

The Comparison of Key Concepts of Critical Theory and the Islamic Theory of International Relationships Regarding to International Peace

Alireza Koohkan¹

Abstract

Frankfurt School's critical theory, derived from the ideology of Herbert Marcuse and Jürgen Habermas et al. was put forward by Robert Cox, Andrew Linklater, and Marc Hoffmann into the realm of international relationships. It will be discussed in the framework of the third debate of international relationships. The concepts represented in this theory are highly similar to those in the Islamic theory within international policy and foreign policy. Thus, the question here is the degree to which these concepts can be employed in order to extend the Islamic theory of international relationships. The present paper is going to determine the degree to which such concepts as freedom, knowledge, mutual understanding, hegemony structure, international clampdown, and the like, which are frequently used in the Islamic international policy literature as the foundation of critical theory related to international peace, are comparable. The first hypothesis of this research is that above-mentioned concepts have only verbal similarities and not interchangeable in the level of ontology and epistemology. In order to explain the main concepts of critical theory, this research, used analytical, descriptive method based on major resources employment. In fact, it answers the question utilizing the major resources being used in the Islamic international relationships literature.

Keywords

Islamic Theory of International Relationships, Critical Theory, Frankfurt School, Freedom, Hegemony Structure, Clampdown, Knowledge, International Peace.

1. Associate professor in International relationships, Allameh Tabatabaee University.
E-Mail: Kohkan@atu.ac.ir

Introduction

Among the latest theories about international relationships is “the critical theory” having roots in the critical discussion of “Frankfurt school”. According to this theory governments are one of major causes of insecurity and of international security problem which should be changed in favor of human security. Instrumental rationality of modern society is criticized by critic theorists while new rationality with critical and rethinking quality has been emphasized (Omidi, 1389: 1).

Max Horkheimer believes that the greatest duty of wisdom is enlightenment, that is to reject what at present is called “intellect”. In fact, the goal of enlightenment is to rescue humans from superstition and fear, while intellect brings hegemony instead of emancipation, and this fight of intellect against enlightenment within the framework of modern instrumental wisdom has changed humans into serious critics of thinkers of modern time (Hiuz, 1378: 170).

Adornor repeated claims of Horkheimer about scientific sciences and assessed the evolution of sciences within the process of social evolutions. His most important discussions included the criticism of positivism, rejection of separation of acquaintance agent for acquaintance subject, emphasis on the integrity of society and social essence of science, rejection of separation of value from knowledge, rejection of any kind of scientific support and specific base in research and interaction of individuals and society. This change in decisive arguments led to the emergence of a new framework in the study of international relationships.

Also Habermas, another famous thinker of Frankfurt, believes that scientific objectivity is a function of glorificational interests of

individuals and mere objectivity (reality) is impossible. Basically, glorificational interests make achievable the relation between the actor and the object of identification. He also represents his critical thinking foundation around criticism of positivism in relation to methodology (Oshavit, 1381: 315).

The following shows the characteristics of critical theories of Frankfurt School theoreticians:

1. emphasis on the existing state rather than accepting it as self-evident;
2. rejection of holistic model of natural sciences within the social sciences realm;
3. rejection of non-historical and non-critical understanding of positivists;
4. emphasis on historical and social conditions of knowledge even in natural sciences;
5. emphasis on historical and social identity of the actor and identification object;
6. believing in the link between different realms of social life and scientific activity as well as emphasis on the entire reality and society;
7. rejection of the science as the only form knowledge;
8. rejection of any absolute and meta-historical fact inside human or outside it;
9. rejection of separation of science from human values and interests;

10. believing in a dialectic relation between the meaning and the instance;

Individual and society essence and accident, potential and actual reality, common and select, form and contents, and...

These characteristics clearly emphasize on the importance of history and rejection of positivistic concepts. In this theory, such concepts as freedom, knowledge, mutual understanding, hegemony structure and international oppression have been defined that have subtle similarities to Islamic concepts because of their critical identity against modern intellect, while yet they have differential lines against each other. In fact the contrast field of concepts of these two approaches will be highly extensive and also fruitful. On the other hand, the emergence of the political Islam as an effective power on international relations rejects the major secularistic theories of international relations about non-effectiveness of religion on international evolutions; because non of those theories believe in the determined role of religion in international policy (Dehghani Firoozabadi, 1389: 18). The present paper is going to answer the question of to which degree such concepts as freedom, knowledge, mutual understanding, hegemony structure, and international oppression and the like, which are highly used in the political international literature of Islamic theory and form the critical theory foundation, are linked to the international peace.

