The Social Sciences 11 (Special Issue 3): 6465-6474, 2016
ISSN: 1818-5800

Analysis of the Foreign Policy of Ahmadinejad's Government According to the Critical Theory of International Relations

[1]Mohammad Ali Tavana, [2]Hamed Eslami and [1]Tooraj Rahmani
[1]Department of Law and Political Science, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran
[2]Department of Political Science, PNU, Tehran, Iran

Abstract: This study aims at the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government according to the critical theory of international relations. The goal is to determine whether this policy has been different from that of the governments before and after him. The study is based on the belief that more a detailed and objective analysis of the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran during Ahmadinejad's government can be possibly offered with reference to the critical theory of international relations. Accordingly, the main question of the article is 'How can Ahmadinejad's foreign policy be analyzed according to the critical theory of international relations?'. It is assumed that the critical theory of international relations has the ability to account for the issue. The policy of his government seemed to be critical of the unjust and hegemonic structure of the international system. In this case, namely in its rejecting or negative form, his foreign policy matched the critical theory of international relations to a great deal. In contrast to the critical theory which serves to rebuild the international system based on the modern rationality, it seems that the goal of Ahmadinejad's government was to rebuild the international system based on the interests of developing countries in general and Muslim countries, especially Shias, in particular. This study is a cross-sectional study conducted for "adaption of theory with case" and " test of theory with case".

Key words: Foreign policy, Islamic Republic of Iran, Ahmadinejad's government, critical theory of international relations, justice, hegemony

INTRODUCTION

Mahmood Ahmadinejad was elected as the president in the ninth presidential election of Iran (1384) and a fundamentalist justice discourse came to rule the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic. Firoozabadi *et al.* (1971) The notable characteristics of the discourse include undermining international norms, challenging the policies of great powers, extension of justice and idealism in international relations and interacting with people and movements of justice (Mohammadreza, 1965).

The conquest and rule of the fundamentalism justice discourse were followed by practical consequences, i.e., real and observable behavior. Adoption and following up of a foundation-breaking strategy against the international order and system, policy of looking to the East and Latin America using symbolism, backing up the Non-Alignment movement and support of liberation movements especially Palestinians were some examples of the change in the orientation of the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic during the rule of the ninth government Firoozabadi and Sayed (1967). This foreign policy seems different from that of the preceding and succeeding governments. Therefore, one has to be equipped with an appropriate theoretical framework for the analysis of the foreign policy of that government. Perhaps, a more detailed and objective analysis of the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran during Ahmadinejad's government can be conducted according to the critical theory of international relations. This is because the theory provides an internal criticism of political structures and deals with their internal strengths and weaknesses. So, the main question of this research is 'How can the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad be analyzed according to the critical theory of international relations? It is assumed that the critical theory of international relations has the ability to account for the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad. The policy of his government criticized the seemingly unjust and hegemonic structure of the international system. Therefore, it can be said in its rejecting or negative form, that the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government matched the critical theory of international relations to a great deal. In contrast to the critical theory which serves to rebuild the international system based on the modern rationality, it seems the goal of Ahmadinejad's

Corresponding Author: Mohammad Ali Tavana, Department of Law and Political Science, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran

government was to rebuild the international system based on the interests of developing countries in general and Muslim countries especially Shias in particular.

Theoretical framework: Critical theory of international relations: The critical theory was developed in Germany in a particular era of complex intellectual activities (Fard and Bahador, 1969). 'The Structural In the 1980s, a critical vision was adopted in international relations. The critical theory, in its particular sense was affected by the Frankfort school and the philosophical views of thinkers such as, Adorno, Horkheimer, Markoza and Habermas as well as individuals like Gramsci, the former leader of the Italian communist party. The theory is as one of the important approaches of rethinking about the current of international relations (Lapid, 1989) Yet, theoreticians like Robert kaks andro Linklater, Richard Eshly and Mark Haffman used it for the analysis and specification of international politics (Linklater, 1992).

There are at least two considerations of the critical theory, namely general meaning and particular meaning. In its general meaning, the theory includes a range of critical viewpoints in international relations, such as post-modernism, post-structuralism, feminism, Marxism, neo-Marxism, world system theory, Frankfort school and constructivism. In this sense, the critical theory is an interdisciplinary effort that combines philosophy, politics, international relations, history and psychology to provide a view point of the world politics with the main goal of showing conversion and replacement against realistic visions of international relations (Smith, 2002).

