

The Concept Of Power And Legitimacy In The Political Thought Of Postmodernism With Emphasis On Foucault's Opinions (Case Study: The Revolution Of The Islamic Republic Of Iran)

Alireza Ebrahimi Fard¹, Ghorbanali Ganji^{2*} and Abdolreza Bay³

¹PhD Student in Political Science, Political Thought Department, Azadshahr Branch , Islamic Azad University, Azadshahr, Iran

^{2,3} Assistant Professor, Political Thought Department, Azadshahr Branch , Islamic Azad University, Azadshahr, Iran
Corresponding author email : ghganji@yahoo.com

Abstract

Power and legitimacy have a special place in postmodern political thought, like other political strategies. Postmodernism considers the combination and balance of power and legitimacy as a requirement for maintaining sovereignty and believes that power is not exclusively in the possession of a person, group or class; Legitimacy depends on various factors. Therefore, the research is looking for an answer to this question: how does power and legitimacy means in postmodernism, and how is it in the occurrence of the Islamic revolution in Iran? Meanwhile, the analysis of Foucault's theories is more important. Despite other postmodernisms, Foucault pointed to the lost spirituality in the field of politics, which is a product of the modern era, and believes that Iran, with the charismatic leadership of Imam Khomeini, has sought to involve religion in politics beyond economic issues and this has been the most important motivation to create a collective will for the Islamic revolution to happen.

Keywords: Power; Legitimacy; Postmodernism, Foucault, Revolution of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Introduction

The concepts of power and legitimacy are among the most important and fundamental topics of political science and especially political thought. Legitimacy in political science is discussed both as a philosophical issue in philosophy and political thought and as an objective and practical issue in political sociology. In philosophy and political thought, the legitimacy has a normative aspect and is explained based on dos and don'ts. In the sense that political philosophers try to express the criteria of legitimate and illegitimate government; But in political sociology, the focus of sociologists is not on dos and don'ts, but mainly on how a government can be considered legitimate for the majority of citizens and how

governments can get the satisfaction of the majority of their citizens (Hatami, 2005:14). One of the trends of political thought is postmodernism. Thoughts and ideas derived from postmodernism show that postmodern philosophy is a combination of several schools, philosophies and theories; It also can be the result of several intellectual tendencies. In postmodern philosophy, instead of emphasizing the coherent identity of the individual and society, the transformation and instability in the identity of the individual and society are emphasized. The foundation of postmodernism is poststructuralism, which believes in the floating of structures and the construction of truth (Julin, 1989:231).

Power is a social advantage that is considered in social stratification. Many conflicts in society are the results of struggle for power; Because the level of a person's ability to achieve power affects how much they can implement their wishes at the expense of others' wishes. According to Morganta, legitimate power is accompanied by elements of ethics and law, while illegitimate power (naked power) lacks this status. He believes that the influence of legitimate power is more than illegitimate power. Power can be classified as positive and negative power (positive power is the ability to force a specific action and negative power is the ability to prevent an undesirable action) and relative and absolute power (Morganta, 2006: 177). Russell defines power as a type of capability that creates the desired effects, and thus power gets a quantitative concept (Russell, 1996: 58). To Halsti's, power requires action; The action that actor A takes towards actor B so that the actor B takes a special way in accordance with the wishes of actor A (Qasemi, 2012: 29).