The first hypothesis of this paper says that the above-mentioned concepts are only verbally similar which are not exchangeable at the level of ontology and epistemology. This is a descriptive, analytical research, on the basis of using main resources to explain major concepts of critical theory and employing reference resource-

es used in Islamic theory literature of international relations to answer the main question of the paper. To do so, first the theoretical bases of Frankfurt School critical theory will be mentioned and then, the most important concepts of that theory will be discussed. Then, the Islamic theory of international relations will be discussed from its meta-theoretical dimension. Afterwards, the concepts mentioned in the preceding part of the paper will be defined from the Islamic viewpoint. In the next part of the paper, the major Islamic concepts and the critical theory in international relations forming the international peace will be compared and finally, the conclusion will be represented.

1. Critical Theory

“Max Horkheimer” and “Theodor Adorno” two German Neo-marxist philosophers and sociologists established the Frankfurt School and the “dialectic-critical” theory in 1980 in the social research institute of Frankfurt city which was also known as “the critical social philosophy”, (Ibrahimi et. Al, 1386: 66). Frankfurt School’s theoreticians follow Hegel’s philosophy and in some subordinate tendencies they follow Immanuel Kant.

The common feature of all existing attitudes in this school is their incompatibility with the dominating conditions and the criticism of existing relations in the society. This causes the ideologists of this school to criticize different branches of scientific and philosophic realms within their specialized topics. In spite of its several roots, the critical theory is narrowly related to the thinking path of Frankfurt school, (Devetak, 1996: 147). Generally speaking, the critical school deals with the criticism of the society and diverse

epistemologic systems with the final aim of revelation of realities of society more clearly.

2. Critical Theory Bases

2-1. Ontology in Critical Theory

Ontology deals with whatever exists and with the identity of the world. The critical theory has been mainly formed to reject the positivist theory;

because it is different from it from diverse viewpoints. Positivists believe that the social world creatures are basically objective and beyond human knowledge, which is a mental fact (Iman, 1388: 51), and reality is a completely objective fact being managed by natural rules. Critics, against positivists emphasize on mind and historical reality (superstructure in Marx's thinking). It is the historical and procedural state of reality that separates the critical from positivist and activates the role of human in it. Thus, the social reality is constantly changing, having roots in roles, conflicts, and contradictions existing in social relations or institutions (Craib, 1381: 77). Critics also see the entire existence and its components in the social entirety. For them, the existence as well as its components, and also the components altogether form the social life are not separate, because they are linked to each other, in the social entirety. Thus, any change in a component leads to the change of other components. Therefore, any social change should take place in its entirety.

2-2. Epistemology in the Critical Theory

The critical theory takes a critical approach in its viewpoint, and accordingly, speaks about critical science. They consider the public knowledge as false knowledge that leads to untrue understanding, and thus causing people to act against themselves. This kind of knowledge contributes to alienation of humans and the only way to escape from it, is resorting to critical science. Critical science doesn't limit itself to mere observation in order to recognize underlying structures and layers of reality. It believes that penetration to the underlying levels of reality and watching conflicts and contradictions is necessary in order to know realities and make changes (Craib, 1381: 99). Critical theory speaks about the place to achieve knowledge. Contrary to postmodernism, critical theory accepts the existence of external knowledge. This knowledge which is known as minimal foundationalism, is the product of an agreement between mental awareness of scientists and the owners of power in any realm. But it is very different from the public theories and main course which believe in the external knowledge (Price and Reusmit, 1999: 262).

2-3. Anthropology in Critical Theory

Critics believe that, firstly, humans have high capabilities in creative power, determination, and free will, and they are never passive (contrary to positivists). They emphasize on human activities and the way those activities impact on more extensive social structures. Secondly, there are diverse realities and situations outside humans that limit them in such a way that humans exploit each other according to their own social situation, and deceitfully impose their beliefs to others by giving untrue information to them. Some action that people do against each other, are not the result of

their own knowledge and choice (Eftekhari, 1388: 228). According to critics, there is a dialectic relationship between humans and their environment. The capable human changes his environment by employing real knowledge through revolution and according to the rules of the history, and emancipates himself. But weak human is submissive in the existing conditions of his environment. He receives information from aware people and by revolution get out of submission and obtains new identities.

2-4. Methodology in Critical Theory

More than anything, critics have criticized positivism and its methodology. They believe that positivism accredits only experimental method for identification, while it is insufficient and delusive, without capability to understand different levels of social life. Critics suggest that since reality has several levels and what is seen at the external level of reality is different from what exists at the deeper levels, so the external visible surface cannot be the representative of underlying structures or causal mechanisms at the deeper level of the society. Causal mechanisms at the practical level have internal contradictions and create structural conflicts. These contradictions can be explored and understood dialectically (Mohammadpour, 1389: 447). According to the principle of contrast and dialectic, this theory is determined to reject separation between reality and value, objectivity and subjectivity, and theory and practice.

3. Concepts of Critical Theory and its Approach toward International Relations

This theory in the international relation realm was a response to the dominance of neorealism and neoliberalism (based on the project of enlightenment, rationalism).