In its particular meaning, the critical theory includes viewpoints inspired by the critical Frankfort school, Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno's discussions. Perhaps more than anyone else, Yorgen Habermas was of effect in this regard. One may refer to his thinking in criticism of modernity, his enlightenment especially in its knowledge-cultural manifestations and his effort for redirecting modernization towards its forgotten aspects. The theory of international relations is further contributed to by the viewpoints of other individuals like Cox (1981), who introduced the critical views to the international relations for the first time, Richard Eshly, who tended toward the critical school in his early work in the 1980s and Mark Hafman, who hoped in the second half of the 1980s that the critical theory would be imagined with a position among paradigms for debates in future international relations. Furthermore, the theory has been inspired by the ideas of Antonio Gramsci who held considerable discussions in hegemony, historical block, civil society, passive revolution, the role of intellectuals, etc. These points are cited in the writings of Kaks, Estefan Gill and e few others.

As considered, there is a particular meaning in the critical theory. The theory was made as a reaction to the domination of neo-realistic and neo-liberal opinions in international relations. This claim is based on the project of enlightenment and rationalism. The approach targets the inefficient progressive ideas of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

With regard to the crisis of modernity, the ideas against its initial ideals brought new forms of slavery known as Nazism and Stalinism (Habermas, 1989). The discussions and impressions which were introduced explicitly to critical theorists Included trans-theoretical discussion, (i.e., discussions of epistemological and ontological types), criticism of the main course in international relations, alternative explanations of international relations and the possibility of transformation of system and international relations (Stephen Gill).

Trans-theoretical issues are one of the main considerations in the critical theory. Attending to epistemological and ontological issues has been related to the considerable subjects of critical theorists (i.e., transformation in international relations) in spite of the fact that many who have written on the main course of international relations have criticized those issues.. Therefore, it was considered as an integral part of its theoretical schema. The ontological aspect of international relations theories which is in fact considered as a context of discovery, refers to the fundamental assumptions in the essence of international politics. The goal of ontological consideration of relations is existence or being. In fact, everything in the world is supposed real, even if those things that cannot be imagined or have no outer or material symbols.

In contrast to the main course of international relations, (i.e., realistic, neo-realistic, scientism and, in general, what is known as the rational course of the relations), there exist order and stability. Critical theorists seek to show not only the variability of the present situation but also the consequence of its injustice. Also, critical theory serves to accommodate for all the factors that help to bring about change and diversity in the range of its studies (Stephen Gill).

Changing the regulations and shaping the norms of the international system is one of the important goals of critical studies so that the governments would stop their thinking and acting based on patterns of realism. Hence, advocates of the critical theory want a system that establishes injustice and attends to marginal issues. In

general, the most important concepts and assumptions of the critical theory of international relations include the possibility of transformation in the international system, the criticism of the main course in international relations, hegemonic international criticism, as well as liberation and transformation. It is these assumptions on the basis of which the present paper offers an analysis of the principles in the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government.

The most important principles of the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government : Foreign policy is one of the main issues discussed in politics and international relations. Because governments are considered as the most important actors in the international system, their foreign policy begins with wills, ideas, demands and goals. Governments adopt a complex set of policies, measures, tools and strategies for achieving their goals that are defined outside national boundaries; it is known as foreign policy. Now a days, dynamic and active foreign policy is considered as one of the vital factors for entering an independent political unit, leading to the path of growth and development in economy, security and politics. If policy makers and decision makers can not present a correct and rational assessment of developments and conditions of the international system, they may be faced with problems and crises and finally with isolation in the international system. Principles mean criteria and standards which serve as the guide and basis for executives and decision-makers' action.

From the very beginning, Mahmood Ahmadinejad tried to express certain principles in his foreign policy using a revolutionary idealistic discourse and by underestimating foreign powers. Some domestic analysts believe that his principles were not according to the views of the founder of the revolution (Ali and Shafiee, 1973) In his political campaign, Mahmood Ahmadinejad focused more on internal political discussions and the economic situation of the country than on the foreign policy. After coming to power, he spoke about the need of aggressive policy toward the west by questioning the structure and nature of the international system. He tried to make a tactical change of Iran's position from an accused country to a complainant by highlighting the weaknesses and failures of the foreign policy of western countries (Alireza, 1968, 1971). The principles of foreign policy in Ahmadinejad's government are described bellow.

Need of revival of justice in international relations: Ahmadinejad announced justice as his main motto and the axis of his programs. Justice is viewed not only as the fundamentalist discourse in the domestic policy but also as its center of gravity and the focus of articulation and identification in foreign policy. Therefore, justice got to be the basis of the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government in international arenas (Firoozabadi, 1971).

In a meeting of ambassadors and heads of delegations of the Islamic Republic abroad on the second of August 2007, he explicitly mentioned justice as one of the triple foundations and principles on which the columns of his foreign policy would be placed and the diplomatic model of the Islamic Republic should be designed and implemented. This justice would be available to the international community (Mahmood, 1965).