The modern paradigm of the concept of power is based on Hobbes's thought; According to him, power is understood based on the concept of sovereignty and in relation to the government and the same concept of power has continued in the thought of other thinkers in this field. While in postmodernism, Foucault's ideas caused a kind of epistemological break in the concept of power; According to him, the power and its relations are not concentrated in the state institution. It is common in society and does not act negatively, but is productive and positive and ultimately shapes human subjects in social relations. Foucault sees power and legitimacy from the reason view and close to the postmodernist view. He does not see power and legitimacy at the level of government, but at the level of physical technology and politics and disciplinary society. He examines the relationship between knowledge and power and talks about the decline of man in the form of power overlooking life and believes

that in the era of modernity, man is the subject of science, and in the post-modern era, man will decline with the development of the kind of power that oversees the life. He says that legitimacy belongs to power and power creates legitimacy and the word is the link between these. Power discourse had a special place in Foucault's thoughts. He believes that in soft power, a type of coercion (indirectly) appears from the type of hard power, and it has a function that hard power is unable to perform in many cases. Soft power is neither force nor money. In soft power, investments are made on mentalities. In this type of power, attractiveness is used to create a sharing of values and the obligation to cooperate is used to achieve all demands (Bashiriyeh, 1996:199).

The Islamic revolution of Iran took place in a period when the postmodernism trend had entered a more serious stage in the last quarter of the 20th century. In the seventies, the majority of postmodern debates were devoted to the field of literature and art, and less included political issues. Iran's Islamic Revolution, with its ideological feature, attracted the attention of people like Michel Foucault and considered the political issues with a postmodernist attitude more than before. To Foucault, the Islamic revolution is the first post-modern revolution of the present era, or in other words, "the first great revolt against the earth systems and the most modern form of uprising". To him, Iran Islamic revolution involves the refusal of an entire culture and an entire nation to obey a kind of modernization that is old-fashioned in itself. Such a revolution is like a revolution without organizations, non-party and unique in its kind (Foucault, 1989:194). According to introduction, the main question of the research is proposed as follows: How was the concept of power and legitimacy in the political thought of postmodernism, especially in Foucault's theories, and how does his view on the Islamic Revolution of Iran play a role?

Review of Literature

The origin of the power and legitimacy of political systems has long been considered as one of the most basic topics of political philosophy, and now it is being studied due to the expansion of discussions and theorizing in the field of politics. Legitimacy is one of the oldest and most basic topics of political systems, which was introduced from Ancient Greece by Plato and Aristotle and then by thinkers such as Cicero, Augustine Saint, Thomas Aquinas and other scientific personalities of the West and also by great thinkers such as Farabi, Averroes, Ghazali, Mawardi, Ibn Sina and others in the field of Islamic thought and the Middle East; Dividing the government into aristocracy, democracy, republic and the like, they discussed the examples of legitimate and illegitimate governments. Every government and political system are forced to recognize the foundations of the legitimacy of its political system for its existence and survival so that with the support of the foundations, it can seize the public and social affairs of the people and take the right to rule.

Power is also the fundamental and central concept of politics in the field of opinion and action, which plays a key and decisive role in the field of political thought and action. Considering the basic and central position of this concept and its importance in politics, there are different definitions and approaches in this matter, and there is no clear consensus among thinkers. Political thought and the epistemological foundations of any thought have led to a specific definition of power; Because in its essence, power is based on "value" and with the change of the value system, the meaning and functions of power also change. The specific complexity of the concept of power has placed it among the easy and restrained concepts that, while seeming obvious, do not include a specific definition and scope. At the same time, the concept of power should be distinguished from concepts close to it

such as authority, dominance, prestige and influence. The closest concept to power is authority. Authority is institutionalized power. In such a case, there is no power, but there is the right of that institution to exercise power. Law is about authority, not the power. Authority is the manifestation of power in organized group situations; In fact, power is the basis of authority.

- Legitimacy

The word "legitimacy" in Persian is derived from the Latin root of "legitimus" which means to be legal and in accordance with the law, and in English it also has the meanings of being right, being according to the law, correctness, solubility etc. (Webster's Dictionary). In Persian and Arabic, this word mostly means "that which is in accordance with Sharia and considered permissible by Sharia" (Omid, 1993). While Shariah is only one of the meanings of legitimacy, and currently this word is more concerned with the meanings of righteousness and legality. In political science, people's conscious and voluntary acceptance and obedience of a ruling power is called legitimacy. In the political term, legitimacy and authenticity is the oneness of how the leaders and rulers of the society come to power with the theory and beliefs of all or the majority of the society at a certain time and place. The result of this belief is accepting the right to command for leaders and the duty to obey for members of society or citizens (Abul Hamad, 1991:244). Therefore, legitimacy is the basis of the ruling power which on the one hand gives the right to rule to the government and on the other hand informs the governed of such a right (Sternberger, 1999: 299).