Pointing to the modernity crisis, this approach considers progressive thoughts of 20th and 19th centuries as insufficient and believes that in spite of their early goals, these thoughts are only new forms of slavery in the shape of Nazism and Stalinism (Ghavam, 1384: 192). Critical theory, based on the liberating viewpoint, criticizes the existing conditions and represents an ideal future of the world. Believing in the positive peace, this theory criticizes rationalistic theories because of their inattention to the structural harshness. From this viewpoint, it considers injustice, discrimination, racism, class society, poverty, hunger, and environmental and hygienic crises as the products of inattention to structural harshness. Thus it condemns the power division according to international system and introduces it as the factor of inattention and discrimination toward the Southern society, third world and other groups of power margin. Critical theory seeks to free human beings from chains made by international relations. It wants to change the tendency and operations of governments of governments.

3-1. The Meaning of Liberation in Critical Theory

For critical school, “being free” means to have the right to determine one’s fate and ability to decide about one’s affairs. The main goal of the critical researcher is to pass the realm of necessity and to reach the realm of human freedom. Critical theory criticizes both, the existing system, and the type of social relationships dominating it. Meanwhile, it tries to change that system. It seeks to

form theories that clearly are committed to reveal and abolish dominance structures. Critical theoreticians want to liberate humanity from oppressive system of global diplomacy and global economic which are controlled by hegemonic powers. They want to reveal the real identity of more rich North's hegemony upon poor South. They are clearly political. They support liberating ideologies and advance them. Defining emancipation, Ashley considers it as the guarantee of freedom from unrecognized limitations, hegemonic relationships and deviated relation conditions that mean denial of human beings' capacity to make their own future based on complete awareness and will power. As Devetak suggests emancipation is demand for independence or the right to make one's own fate. It also means effort to achieve security for entire humanity; the security which is not limited to governments, rather extends and encompasses the entire social relationships in all societies. On the other hand, Cox points to unrightfully distribution of international institutions and shows how they act for the benefit of capitalist countries and help them to exploit others and advance hegemony around the world (Ashley, 1981: 227). Freedom is obtained through intersubjective understanding, discourse morality, critical interaction and resistance against hegemonic powers. Critical deliberation also comprises criticism and study of human mental data and limiting structures in order to explore and change deviations, ambiguities and sophistries that have been formed during human history and international system. These are the very structures that have been accepted as natural and real phenomena because of their prevalence, and dominance of hegemony, creating social limitations. Therefore, freedom necessitates and comprises political, social, and moral reformations in regional and interna-

tional community (Firoozabadi, 1387: 142). This is the goal that is not realizable within the instrumental rationalistic framework, but obtainable based on communicational-moral and critical-idealistic rationalism, because these hegemonic oppressive systems themselves are created by distorted use of wisdom across the world (Lochet, 1377: 288-295).

3-2. International Peace in Critical Theory

In the character represented from the world by critical theories “systematic violence” is replaced by peace. The term “systematic violence” is a key term in critical theory. It has been used specially by Johan Galtung to describe capitalism.

In definition of this kind of harshness it has been said that systematic harshness results from the hegemony-like quality of relationship among units. Self-estrangement-colonialism, exploitation, and,... are among key concepts existing in the heart of this relationship. Maybe the term “hegemony and submission” can be a good and useful interpretation of systematic harshness. These studies were a response to the traditional approach of peace and security, and the starting point of criticism of governments as the authority of peace and security in the modern paradigm. Thinkers of this ideology consider governments with national sovereignty as an important factor of insecurity and peace violation. Permanent peace is achievable by people and groups only when they don't deprive others from it. Achieving this goal is possible when security is considered as the process of freedom (Baylis, 1385: 572). Critics used such concepts as freedom and self-determination in their peace literature. Accordingly, there is a direct relation

among peace, absence of threat, self-determination, and freedom (Asgari, 1383: 43). Here, freedom means to emancipate people, both, individually, and in groups, from limiting and preventive factors in all economic, political, social, and cultural realms. This process should be according to the freedom of free will and right of choice on an equal basis in order to reduce barriers on the way of humans to meet their needs (Abdollahkhani, 1382: 25). Critics believe that “hegemonic global system” is the same with “appropriate co-ordination of etiologic power and material institutions” and it is a form of hegemony created from woven strings of social and political power. Hegemonic leadership acts for the benefit of itself more than what appears, while it uses “public or global benefits” when speaking. Antonio Gramsci believes that hegemony involves giving privileges to the dominant class who has forced other classes to submit when distributing power by convincing them that they are not being exploited. Cox points to unrightfully distribution of existing international institutions and shows how they act for the benefit of capitalist countries and help them to exploit other countries and advance their own hegemony across the world (Moshirzadeh, 1384: 57). Powers that weaken hegemony are called antihegemonic powers that can advent both, in governmental form (the coalition of third world countries), and in the form of non- governmental actors.