Emphasizing the values and ideals of the Islamic Revolution in the international arena (fundamentalism): The most important index of Ahmadinejad's foreign policy is fundamentalism; that is, a return to basics, values and ideals of the Islamic revolution in the international arena. The ninth conservative government believed the discourse held by the Governments of Construction and Reforms had a distance from the basics and the initial values and ideals of the Islamic revolution. So, Ahmadinejad redefined and re-emphasized the initial ideals of the Islamic revolution as the departure point of his government. Whether as a presidential candidate or in his presidency, he emphasized that, in the domestic and foreign policies, he sought to revive the those basics, values and ideals, with justice at the top.

Revisionism in the international system, (i.e., disturbing the existing international order): Undoubtedly what distinguishes the discourse of this period (fundamentalism) from other Islamism sub-discourses is the meaning and position of international order and system. From the perspective of fundamentalist discourse, international order and system is completely unjust, illegal and undesirable. This international system is the concrete symbol of injustice, inequality, discrimination and application of domination (Firoozabadi and Sayed, 1967). One of the most important programs and goals of the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government was description of the position of the unjust order in the system of world domination. Ahmadinejad spent most of his energy and diplomatic power to describe and analyze the undesirable international reality. So, the main axis and the focal theme of his speech in the sixty-first session of the UN General Assembly in September of 2006 was the undesirable and unjust international system and the relations based on force, oppression and discrimination.

Criticism of the international organization and the need for reforms in those organizations: With the rise of the ninth and tenth governments, significant changes took

place in the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. However, some principles like attention to independence and observance of esteem, interest and wisdom remained on the agenda. Legitimation, acceptability and the performance of some institutions and regional and international assemblies, such as the World Bank and IMF, were again put on the demand because of their performance and dependence on capitalism. The UN, especially the Security Council, was criticized more than before and the need for its restriction, reforms in making decisions and just orientations were emphasized. International institutions were introduced as mechanisms that are too unreliable and inadequate to help developing countries achieve any considerable progress.

Anti-hegemony or anti-arrogance, policy: One of the most important behavioral principles of the Islamic Republic has been anti-hegemony or anti-arrogance, foreign policy over the past three decades. Accordingly, Ahmadinejad's government was dominated by this mentality as one of his priorities and objectives. According to the ninth government authorities, the approach of European countries and the USA is rooted in their own ethics and aggressive behavior. Therefore, the decision makers of the ninth government put in their agenda "fighting with the uni-polar system and the global dominance of the western empire" and, hence, tried to deal with the tricks of this hegemonic system. They found that expanding or, at least, maintaining relations with European countries and America would not conform to the normative anti-hegemony requirements of the ninth government. So, redefinition and balance of relations with the West was taken into account.

The policy of looking to the East: The policy of looking to the East and expanding Iran's relations with Asian countries is one of the most important problems in the foreign policy of Iran after the rise of the ninth government. In fact, lack of inefficient relations with western countries caused the spread of relations with the East. The main tenet of the foreign policy principles was to align the economic and political interests of the country in conformity with political friends and economic contracts with them. The threats of the West and America about the Iranian nuclear plans accelerated the formation of this approach. Ahmadinejad's government wanted economy in the service of politics and security and accordingly, he tended to lessen the dependence of the country on the blocks that did not cooperate with Iran on political issues. Instead, attention to Asia and Eastern countries that had a better match with Iran was placed on the agenda (Alireza, 1971). In the approach of looking to the East of the ninth government, China had a unique position as one of the permanent members of the Security Council. The procedure of establishing economic relations with China has had an annual growth of 30-50% on average in recent years. As a result of this growth, the trade between Iran and China amounted to about 23 billion dollars at the end of 2009 (Vahid, 1969).

Third world-ism: Third world-ism is a kind of discourse and it means an international political system that is of an anti-colonial, anti-imperialism and anti-hegemonic nature. After the victory of the Islamic Revolution in 1979, third world countries came into focus of the foreign policy of Iran. However, due to some factors, relation with such countries was not taken seriously until the rise of Mahmood Ahmadinejad in the presidential election of 2005 when his government vitalized the 20 year old vision of the country to play the role of a vanguard in making bilateral and multilateral relations with third-world countries especially African and Latin American countries.

The analysis of Ahmdinejad's foreign policy according to the critical theory assumption of international relations. Justice is a concept whose authority is obvious among many philosophical schools and in various courses. Justice has always been one of the bases for classification of the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Ahmadinejad's government emphasized justice in its foreign policy. Critical theorists of international relations have emphasized justice more than any other concept. Since the concept of justice has been and is disputable, the difference between its definition among critical theorists of international relations and Ahmadinejad's definition of this concept is not unexpected. However, nobody doubts that injustice exists in the current situation and the prevailing international order. The critical theory convinces one that the current system is unjust in international arenas and it seeks to change the status quo to establish the world justice. Many critical theorists, such as Robert Kaks, believed that any attempt to establish sustainable global peace without considering the conditions for establishment of justice and removal of injustice will be useless and basically, sustainable peace depends on establishment of justice in the world.