In the literal definitions provided by some thinkers, legitimacy is legality and being in accordance with the law, therefore some consider the legitimacy the same as legality; While legitimacy is not the same as legality. According to Leeds' interpretation, the legitimacy of the ruling power in any society is determined

according to the attitudes and customs of a nation and when the people of a society accept the leaders, laws and constitution of that society with satisfaction, that government is recognized as legitimate (Leeds, 28:1998). It is also possible to equate legitimacy with acceptability and think that a legitimate government is a government that enjoys public acceptance and satisfaction; But there is a difference between the two.

The legitimacy is a category related to political philosophy and political thought in which the main question is who has the right to rule and who should rule? What kind of government is right? Therefore, it is about the legitimacy of the ruler and the type of government. While acceptability or legitimacy is a category related to sociology in which the main question is, what is the efficiency, durability, acceptability and satisfaction of the people for a government? With what conditions and factors do a certain ruler gain popularity and acceptance in a religious or non-religious society? Therefore, in the discussion of acceptance and legitimacy, the right or wrong of the government and the ruler are not considered, and the acceptance by people, the social base of the ruler and the factors of expansion of its satisfaction and acceptability are considered (Mousaviyan, 2006: 389).

Since the emergence of new democratic governments, the proposed definitions of legitimacy consider it to be in conformity with beliefs and ideas. That is, if people are of the opinion that the existing institutions are morally or religiously worthy, then the institutions are legitimate (Alam, 1994: 270). According to Lipset, legitimacy means the capacity of the political system to create and maintain the belief in the principle that the existing political institutions in the society are valid and the institutions are established to meet the needs of society. Maurice Duverger believes: "The legitimacy of a system means the regime's conformity with the general consensus is the

basis of a political system's relationship with society, and thus legitimacy itself has a direct relationship with democracy" (Lipset, 2006:10).

In this era, the most well-known common definition of legitimacy is the definition expressed by Max Weber: "Legitimacy is the manifestation of the mental-internal acceptance of the ruling power for the members of society" (Weber, 1995: 22). According to him, legitimacy is based on belief and requires people to obey. Power has the exclusive right to use force, but it is effective only when it is legitimate; That is, the main element of political power is its legitimacy. In this concept, legitimacy is the manifestation and measure and criterion of the subjective acceptance of the ruling power for the society, which is related to the concept of sovereignty in the sense of exercising power (Gelani, 1999: 8). In other words, legitimacy is the uniqueness of how the leaders and rulers of the society came to power with the theory and beliefs of all or most of the people of the society at a certain time and place; The result of this belief is accepting the right to command for leaders and the duty to obey for community members or citizens (Abul Mohammad, 1989: 245). Therefore, legitimacy (a term in political science) results from the harmony of beliefs and values between citizens and rulers in such a way that this coordination makes obedience easy; It causes that the government does not need to use force and threats in order to ensure obedience, or it reduces its use to a minimum (Marandi, 1997: 32).

Today, the most common form of legitimacy in the Western world and non-religious thinking is the belief in legality, whether this law is enacted through majority votes or a minority imposes the will. In other words, when there is no agreement on the foundations of the universal system, it actually means that this system has been imposed on the minority. However, it is very common for minority to use force or harsh and targeted methods in order to enforce a system that initially

faces opposition, but gains legitimacy over time. In fact, as long as the ballot box is the legal means of changing the system, it is very natural for the minority to become the official majority and majority accepts that. In such cases, majority rule is just a fantasy. Belief in the legitimacy of a system based on voluntary agreement is a relatively old belief (Weber, 1995: 43-44). Therefore, legitimacy is a mental and belief matter, in such a way that different societies have different perceptions of it.