3-3. Hegemony System in Critical Theory

Within the framework of hegemony and cultural dependence, many contemporary thinkers and critical researchers on the hegemony of global capitalism, have focused on imperialism as an ex-

tensive phenomenon based on hegemonic relations and dependence of central and peripheral countries. They have assessed the imperialistic characteristics within the recent relations. From this point of view, the current global order includes a series of historical structures that have become “more liberal” and more merchandized” because of capital restructure and moving toward the right political center. This process involves spatial extension and social deepening of economic liberal definitions of the goal of community and individualistic and possessive action and policy patterns (Gill, 1385: 235). For Gill the structure of the present world’s political power involves a historical super national block with regional varieties whose center is formed by super national capital, G7 governmental administrations. Criticals, suggest that super industrial governments’ efforts to promote globalization in the direction of stabilization of unrightful current situation is in favor of them. Critical theory says that in the presents globalization realm, neoliberal political-economic principles and institutions are dominant. In this viewpoint, the disciplinarian neoliberalism has been embedded as the ideology of capitalism with the maro-level of power in the form of modernity of legal like structure of government and international political frames under the title of new rule of the law. New rule of the law can be defined as the political program of struggle to change the super national liberalism, and if possible, democratic liberal capitalism into the only model of future development.

4. Islamic Theory Principles in International Relations

Since the agreement of Westphalia (1648) analysts of international policy and diplomats of unity and conflicts among nation-coun-

tries have affirmed that they are acting based on the national benefits of those countries, while religion has been limited only at personal affairs and ideological realms. The impacts of Westphalia system are clearly visible in mainly European order of the First World War. In the end of the Second World War the cold war paradigm was reformed, again based on centrality of nation-countries, while the international order encompasses a more complicated set of global actors such as ethnic, tribal, international organizations, and off-limit grouping after the collapse of Berlin Wall. After the cold war and the development of globalism, a new paradigm was formed in international relation with the centrality of religion. In this process (globalism), great religions, and specifically Islam, is of a high importance in different dimensions of human life (economics, culture, politics). Of course global order equations also are highly important (Hansen, 1389: 32-36). Regarding the richness of Islamic culture during past 14 centuries, some ideas can be specified that can strengthen metatheoretical assumptions of Islamic theory in international relations' realm, although they have not taken affirmative form yet, and no recommendation for it as an external evidence.

4-1. Epistemology in Islam

In Islamic thinking language, knowledge means to understand the general features of affairs by employing wisdom. Some Muslim philosophers such as Farabi, Avicena, and Ibne-Roshd have pointed to the possibility of such a knowledge. Of course within this thinking realm (Islamic philosophy), discussion about dimensions, tools, and methods that eventually contribute to intellectual knowledge and specifically the relation of all of them with religion

and religious resources is being continued. In Islamic thinking, knowledge resources establish four basic origins for understanding and perception in the first steps of thinking. First of them is the intellectual origin. In principle, the basic subjects of reflection is put forward within intellectual framework and before acceptance and judgement of wisdom, no discussion starts within the basic subjects or within the realm of scientific philosophy. Second is the revelatory origin (the holy Koran, Maedeh: 110, Ghesas: 7).

For several centuries, man has employed revelation to understand and describe natural phenomena. Revelation has an extensive range of influence in the realm of recommendation and musts and mustn'ts. There are so many situations, where the intellect either doesn't judge, or its final verdict is not peremptory. Revelation can help man to make the best decision in such situations. Third is the experimental origin. There is a great ocean of knowledge beyond man's experimental studies. And finally the fourth resource is the intuitive one that refers to man's heartfelt perception (Nabavi, 1383). In summary, it must be said that the Islamic theory believes in the maximal and complete recognition in its absolute form, and this complete form of knowledge belongs only to Allah; some part of it has been conveyed to man through revelation and the other part is the product of human intellect and experiment.

4-2. Anthropology in Islam

In Islamic ontology, anthropology is of high importance. Religious anthropology is based on Islamic ontology. According to it, some two-dimensional philosophy has control over the Creation system.

The existence of evils has always been together with good-

ness, and both of them, have constantly put their shadow over the world. According to God's will there is not any absolute evil in the Creation system, but good and bad always emerge against each other. It is a principle that the Creation system should be targeted and full of goodness. But the existence of evils also should not be forgotten although evils are not among the final purposes of Creation. Something may be considered by a group of people as evil, while the same phenomenon can be good for another group. For this reason, it can be said that there is no absolute evil in the world (Motahhari, 1379: 125). In Islamic teachings after Allah the most important thing is man and the creation of the world, appointment of prophets, and the descent of heavenly books such as Koran, have all been for the sake of man's salvation. Man's importance is so high that the Shiite School's first Imam has considered man's recognition as the prerequisite of the recognition of Allah (Imam Ali narrated by Tamimi Amed, 1334: 232). Islam introduces man as the best creature made by God, but at the same time says that man's prosperity is dependent on his own free will in God's direction. That is why both, his goals and his life are identified within material and spiritual, this worldly and the other worldly extensive realms and in the framework of religion. In fact, any right of man is considered to be in this framework. Man has inherent greatness and Godly essence in Islam. He possesses his own authority theory and has the capability to develop .Individuals ,from any race and any nation ,are equal enjoying equal greatness and equal rights.