According to the evidence, the ninth government paid careful attention to justice in its foreign policy principles. For instance, Ahmadinejad spoke about the importance and necessity of justice in international relations in the general assembly of the UN in March of 2005. According to him, "The Islamic Republic of Iran wants peace based on justice and idealism not only for Iranian people and Muslim nations but also for all people

of the world". Thus, in his speech in the UN, Ahmadinejad introduced the justice factor as the basic principle in international relations. He held that reliance, hope and understanding and cooperation of governments and people is needed to achieve global peace. As he put it, practicing justice in ruling organizations leads to expansion and deepening of international justice (Ferd, 2006).

Generally, the need of justice in international relations was repeated frequently not only in Ahmadinejad's speech but also in the position of the head of Iran's diplomacy, Manochehr Motaki, the minister of foreign affairs, as he declared justice as the one of the two major principles of Iran's foreign policy. He restated "the approach of justice is reflected in Iran's foreign policy", as he actually tried to shape it up as a behavior in international arenas. He also announced, "the Islamic Republic of Iran is interested to be a guid in the pursuit of international justice" and "the foreign policy of the ninth government includes strengthening dialogues based on justice and recognizing right of countries to play their role in creating a new and just global system (Manoochehr, 1965).

During the presidency of Ahmadinejad, the objective of the Islamic Republic of Iran in support of the oppressed, as one of the aspects of justice in foreign policy, was to defend the rights and ideals of Palestinians and the positions of anti-Zionist. However, this support, especially for Palestine was one of the sustainable ideals of the Islamic Republic of Iran but it seems the support was greatly strengthened with the start of Israeli 22-day war that aimed to destroy Hamas or at least destroy its military power. So, Gaze became the first priority of the country's diplomacy. In this regard, diplomatic efforts were made to describe Zionist regime's crimes in Gaze with the aim of prosecuting Israeli officials in international courts and getting them condemned by the Human Rights Council of the UN. As a result, Israel was renounced strongly in the final resolution of the council. Iran could also persuade Venezuela, one of its allies in Latin America, to keep up with the policies of the Islamic Republic. Therefore, this country supported Hamas, expelled the Israeli ambassador and cut off its relations with that country (Mohammadtagi, 1967).

The criticism of the situation and the possibility of changing the international system by Ahmadinejad's government: One of the principles of the critical theory is the criticism of the politico-economic situation, getting rid of it and providing a favorable future for the world where justice and equality can replace discrimination, violence and inequality. It seems the view that ruled the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government. He wanted to change the situation that is known as the symbol of injustice and exploitation. It seems Ahmadinejad's government, like critical theorists, believed that a violent structure governs the relations in the international system and that this situation arises from the hegemonic nature of relations among the units of that system. Hence, with this belief of injustice, efforts began for changing and finishing the unfair situation which is the most important feature that the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government had in common with the critical theory of international relations.

One of the assumptions of the critical theory is the possibility of change in the international system. International theorists that speak about this possibility usually set it only as an issue that cannot be evaluated with certainty. However, critical theorists tend to explain developments in clear-cut terms. In general, what matters for critical theorists includes backing up normative ethics in international relations, reduction of global inequalities, establishment of international justice, as well as respect for diversity, plurality and difference (Elham, 1972). All it suggests is that the critical theory calls for a change in the international system and the world order. It also suggests that the theory criticizes the situation for the sake of freedom from domination and looks for the control of structures that cause discrimination and inequality.

One of the aims of the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government seems to have been determination and description of conditions that have led to injustice in the world order and domination in the global system. Ahmadinejad spent most of his energy and diplomatic power on describing and analysing the adverse international facts. For example the central theme of his speech in the sixty first session of the UN General Assembly in September 2006 was description of the unfair situation or the injustice in the international system and a relationship of force, aggression and discrimination in that regard (In the twelfth summit of Shanghai cooperation organization, he states the order governing the world has failed because of its innate injustice and inhumane features. He also declared that "inefficiency and discrimination in the current world order has come to a critical point and imposed unnecessary distractions on all people. The current world order has failed because of its innate injustice and inhumane features and it is at the end of the way".

By raising the question of whether continuing to move with the systematic framework whose principles were set by former colonizers and today's Taliban can make our countries progress and completely attain their goals, Ahmadinejad said "all of us want to get rid of the

current order and design new systems to achieve our goals, set up the systems based on justice, look for lasting peace and prosperity for everyone, renounce the current monopolized management and provide public participation in global matters" (Firoozabadi *et al*., 1967).

