jahani/global arrogance means the heads or leaders of infidel Western powers in the blasphemous international system (Mansoori, 1995:30). A relentless and permanent struggle with the West has thus been considered as a main objective of the Islamic revolution in relation to the international system.

Manoochehr Mohammadi, former deputy of Iran's ministry of foreign affairs, represents this conflict in the form of a confrontation between the US and Iran after September 11, 2001. He describes the international system in the form of concentric circles, with the Islamic Republic of Iran as the heart of D'ar Al-Islam in the center of the circle and the US as the head of Estekbar-e Jahani/global arrogance, which is leading D'ar Al-koufr, in the outermost shell; depending on their position and status toward Iran (as the symbol of Islam and Faith) and the US (as the symbol of koufr/blasphemy), other nations are in different orbits between these two levels. He has depicted this system in the diagram. 1:
Mohammadi believes that the structure of the international system will be formed based on the outcomes and consequences of the encounters between the Iran's government and the West (Mohammadi, 2003: 26).

In this context, the encounter with Estekbar-e Jahani is not limited to the struggle with the Western powers; it also includes trends like globalization. Based on such an understanding of the world, globalization is nothing but a project of domination based on the materialistic principles, norms and rules of D'ar Al-Koufr/ Estekbar-e Jahani/ global arrogance enacted upon the whole world. On the basis of this perception, Ramin Khanbagi explains that globalization is in essence a project of propagating a mundane and materialistic approach to human life on a global scale; in this project, all nations should become material and then globalized. He believes that what globalization brings to the life of Muslims is not global thinking, but rather the prevailing materialistic and mundane lifestyle of the West. In other
words, through the globalization trends that began 400 years ago, the Western lifestyle has become globally dominant (Khanbagi, Fall/Winter 2002:4). Therefore, globalization is nothing but materialism.

In light of such a perception to the world, when taken in the context of the struggle with Estekbar-e Jahani/global arrogance and also as a part of the permanent encounter between D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-koufr, the Muslim nations must reject and deny globalization as well; any form of interaction with and participation in this global conspiratory game makes them a part of such a blasphemous, mundane and material international system. These ideational structures are deeply rooted as a consequence of the reinterpretation and redefinition of Iranian historical demands for independence and freedom drawn from Islamic precepts and the mentality of the founding fathers of the Islamic revolution, and they are further affirmed by the imposition of hostile international material structures towards the revolution. They have constructed a permanent enmity toward the West as an indispensable part of Iranian foreign policy behavior.

**Conclusion**

In this article, based on a constructivist inside-out view, I have tried to show how the enmity between Iran and the West has been constructed. Despite the constructivist assertions about the importance of international meaning structures in constructing identity, interests, and behaviors of states, I have attempted to show the constitutive role of domestic meaning structures in the construction of the I.R. of Iran's identity, interests and foreign policy. Without a deep understanding of these internal structures, it is almost impossible to understand Iranian foreign policy. I have argued that in order to understand this enmity, we should thoroughly consider the domestic ideational structures of the Islamic revolution because these structures have had a constitutive role in constructing the enmity; international material structures have had an affirmative role in this regard. I have also clarified the meaning system of the Islamic revolution based on the two central constitutive ideas of independence and freedom (full autonomy against the West and emancipation from the West, the international system and its norms and rules) as the symbols of Iran's historical demands in the modern world for the revival of its self-respect, which was degraded by the domination of the Western powers.

I have explained that in the context of the revolution's ideational structures and mentality of its founding fathers, these two ideas, which are Islamic by
their nature, were reinterpreted and redefined based on Islamic thoughts and attitudes such as dividing the world into D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-koufr. These ideas also contributed to the constructed identity and interests of the I.R. of Iran in its confrontations with the West. Such an encountering identity and interests are symbolized and institutionalized in the speeches of Ayatollah Khomeini and other founding fathers of the revolution, the constitution of the Islamic republic of Iran, and the inimical behavior entailed in Iranian foreign policy toward the West. After the 1979 revolution, the imposition of international material structures of the physical world on the newly established I.R. of Iran, including the US sanctions against Iran, the eight-year Iraq-Iran war, and Western support for Sadam Hussein, among other factors, strengthens the anti-Western meaning system of the Islamic revolution. Such impositions also contributed to Iran’s confrontational identity towards the West and its inimical foreign policy in the context of a permanent and inevitable struggle between Estekbar-e Jahani/ global arrogance (as D'ar Al-Harb) and Iran (as heart of D'ar Al-Islam).
Notes and References

1. Islamic Lands or Islamic territories as lands of God, peace and believers.
2. Non-Islamic lands as territory of blasphemy.
3. Part of D'ar Al-Koufr which clearly is in hostility with D'ar Al-Islam.
4. Although in the process of the revolution, some of these Western ideologies, like Nationalism & Communism, were temporarily tolerated by mainstream Islam during the revolution overthrow the Shah's regime, after the revolution, they became clearly irreconcilable in just three to four years, and these Western trends were excluded by mainstream Islam in the revolution.
5. Autonomy is a relative concept, and no country could be absolutely autonomous, but as Ramezani explains, this relative concept is appropriate to explain the I.R. of Iran's foreign policy.
6. According to Islamic thought, the world has been divided to two part: D'ar Al-Islam and D'ar Al-koufr. Although there is a possibility for these two worlds to live in a peaceful coexistence, D'ar Al-Islam by its nature has an indispensable duty for the expansion of Islam in D'ar Al-koufr, which naturally constructs a kind of encountering relation and inimical identity between them. Also, in this article, when I mention D'ar Al-koufr, I mean that part of D'ar Al-koufr that is clearly in a hostile relation with D'ar Al-Islam and has been defined in the Islamic texts as D'ar Al-harb; the Islamic revolution meaning system has redefined this hostile part of D'ar Al-koufr as Estekbar-e Jahani (global arrogance/the head of D'ar Al-koufr/mainly the US).
7. Although Arab allies of the US in the Middle East are Islamic countries, because of their close relations with the West they have been considered by the I.R. of Iran as dependent satellite States of D'ar Al-koufr.