4-3. Methodology in Islam

Islamic ontological and epistemological bases are not compatible

with the separation of methodology of natural sciences and social sciences from one side, and from the other side, they don't agree with the dominance of methodology of natural sciences upon social sciences. But since knowledge realms or scientific fields have common goals, they are common subjects with common destinations forming the same fact, and their research methods are similar. Limitation of methodology will contribute to the insensibility of researcher about the complications of the reality and its different features and layers. Skeptical monism in epistemology is the basis of compound approach in methodology that created a wide range of appropriate and compatible research methods that are used according to situations and problems of any scope (Alamolhoda, 1386: 29). Beside rejecting methodologic monopoly, focusing on foundationalistic approach, employing standard knowledge, observance of characteristics of researcher in the validity of the research, attention to the third level of reality, generalization of understanding mythology from social sciences to natural sciences are among other methodological approach principles resulting from Islamic bases.

4-4. The meaning of freedom in Islam

Islamic thinking believes that freedom is divided to two types of social and spiritual. They suggest that social freedom is not achievable without spiritual freedom. Spiritual freedom is emancipation from the chain of carnal desires. Social freedom means that individuals should have enough opportunity to develop and other people should not interrupt this process. In fact an individual should be free from the limitations made by others (Motahhari, 1388: 41). From Islamic viewpoint, man should accept submission to God in

order to be free from others. Islam emerged to remove social and inward heavy chains from feet and arms of man in order to free him from idols, devil, and superstition. For Islam, the role of some organizations is of high importance in providing and protecting freedom. For example the law-oriented government can provide and protect legal freedom of people in the society. The second organization is the family as the first and most important training center. The third organization is education. In this part, institutions such as schools, universities, and radio and television play an important role in creating the spirits of love of freedom and independence on individuals. Although in religious thinking freedom is considered as a great human value, it is never the highest value. In Islam, the criterion of freedom is material and spiritual interests of individuals and the society, that is, just as social freedom and material interests of the society shouldn't be endangered, the ideality of the society also is very important and respected. Individuals are not allowed to do all kinds of social action. The Islamic and Koranic messages say: "Those who like evils to spread among believers, undoubtedly will receive a dreadful torture in this world and the other world", (Noor: 19). In fact, no one is allowed to spread evils within the society or even to like it.

4-5. International peace in Islam

Peace is an original and important case in Islam with a firm and unbreakable connection with the nature of Islam and its general theory about the world and human life. Islamic teachings, with their distinct and comprehensive attitudes about human quality, consider international relation as inseparable from war and peace; war for ambition and self-preservation, war for monopoly, and war

for elimination of discrimination and realization of social justice. Generally From Islamic viewpoint, war is the product of imbalance between human nature and instincts, in which, instincts overpower human nature (Seyyed Ghotb, 1386: 52).

Islam believes that international area should be away from an anarchy state for the benefit of formation of some international community type and thus find a common identity confirming this concept that the future of international community depends on the behavior its all actors. Such an attitude can moderate indifference or negative nationalism, and create some kind of international sensitivity that leads to the commitment of actors toward each other. This means that the prosperity theory makes us sensitive to the future of international system, and for this reason, we should try to guide others and improve affairs (Eftekhari, 1389:324). Islam believes that the mechanism of peace lies in cutting the roots of war that mainly happens through the negative relationship between human instincts and his nature. Man is inherently interested in peace and hates war, but his dominating instincts sometimes overshadow his deep inherent wish and create conflicts in social relationships (Barznooni, 1384:86-87). Therefore in foreign relations of Islam, neither war is a principle, nor peace is permanent (as realists suggest). Islam believes that peace and war together make the tangible reality of human history. But regarding its universal duty, based on inviting all people toward prosperity and perfection, Islam constantly follows peaceful relationships with foreigner communities and focuses on peaceful coexistence (Sajjadi, 1381:97). On the other hand, Islam recommends fighting against oppression in order to achieve justful peace because it believes that viable peace can be obtained in the light of centrality of social justice and equali-

ty. Therefore, it can be claimed that peace and peaceful relationships are the central parts of Islam because only in the light of its religious convocation they are achievable through taking the advantage of sound competition and wisdom and reasoning. On the other hand, peace is established in the light of justice, while justice necessitates the removal of oppression through the employment of Islamic Jihad. That is why Islam considers honest peace as the central element of social relationships (holy Koran, Nessa: 128). Islam, at the same time points to the matter that inviting people to honest peace is equal to inviting them to justice. Although Islam divides the world to two parts of “Darolharb”(the house of fighting), and “Darolislam”(the house of peace and quiet) it focuses on peaceful existence as an important principle ,and recommends war only for defense (Farati,1389 :260-281).Justice is considered as an important issue (holy Koran.Nessa:135,Hadid:25,Showra:15).In fact, it can be claimed that comprehensive justice is the foundation of universal peace in Islamic theory of international relations. In the Islamic approach toward international relations three vital and interrelated topics are emphasized. They are peace, justice, and Jihad.