- The Power

The word power, more than other words of political science, reflects the multiplicity in the definition of understanding and its application method. The various definitions have been presented by political scientists. For example, Max Weber writes: "Power is the special possibility of an agent (individual or group) due to having a position in social relations that can use the will despite the resistance beyond the basis of relying on this special possibility". Schwarzenegger writes: "Power is the ability to impose our will on others, relying on the guarantee of effective implementation in case of non-acceptance" (Alam, 1994: 89). In other words, the ability to make people or things do something they would not do otherwise. McIver also writes "The power is the ability to focus and direct the behavior of people or work (McIver, 1975:91).

According to Duverger, the concept of power is very broad and ambiguous. For example, the head of the government is just a ruler and powerful, a simple citizen is just an obedient and under power, and the rest of people are both ruler and obedient. According to him, power is a relative truth or doubt. He believes that "we cannot understand the power in the absolute sense of an unequal human relationship, based on which one person forces another one to obey him, but power is a special relationship with special restrictions" (Duverger, 21:1979). While he takes power as a

special type of human relationship, that is, an unequal relationship that is embodied in the form of command and obedience, he presents discussions to show the face of this special human relationship, that is, political power, among different types of human relationships.

In rights related to power, social power cannot be ignored. Parsons says: "the power is the generalized ability to guarantee the implementation of the binding obligations of units in the system of collective organization". In his explanation, he points to two important factors; The first is the legitimacy of the aforementioned commitments in terms of the positive impact it has on providing social goals in harmony with people's beliefs. This, to a large extent, will be the source of acceptance by people, and this is a clear example of the "ability to implement the obligation" that has been mentioned in the definition. The second is the existence of the executive guarantee of government, which manifests in the form of rewards and punishments and criminal sentences; In cases of disobedience and rebellion, which the first factor alone does not have an effect on the obedience of individuals, this factor will be another supporting factor for the implementation of the mentioned commitments and its forced acceptance by this group (Lux, 1991:147). According to mentioned factors, two levels of power appear. The first level is related to people's belief in the legitimacy of the law and its managers and enforcers; Because people automatically obey the laws and apply their obligations based on their belief. The second is related to the cases which people disobey or rebel because they do not believe in the legitimacy of the laws for any other reason.

McIver considers social power as the ability to make others obey in any social relationship. He emphasizes that social power is the ability to monitor the behavior of others, either directly by command or indirectly through the provision of

existing means (McIver, 1975: 106). Max Weber used the word "opportunity" instead of the word "ability". According to him, "power is an opportunity that arises within the framework of social relations and allows a person to impose his will (regardless of the basis on which the said opportunity is based) even despite the resistance of others on them (Max Weber, 1988:139). To Weber, "power is the opportunity of a person or a number of people to exercise their will even against the resistance of other elements" (Weber, 1995:232).

Foucault examines the figures of power and analyzes power in this way:

1- Power does not exist in a specific place, but has taken root in all areas of life in modern societies. In the sense that it does not have a central point, and contrary to the idea of Marxist-Leninist theorists, it is not organized as a hierarchy from top to bottom (power includes all members of the society, and the individual, in fact, is a product of power.

2- Power is not acquired, but it affects the smallest element of society.

3- Power must arise from the economic relations and it cannot be understood in relation to autonomy and dependence.

4- Everything and everyone revolves around power; Power structures are always dynamic (M. Foucault, 1985: 12).