Obviously, the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government matched the approach of international relations prescribed by the critical theory on the need and importance of changes in the current international order and system. In fact, critical theorists know changes in the international system a requisite with which to establish fair conditions in international relations. This implies that theorists consider the current system unjust and discriminatory. Also, Ahmadinejad's government emphasized the need of change in the system of international relations and establishment of justice in foreign policy.

Among critical theorists, Kaks holds the most revolutionary views about the change in the international system and wants to unite countries in an opposition against the present international structure. He believes that, to achieve alterations, we can use the internal contradictions of the current order to challenge it and achieve a more equitable global order. In his opinion, social movements and anti-hegemonic forces are the best power for challenging political and institutional arrangements (Mohsen, 1967). It was with the presidency of Ahmadinejad and the establishment of extensive political, economic and commercial relations with Latin American countries, African and non-alignment movement that an orientation to the east took place in the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. This orientation, as one of the principles of his foreign policy, matches the view of Robert Kaks about the role of anti-hegemonic forces in alteration of the current international system.

Actually, after redefinition of Iran's foreign relations with the west, one of the areas of interest for new ties emerged to be third-world countries and developing nations represented mostly by the non-alignment movement (Aliakbar, 1945). "Non-Aligned In general, the positions of the Islamic Republic of Iran expressed in the speeches of its officials in the movement summits include a request for promoting the global role of the movement in international arenas, especially in political and economic relations, attempts to correct unilateral and discriminatory trends, attention to the high political capacities of the movement as the representative of the majority of the global community, use of its capacity to settle international conflicts and development of peace and quietness, strengthening of the non-alignment movement via wider interaction and upgrading and mediating members relations, a general review in the goals and structures of the security council of UN and realization of permanent membership with the right of veto in the security council based on justice (Homeira, 1964a, b). In other words, Ahmadinejad's government hoped to reform the global system and create a new global system based on justice and respect for the rights of all nations by promoting the non-alignment movement in the international arena. After formation of his government in 2005, extension of diplomatic, cultural and economic relations and paying more attention to multilateral relations to African countries were the most important foreign policy approaches of Iran (Mohsen, 1967). or example, Ahmadinejad visited Banjul, the capital of Zambia, in 2006 and as a special guest, participated in the eighth summit of the African Union. Regardless of his other trip to Dakar (in March of 2007) for participation in the OLC summit, he once again arranged a visit to three African countries including Kenya, Djibouti and Comoros in 2008. He formed a deputy position for Africa in the ministry of foreign affairs and opened two Iranian embassies in Zambia and Gabon in order to institutionalize Islamic republic relations with African countries and promote cooperation. The ninth government also took steps for holding an Iran-Africa summit in Tehran and made medium- and long-term strategic plans for development of relations with Africa Firoozabadi and Sayed, 1967.

Perhaps the most important factors that caused Iran to get close to these countries were its revolutionary and anti-imperialist nature as well as discontent of these countries with the west. In countries like Cuba, Venezuela, Nicaragua and Bolivia, the governments have anti-hegemonic and anti-imperialist policies. Therefore, Iran, with the aim of opening an anti-hegemonic front against America, tries to change the behavior of these countries.

The ninth and tenth governments believed that the discourses of reconstruction and reforms cherished by the previous governments were deviated and far from the principles, values and primary ideals of the Islamic Revolution. The most important aspect of the conservative policy of Ahmadinejad's government was against Israel. Ahmadinejad's emphasis on the elimination of Israel off the map, expressed in an international conference on the Holocaust in Tehran in the presence of domestic and foreign scholars was a radical reaction shown based on the opposition with the USA and Israel. Ahmadinejad emphasized elimination of Israel in his domestic and international speeches for several times, such as in the United Nations and even in the

international conference of Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in Rome and in the anti-racism conference of Durban. Supporting Hamas and Hezbollah in Lebanon also had already found its place in his former speeches and in the speeches of other executive Authorities. Therefore, reaffirmation of the values and ideals of the Islamic Revolution and emphasis on its principles are known as the main features of Ahmadinejad's foreign policy (Ahmad, 1971).

These policies which were based on the statement of change in the international order overlap the critical theory. In other words, this statement explains another principle of in the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government, namely placing emphasis on the values and ideals of the Islamic Revolution in international arenas.