4-6. Hegemonic system in Islam

From political Islamic viewpoint, hegemonism, cultural, political, and economic colonialism, and exploitation by a small oppressive opportunist minority upon the great majority of deprived individuals creates the main core of a system based on hegemony. Islamic culture rejects any type of hegemonism that contributes to the separation of people from each other and from their rights specifically

from submission to Allah. From Islamic viewpoint, individuals are not allowed to worship nobody except Allah (holy Koran, Ghesas: 6 and 8, Ghafer: 24, E'raf: 127, Nessa: 46). Hegemonism can have either internal roots; like the action of groups of dictators who oppress nations, or international roots such as governments who exploit nations. Colonialistic policy of great powers of imperialists of West and East can be good examples of this case. Today, in political culture of the world, some terms such as colonialism and imperialism are also used to convey the above-mentioned concepts (Mohammadi, 1377: 33). In its principles, Islam declares that Godly orders have been established on the columns of faith, brotherhood, and good deeds (Al-Banna, 1997: 15). One of characteristics of imperialistic countries in the hegemonic system is access to existing possibilities all around the world. For this reason, universal domination and ownership of belonging of other nations in order to protect their superiority and continue their life are all among the characteristics of great oppressive powers. One method employed by imperialism to protect their domination upon other nations is prevention from the advance of deprived nations. Imperialism is willing to do anything such as attracting elites of third world countries, stonewalling in their developmental plans, employing sanctions and international limitations on different pretexts. Islam is an Ibrahimian religion and a Muslim worships only Allah, and Allah reveals his path to everybody who seeks peace. Islam invites people to have peaceful activities with all others across the world. But war may become inevitable during a time. Allah has mentioned five times when war should take place with the name of jihad, meaning endeavor to maximally employ one's power in the way of Allah (Al-Sheha, 2005: 45). According to Islamic ideals the quali-

ty of power distribution within the political international relations is unequal, in violation of rights of nations and weak countries.

Distribution of natural and material resources of power is not equal at universal level and what happens in tangible international political structure is the product of unequal political relations, exercise of hegemony, impression of great powers and political dependence of dominated countries. On the other hand, the quality of power distribution, has led to the formation of bipolar and multipolar international relations system in the contemporary history of international relations and the world has been divided among great poles or powers. This unequal distribution of power has contributed to promotion of structural dependence of weak countries on strong countries and consequently powerful countries give themselves the right to intervene the affairs of other nations (Dehshiri, 1379: 268). Accordingly, the matter of competition of great powers in such a system is the belongings of oppressed nations and they consider themselves as the owners of resources of weak countries, and often they compete or even conspire to plunder their natural belongings. Within this atmosphere the oppressors consisting of superpowers and great powers are against the oppressed nations consisting of a few Islamic countries and the remainder of the third world, and they are seeking to have a higher level of authority upon Muslims and other third world nations. They try to culturally alienate people from each other in such a way that they forget themselves and be attracted by two superpowers of the West and the East. And the most unfortunate feature is that the oppressed nations are being dependent from every aspect of life.

5. A comparison between the Islamic and critical concepts of

international relations

In spite of similarities between the concept of freedom in Islamic viewpoint and in critical school, these two concepts are not the same at all because they are the products of two different ontologies, epistemologies, and anthropologies. For critics, emancipation is a movement in order to obtain the maximal will power by an individual to create his real world and have authority upon his own future, while in Islamic viewpoint, because of its different approach to human, an individual has the authority only in direction of God's willpower and not beyond it. For Islam, freedom means emancipation from slavery, and submission only to God (Tabatabaee, 1369: 182-185). Therefore, emancipation happens only when an individual provides the grounds for his own spiritual freedom in order to achieve the social freedom as well. Generally, in critical school wherever willpower is mentioned, it means the inclinations and attitudes of people (Ayazi, 1378: 72). But, since in Islamic scholars' viewpoint, freedom has roots in Islamic culture, accordingly, as a human value and perfection, freedom is considered as originating from human nature that has been put in him to achieve an important goal. Also the concepts of freedom and emancipation necessitate the departure of individuals and the society from unjust external occasions that prevent them from understanding the truth. In Islamic viewpoint, complete freedom is not dependent only on attention to internal limiting structures, rather, this freedom starts from inside. In fact, if it doesn't start from inside, it is nothing except another type of slavery. In Islam peace is an original and deep-rooted issue being firmly linked to the nature of Islam and its general theory about the world and human life.