Power and Legitimacy in The Political Thought of Postmodernism

Modernism is a symbol of the era in when the spheres of religious and worldly behavior were separated from each other. Many believe that modernity is a cultural, political, economic, social and philosophical complex that has continued since the 15th century until a few decades ago. In this approach, any spiritual force outside of human wisdom is discredited and

denied. The prominent features that can be mentioned for modern thought are the predominance of human-centered ideas, gradual disappearance and confrontation with traditional systems and attitudes, separation of social political institutions from religion (secularism), relying mainly on experimental and sensory methodology, and positivism as the fundamental methodology of modern science (Russell, 1988:17).

Postmodern (after modernity) is a situation in which the inability of modernity and its crises have been revealed. Postmodernity is more representative of the crisis of modernity. An important point in this is that the postmodern attitude is a modern movement in its foundations and principles the post-modern is bound to repeat the modern and these two schools cannot be considered as two distinct or even completely different schools and attitudes. This is such that even sometimes postmodern is used in the sense of modern fixation. In the strict sense, postmodern refers to the modern break.

In the recent decades, postmodern introduced and announced the final criticisms on the modernist thinking in the discussion of development; The goals of modernists are specific to a particular civilization and cannot be generalized to other societies. Postmodernists believe that the propositions of development and modernization such as freedom, secularism, rationalism, human rights, and Western democracy, which are made by the West, are not general concepts, rather, they arise from a pure civilization and experience and find meaning only in the context of that civilization. From a post-positivist point of view, postmodernists believe that a single theory cannot be reached in social sciences and the experience of the West is limited and bound to European civilization. Rejecting the macro theories, the postmodern have risen to the war of totality and holism, and emphasizing the principle of pluralism, they have abandoned examination of

the general and considered the local and native examination to be original and practical. Postmodern supports different directions of development and progress; This means that countries and political systems can follow different paths from the development path of the West (Tajik, 1998: 93).

Postmodernism has some characteristics; Theorists describe the most important of them as follows:

1. Exclusion of comprehensiveness from any thought
2. Negation of coherent individual and social identity
3. Declaring the end of ideologies
4. Rejection of objective truths
5. Relativism and uncertainty in the field of knowledge
6. Presenting a mixed flow of thoughts (Ferrati, 2010: 57).

Foucault, one of the most prominent theorists of postmodernism, has identified three types of power in society: social-disciplinary power, mind and soul power, and the inherent power of sovereignty. From Foucault's point of view, social-disciplinary power was formed in the seventeenth century in Europe in a social form and considers humans as the source of power. Socio-disciplinary power has an empowering and limiting aspect, and by subjugating people, it forms the possibility of organizing them in society and social systems.

According to Foucault, another type of power developed in Europe in the 18th century and was divided under the influence of the republican theory who considered people of the society as malleable forces and considered their education and making them useful as one of the duties of the government. This form of power relations

considered the population as a source of authority, and hence it attempts to organize populations, promote health, and with the support of modern medicine and psychiatry, establishes a normative form of individuals and personalities in the demographic fields. For example, the methods of the spiritual leader have been used in different ways, however, the spiritual leader is one of the most active members of society in the Western world (Heinrich Fink, 2003:5).

The inherent power of sovereignty is also formed in the framework of classical theories and in the form of government and political institutions. In Foucault's view, a form of power relations developed in the 17th and 18th centuries in the West, which was rooted in the organization of political power in ancient Jewish societies. These relationships handed over the responsibility of the subjects' actions to the ruler and as a result assumed him to be responsible for the salvation of his followers. In front of taking on this serious responsibility, the ruler demanded the unquestioning obedience of his subjects in all areas of their lives, and this was similar to the relationship between a shepherd and his flock (Vakili, 267:2010).

It should be noted that Foucault insists that any society in any particular period of history creates power relations, order or social balance by institutionalizing what is truth or knowledge and what is not truth or knowledge. To exercise power and to achieve public consensus, powerful groups control the actions of others through controlling the minds (knowledge, attitude and ideology) of those groups mainly through discourse (Dike, 2003; 114). He believes that power systems are responsible for determining choices, decisions, and choices to create meaning. Foucault also believes that the complex and changing system of power gives legitimacy to knowledge and determines the truth (Dreyfus and Rabinau, 2000: 6).