The criticism of international hegemony by Ahmadinejad's government: Another striking point of the critical theory is 'international hegemony'. In this regard, Ahmadinejad and his government had a criticism on the international organization and as announced in his foreign policy, felt a need for reformation in this organization. Hegemony is a concept which reminds of the name 'Gramsci' more than any other one. Critical theorists have highlighted this concept as something that exists and operates strongly in international relations. The critics view the nature and structure of international institutions as a means of endurance for hegemony which conforms to Ahmadinejad's view of international organizations and institutions. Kaks provided a kind of critical theory of international regime with an emphasis on the role of international institutions in holding up hegemony. In his opinion, international institutions "deal with the rules in such a way as to facilitate the expansion of hegemonic world order". According to him, it is hegemonic governments that make international rules on the basis of which international institutions adopt a specific ideological role as to serve the political, social and economic benefits of great powers (Homeira, 1964ab). During the eight-year presidency of Ahmadinejad, the legitimacy, acceptability and performance of some regional assemblies and institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, were put to question because of what is claimed as their biased operations as well as dependence on capitalism. The UN, especially the Security Council, was criticized more than ever and the necessity of restructuring it, reforms in decision-making methods and having orientations of justice was emphasized. For instance, he strongly criticized the structure and mechanism of the United Nation and the Security Council in the UN General Assembly and demanded for reforms in it.

As mentioned above, the legitimacy of international institutions and the rules that govern them were repeatedly put to doubt. As an instance, he stated that, "the structure and procedure of the Security Council do not respond to the expectations of the current generation and today's needs of humanity. Since its structure and procedure are the legacy of World War II, the UN cannot act clearly, fairly and democraticly on behalf of the international community; therefore, it is not legitimate either. Unless the UN structure and procedure are modified, injustice, oppression and bullying cannot be expected to be eradicated. So, today, new reforms in the Security Council are needed more than ever (Mahmood, 1965).

Mahmood Ahmadinejad considered the unjust and discriminatory structure and the domination of great powers after the Second World War as the cause of the ineffectiveness and illegitimacy of international organizations, above all the UN and mentioned, "ineffectiveness of the United Nation is because of the ineffectiveness of its structure caused by the conditions after the second world war. The structure of the United Nation was designed in accordance with the post-war situation. This impact is visible at its top center, namely the Security Council. The levels of decisions in the council are due to the political blocks formed among the great powers over the past sixty years. Although the Security Council should be based on justice and human rights, decision making is subject to the interests of the superpowers and political trade-offs. This is why the council is not able enough to guarantee peace, security and realization of nations rights (Mahmood, 1965).

The following items include the behavioral patterns of Ahmadinejad's government versus international institutions and organizations especially the Security Council: Non-compliance with the provisions of the council resolutions and the statements of other international institutions like the International Atomic Energy Agency (Mnoochehr, 1965).

Consideration of the Security Council resolutions as scraps of paper. As a reaction to the third Security Council resolution number 1803, Ahmadinejad warned the UN that "any new resolution against Iran's peaceful and legal nuclear program will be a shot fired at the Security Council, as the pillar of the UN. So, don't ruin the credit of the Security Council with this action". Furthermore, in an exclusive interview with the Spanish EL Pais newspaper and in response to the question "What do you do with the new Security Council resolution?", he clarified, "We will do just as we have done with the previous resolutions"(Mahmood, 1965).

Suspension of Iran's voluntary transparency activities, such as stopping the implementation of the additional protocol; Setting up more sections to the enrichment facilities, such as more waterfalls, in response to the Security Council actions (Mohammadtagi, 1967).

In general, the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran during the presidency of Ahmadinejad in the face of the dominant international system was affected by such factors as the negative procedures and operations of international institutions in issues like the nuclear program of Iran and the reactive criticisms of the country on the structures of those institutions, especially the UN Security Council. So, the Iranian government tried to show its dissatisfaction with the current situation and to question the legitimacy of the dominant rule of international organizations through speeches here and there in world economic and political circles. An analysis of Ahmadinejad's speeches in relation to regimes and international institution denotes the point that, based on his beliefs, international organizations like the UN have belonged to the two blocks of the East and the West since the very beginning. In other words, such organizations have been used by superpowers as a guarantee for their hegemony as well as maintaining of the bipolar system during the Cold War. However, after the collapse of the Soviet Union and emergence of the USA as an unrivaled superpower, the organization converted to a means of dominance for that country. On this basis, other countries can neither use the potentials of this organization nor convert it to a tool for defending their rights. Accordingly, it is believed this hegemony should be replaced with a just and fair system.

The program of freedom from dominant international structures in Ahmadinejad's government: In the analysis of the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government from the perspective of the critical theory, the concept of 'emancipation' plays a key role. Indeed, this concept is the core of the critical theory. Some theorists have defined emancipation in different ways. From Linklater's point of view, it is defined as freedom, ruling the fate and ability of making initiatives (Linkliter, 1992).