Islam is the religion of solidarity and unity all around the world. Monotheistic teachings suggest that all Creation System is influenced by God's management and unification between children and parents among all humans as the most stable theoretical foundations of peace and solidarity across the world. In Islamic theory, the roots of peace have been knotted to the concept of justice; justice against oppression, justice with the meaning of restoring people's rights and discharge of right from wrong. The oppressors and the interrupters of peace are worthy of being destroyed because they disrupt the inherent justice of the universe. In this case, peace means fighting against the disrupters of universal justice. In Islamic discourse human disobedient, untrained self, with its greediness, is one of the interrupters of peace. On the other hand, the fight suggested by critics to establish peace is in the framework of privative definition of peace paying attention to what is called systematic violation. In their ontological and epistemological viewpoint also, critics don't start from monotheism and the order that originates from universal Godly targetedness. In critical school, the roots of war and insecurity originate from international hegemonic powers who are constantly trying to colonize and exploit weak nations. In comparison to Islamic theory, they pay less attention to interrupters of international peace. In fact, except hegemonic powers and struggles generated by international dominating classes, they seldom focus on moral-human roots of wars. Islam with its comprehensive viewpoint about life, considers peace only within the circle of limited number of life-related issues, rather it focuses on a comprehensive peace in all levels and creates a firm connection between it and the general ideology about life and human. The peace sought by Islam is different from the concept followed by

critics; it has a deeper and more extensive meaning. Peace in Islam is the peace that establishes the name of Allah that involves social justice and public security all around the world, and not only mere refraining from fighting at any cost (Seyyed Ghotb, 1386: 51). In spite of their similarities, the hegemonic system in two Islamic and critical schools, are completely different from each other. In Islam the criterion to differentiate hegemony, is good and evil that has roots in the concepts of right and wrong. In Islamic approach toward international relations, regarding ontological and epistemological and anthropological bases, the emergence of hegemonism is not visible only because of imbalance between economy and society, but more than it, because of the irrationality of approaches that are considered as the reason of disputes. Accordingly, even the manner of developing conflict against hegemony should be upon justice, or else, fighting against oppression wouldn't be considered as the instance of fundamental removal of injustice. Conversely, for critics, hegemonism lies in economy, and not in the pattern of right and evil. It starts from economy and ends in culture. It is in the light such a hegemony that every individual as a producer or a consumer is forced to act in the predetermined framework of capitalism. And in a higher level also, the international community will be under the influence of hegemonic system.

Conclusion

The present paper compared the concepts of critical theory and Islamic theory of international relationships on international peace. To do so, first it pointed to major bases and concepts in critical theory, and then major bases and concepts in Islamic theory related to international peace were discussed. And finally they were com-

pared to each other. By studying the above-mentioned discourses in the realm of international peace a lot of common points can be seen, so that in some realms such as rejection of hegemonism, and universal justice they can be replaced by each other. But with an ontological and epistemological and even methodological study it becomes evident that they are two separate and independent issues and as a result, common concepts cannot be considered as similar. In fact, they have verbal similarities. Generally it can be said that superiority of nature upon instincts, religion-orientedness existing in the semantic structure of Islamic theory both, in describing the international peace logic, and in an ideal prescription of a solution to the pathology in this realm contribute to differentiate these two discourses. Some of differences existing between them are: individual freedom base, borders and limits of will power, the quality of emancipation, hegemony criterion, the quality of formation of hegemony and fighting against it, or rejection and acceptance of concepts of peace and violation leading to differentiate them from each other. Regarding international peace, both theories emphasize on the forbiddenness of war and ideality of peace and from this viewpoint they are opposed to some theories in international relations. On the other hand, both theories believe in positive peace and necessity of removal of factors that contribute to war, but they act differently in relation to achieve international peace. Islamic theory suggests that peace is the product of human disobedient self representing itself within social environment, while critics believe that in order to achieve peace, the factors of hegemony and oppression should be removed from human societies. The interesting point confirming this idea is that the critical theory considers religion as one of hegemonistic tools of oppression while in

the Islamic theory, the absolute authority of monotheism within religious ideology is the only way to achieve real peace.

References

Holy Quran

Ibrahimi Meinagh, Ja'far and Amiri, Mohammad and Ameri, Mehdi (1386), "Frankfurt School and critical theory", *Social Sciences Research*, No 4, : 65-86.

Eftekhari, Asghar, (1388) *Critical School in the Real in of Social Sciences*, 1st. volume, Tehran: Imam Sadiq University publications.

Omidi, Mehdi (1389) "Critical Theory in International Relations with Comparative Approach", *Ma'refat magazine*, No 79: 62-74.

Oshavit, William (1379) "Great Thinkers of Sociology", translated by Mehrdad Mirdamadi, Tehran: Nashre Markaz, 1st: edition.

Imam Mohammad Taghi (1388), "Paradigmatic bases of Qualitative and Quantitative methods of Research in Human Sciences", Ghom: Seminary and university research center.