Ken Booth deems emancipation as something that involves freedom of men and nations from constraints that limit their choices and actions. Richard Ashley defines the concept as freedom from unverified restrictions, relationships of domination, communications and distorted understandings which deprive man of the ability to achieve his future through will and full knowledge. As for emancipation in the critical theory, the concept is seen as the freedom or autonomy of nations and marginalized people in international arenas from the structures of domination and suppression possibly through criticism and altering of global economic and political relations which underlie injustice and inequality. The emphasis of emancipation is, thus, on the abolition of dominating structures and elimination of suppression in international relations.

Perhaps emancipation can be placed in anti-domination and anti-arrogance programs for fighting the unipolar system and dominating empires. It is a struggle with the monopoly of power at the global level which Ahmadinejad's government undertook. Although anti-domination and anti-arrogance policies had existed in different ways in the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran, with the rise of Ahmadinejad and the dominant discourse of his government, it was given a special priority and importance. He believed that an anti-arrogance or anti-domination movement had to be formed so that all free nations, just and fair man and free thinkers could cooperate to fight the domination system in a common front (Mahmood, 1965). In its foreign policy, his government tried so much to realize the anti-domination principle and cope with dominating structures and arrogance. This aim was followed in the format of Third World-ism by setting up relations with Latin American countries especially Venezuela, spreading economic and political relations with African countries and non-aligned nations and adopting the policy of looking to the East. Therefore, the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran in this period established an anti-hegemonic and unilateral orientation with governments which were in contrast to economic and political unjust structures.

To establish economic and political relations on the basis of justice and anti-domination normative requirements, the ninth government chose regions that had governments agaist the global domination, or at least those that did not seek domination. Accordingly, Manoochehr Mottaki emphasized the serious orientation of Iran's foreign policy towards Asian, African and Latin American countries (Manoochehr, 1965). Mahmood Ahmadinejad held that what made him expand relations with certain governments was their distance from claims of domination. In this regard, he mentioned, "relations with the neighboring countries, African countries, South America, friend countries and those that have no claim of domination are a priority of our foreign policy" (Mahmood, 1965). As it can be seen, these policies, the emphasis on anti-domination principles and the struggle with dominant and arrogant structures in the foreign

policy of Ahmadinejad's government conform to the claims of the critical theory which aims at releasing man from injustice in the global policy and economy that are under the control of hegemonic powers.

Summary: There exist consistencies and inconsistencies between the critical theory of international relations and the foreign policy as proposed and practiced by Ahmadinejad's government. Perhaps the most important feature that can account for the distinction of these two approaches is their intellectual foundations. That is, while one lays its criticism, restructuring and rethinking of the structure dominating the international system on the basis of general human rationality, the other seeks it through Islamic assumptions.

CONCLUSION

A study is conducted of the principles of the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government according to the critical theory of international relations. it is concluded that, although he emphasized the concept of justice in international relations as one of the principles of his foreign policy, it did not match the concept of justice in the critical theory. He considered domination of Islamic and revolutionary values and norms as justice in international arenas. In other words, both the critical theory and Ahmadinejad's attitude agree on the same point that what should not exist is inequality and injustice of economic and political types in the international system. However, what makes a distinction between them is what justice is. Whether or not the definition of justice held by the critical theory of international relations is wise and humanistic is a matter of subjectivity. As a result, it is believed the values dominating international relations should not only come from human intellect but also ensure that all human beings be treated in the same way regardless of their religion and culture. It seems that Ahmadinejad's view was derived from meta-rational religious attitudes which would give floor to both rational and irrational actions. On the basis of such attitudes it is, thus, not necessary to consider facts. In contrast, the critical theory which is based on historical dialectics, makes criticisms of the current situation and tries to take it step by step toward rational and moral perfection. Ignoring the radical beliefs of Marcuse, the mainstream of the theory, thus, prescribes making gradual, not revolutionary, moves ahead.

Although, there are common grounds on which the critical theory and Ahmadinejad's opinion stand, namely the necessity of practicing justice in the current unfair international system, the one feature that makes a manifest distinction between them is the way they look at the issue ideologically. While the critical theory assumes the structure of international system is ideological due to the joining of capitalism and liberalism and wants to make it non-ideological and not replace it with another ideology, Ahmadinejad wanted to make changes on the basis of a religious ideology. The critical theory of international relations believes capitalist countries use institutions, organizations, rules and media to establish and follow a special ideological cognition which is the common sense of all nations. Thus, their best solution for patterning that ideological cognition upon the needs and desires of the global public is to use inter-subjective dialogues based on the underlying structures of wisdom and language. To do so, the structure of the international system should be de-ideologized. This is in sharp contrast to the foreign policy of the ninth and tenth governments in Iran which tried to replace the capitalist ideology with the Shiite Islamic ideology.

Regarding emancipation which is the core concept of the critical theory, one can say it is both rejection of domination and construction of a desirable society. In other words, emancipation has two negative and positive sides. On its negative side, the critical theory tries to break hegemony and unequal relations that dominate the structure of the international system. In this respect, there seems to be a consistency between the critical theory of international relations and the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad's government. However, there is a difference between them in that human beings should be free from any restriction except rational restrictions. While, the critical theory of international relations considers human rationality as the only final authority and tries to manage the international system structures based on it, the foreign policy of the ninth and tenth governments defined emancipation as a struggle with physical restrictions on one hand and with remarks and practices against Islamic values on the other hand. Thus, according to the positive side of emancipation in the critical theory, this concept takes places on the basis of historical dialectics. It means that rationality is used for criticism of the current situation in the international system on the purpose of boosting or improving it which is a process found in the history. Therefore, with the presence of this rationality in the critical theory, it is less likely to have revolutions or sudden and violent changes. In contrast as the foreign policy of Ahmadinejad' government suggested, emancipation would require revolutionary actions. It means that the structure of the international system should suddenly collapse and be replaced with the political structure of Shiite Islam and its values or at least the values of the third world.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, H.B.F., 1971. Survey of the ninth and tenth governments foreign policy's operation in providing national interests. Specific J. Political Sci., 20: 7-38.

Ali, D.B. and M. Shafiee, 1973. Study of Iran's Foreign Policy in the Light of the Theory of Constructivism. TISSA-UUM-Publication, Tehran, Iran,.

Aliakbar, A., 1945. Non-Aligned Movement from the First to 1985. Soroosh Publication, Tehran, Iran,.

Alireza, A., 1971. The Frameworks and Orientations of Islamic Republic of Iran's Foreign Policy. 2nd Edn., Ghomes Publication, Tehran, Iran,.

Alireza, S., 1968. Foreign policy of the ninth government towards Latin America, in foundation ruling and practical policy of the ninth government in international relations. The Center of Research and Documentation of Presidency, Tehran, Iran.

Cox, R., 1981. Social forces, states and world orders: Beyond international relations theory. Millennium, 2: 126-155.

Elham, R.S., 1972. Survey of revolutionary developments of Arabic countries from the perspective of liberalism, constructivism and critical theory of international relations. J. Foreign Relat., 2: 221-243.

Fard, P. and Z.Z. Bahador, 1969. Islamic justice and critical discourse in Iran's foreign policy. J. Politics Faculty Law Political Sci. Newspaper, 3: 75-92.

Firoozabadi, D. and J. Sayed, 1967. Foreign policy of Liberation: Critical theory and foreign policy of Islamic Republic of Iran. Foreign Policy J., 2: 302-328.

Firoozabadi, D., J. Sayed and N. Vahid, 1971. The Foreign Policy of Islamic Republic of Iran in Fundamentalism Era. Imam Sadegh University, Tehran, Iran,.

Firoozabadi, D.J., 1966. Justice fundamentalism discourse in foreign policy of Ahmadinejad government. Two J. Political Sci., 5: 67-98.

Fred, R., 2006. Introduction in the Cambridge Companion to Critical Theory, Edited. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, UK.,.

Habermas, J., 1989. The Structural Transformation of Public Sphere: An Inquiry into the Category of Bourgeois Society. MIT Press, Cambridge, England, UK.,.

Homeira, M., 1964. Evolution in Theories of International Relations. 10th Edn., Samt Publication, Tehran, Iran,.

Homeira, M., 1964. Review of critical theory in international relations. Faculty Law Political Sci. Mag., 67: 225-249.

Lapid, Y., 1989. The third debate: On the prospects of international theory in a post-positivist era. Intl. Stud. Q., 33: 235-254.

Linklater, A., 1992. The question of the next stage in international relations theory: A critical-theoretical point of view. Millennium J. Intl. Stud., 21: 77-98.

Mahmood, A., 1965. Part of the Press and Media Interview of President with Domestic and Foreign Reporters. Islamic Republic News Agency, Tehran, Iran,.

Manoochehr, M., 1965. Foreign Policy of the Ninth Government, one Year Later. Middle East Strategic Research Center, Tehran, Iran,.

Mohammadreza, D., 1965. Survey of the Ninth Government's Foreign Policy, Continuity and Change. Diplomatic News Magazine, Tokyo, Japan,.

Mohammadtaghi, H., 1967. Iranian nuclear issue, great challenge. Second Harvest J., 7: 87-112.

Mohsen, M., 1967. Islamic Republic of Iran's relations and Africa: Strategy of relations in framework 20-years-old landscape. Foreign Policy J., 2: 479-514.

Smith, S., 2002. The United States and the discipline of international relations: Hegemonic country, hegemonic discipline. Intl. Stud. Rev., 4: 67-85.

Vahid, N., 1969. Priorities of geographical-conscience in foreign policy of the ninth government. J. Political, 1969: 27-52.