Ayazi, Seyyed Mohhamad Ali (1388) "The Relation between Religion and Freedom", Tehran: Zekr research and publication institution.

Amoli, Javad (1375) "Human Right: Philosophy", Ghom, Asra' publication center, 1st turn.

Barzаноoni, Mohammad Ali (1384), "Islam, Originality of War or Originality of Peace?", *Hoghooghi Magazine*, No 33.

Tamini Amedi, Abdolvahed (1334), "Ghorarohkam and Dorarolkalam", translated by Mohammad Ali Ansari Ghomi, Ghom:

Darolketab.

John Bilis and Stive Smith (1384) “Globalism of Policy: International Relations in Modern Time”, Tehran: Abrare Moaser publications.

Dehghani Firoozabadi, Seyyed Jalal (1389) Foreign Policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran”, Tehran: The organization of study and edition of human arts books of universities (Samt), 2nd edition.

Dehghani Firoozabadi, Jalal (1387) “Critical Theory, A Framework to Analyze Foreign Policy” Political Sciences Research, Third year.

Sajjadi, Abdolghayyoom (1381), “Diplomacy and Political Behavior in Islam”, Olume Siasi magazine, fifth year, No 19, autumn.

Seyyed Ghotb (1391) Islam and Universal Peace”, Translated by Seyyed Hadi Khosrowshahi and Zeinolabedin Ghorbani, Ghom: Islamic Cultural Publication office.

Tabatabaee, Seyyed Mohammad Hossein (Bita) Almizan Tafsir”, teanslated by Seyyed mohammad Bagher Mousavi, Ghom: Islamic Publications office, 4th vol.

Abdollah Khani, Ali (1382) Theories of Security, An Introduction to Planning of National Security”, Tehran: Abrare Moaser.

Asghari, Mahmood (1382). “Epistemologic Approaches of Security”, Strategic Research quarterly periodical, No 20.

Alamolhoda, Jamileh (1366), “An Introduction to the Islamic Bases of Research Method”, Educational Innovations, course 173: 6-202.

- Farati, Abdolvahhab (1389), "Framework and Bases of Relationships of the Islamic Government with International System", Series of Articles about Islam and international relations (theoretical frameworks, thematic and analytic), by Hossein, Pourahmadi, Tehran: Imam Sadiq University publications, 1st. edition.
- Ghavam, Abdolahi (1384), *International Relations: "Theories and Approaches"*. Tehran: Samt publications.
- Cribe, Yan (1387), "Modern Social Theory", (From Parsons to Habermas), translated by Abbas Mokhber, Tehran: Agah publications.
- Gill, Estephan (1385), "Globalization, Market-oriented Civilization and Disciphnarian Neoliberalism, "on basic concepts about international relations: Marxism, Andrew Linkliter, Tehran :International and political studies office of Foreign ministry.
- Lochet, John (1377) *fifty Contemporary Great Thinkers (from structuralism to post-modernism)*, translated by Mohsen Hakimi, Nashre Khojasteh.
- Mohammad Reza, Dehshiri (1379), "An Introduction to Political Ideology of Imam Khomeini", Tehran: The center of Documents of Islamic Revolution.
- Mohammadpour, Ahmad (1389), "Method in Method: About Knowledge Production in Islamic Sciences," Tehran: Sociologists.
- Moshirzadeh Homeira, (1384), "Critical Theory of International Relations and Negotiation of Civilizations", Political sciences research, Autumn and winter, No 1.

- Mohammadi Manoochehr (1377), "Islamic Republic of Iran's Foreign Policy", Tehran: Nashre Dadgostar.
- Motahhari Mortaza (1379) "Compilation of works," Tehran: Sadra publication vol. 2.
- Nabavi, Seyyed Abbas (1383), "An Introduction to Free Thinking and Ideology in Religious Sciences," Ghom: Ghom Seminary management center.
- Hansen, Erik, O (1389), "Religion and Politics in Contemporary International System", translated by Arsalani Ghorbani Sheikhneshin, Tehran: Imam Sadiq University publications, 1st. edition.
- Hiuzi, A. (1378), "Hijrat, Social Thought", translated by Ezza-todowleh Foolad-vand, Tehran: Tarhe no.
- Al-Banna, Hasan (1997), *Peace in Islam*, London: Prelude Ltd.
- Al-Sheha, Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Kareem (2005), "Islam is The Religion of Peace", Translated and Adapted into English: Abu Salman Deya-ud-Deen Eberle, Rabwah: Islamic Propagation Office at Rabwah.
- Ashly, R. K. (1981), "Political Realism and Human Interests", *International Studies Quarterly*, No 25.
- Devetak, R. (1996), *A Theories of International Relations*, London: Macmillan.
- Price, R. M; Reus-smit, C. (1999), "Dangerous Liasons" *Critical International Theory and Constructivism*, *European Journal of International Relations*, 4, 3, pp. 259-281.