On the other hand, Max Weber is known as the publisher of charismatic leadership theory. Charisma is defined as the characteristic of someone who, personally or in the opinion of others, has high power and leadership ability. The term is often used in political science and sociology to refer to a subset of leaders who use the power of their personal abilities to have a profound effect on the people of their communities. Weber describes charisma as a special characteristic of a character of the phenomenon (Foucault, 2000:54). Charismatic leadership based on individual passion is a type of leadership that has an exceptional ability to the people and the fans, and this is only in the case that these exceptional abilities originate solely from the strength of the individual's personality and commitment. In this type of leadership, a relationship is established without the use of illegitimate rewards, both financial and coercive.

People of a society recognize charismatic leaders based on their behavior and mutual actions and give them an identity. Charisma should be viewed as an attribute and characteristic created by the people of society, that is, those who observe a set of certain behaviors from the leader in organizational situations and conditions. The observed behavior of the leader in the organization can be interpreted by expressing the charismatic characteristics of his followers; It is a special characteristic that results from the leader's behavior. In this field, one of the most profound researches is the classification of Conger and Kanungo. These two researchers point out that if the characteristic of charisma depends on the observed traits of people, then there are a series of behavioral components that are responsible for these traits. They investigated these components and presented leadership characteristics and attributes in the form of this category. These components are interconnected and their presence or absence as well as their intensity is different in leaders. The results of the behavioral components of the research show that:

- Charismatic leaders may accept high personal risks, incur high costs and sacrifices to achieve common goals.
- The charismatic leader describes the current situation as a negative and exhausting situation and future goals as a more attractive and attainable alternative.
- Charismatic leaders use behaviors that are original and unusual and take personal risks that are likely to harm their personal interests.
- The behavioral components of charismatic leadership are related to each other and form a group with each other.
- Charismatic leaders have an accurate assessment of their environmental resources and understand that constraints affect their determination or understanding of prospects. When environmental resource constraints and pressures are positive for charismatic leaders, they employ their own innovative strategies.
- Leaders are charismatic when their visions are very opposite to the current situation, but at the same time there should be freedom of action for followers to accept it or not.
- Charismatic leaders prove their skill in going beyond the existing system by using unconventional and exceptional tools.
- Charismatic leaders clearly state their motivations so that they can lead through bold behavior and expression of self-confidence, expertise, unconventionality, and concern for followers' needs (Conger, & Kanungo, 1987: 637-647).

Postmodernism and Islamic Revolution of Iran

Postmodernists have been looking for an external example for their ideas after proposing their views and describing them. In the meantime, Michel Foucault, witnesses the whole and details of the Islamic Revolution of Iran in 1978 as a

journalist. Postmodern thinkers had a special opinion on the Islamic revolution and called it the first postmodern revolution in the world, which took place beyond modern forms and the element of modernity has not been enough to explain it. "Akbar Ahmad", one of the postmodern writers, considers Iran's Islamic Revolution to be the first postmodern revolution in the world, which is highly deconstructive. Mengel Bayat, one of the postmodern writers, considers the Islamic revolution as a new form of modernity, which is different from the modernity that relies on calculating rationality. Michel Foucault, who closely witnessed the course of the revolution, says: "Maybe this is the first great uprising against the world systems".

The new definition of the phenomenon of power makes the flow of demonstrations of the Islamic Revolution, in which different members of the society stood against the most secure government in the region, attract attention for Foucault. In the meantime, Foucault presented a completely new understanding of the phenomenon of power. He considered power as a scattered phenomenon in society that is not owned by anyone. In Foucault's understanding, power is not exercised by specific individuals, but power is a complex network of relationships.

The special opinion of postmodern thinkers on the Iranian Islamic Revolution was due to its fundamental differences both in terms of form and substance with other classical revolutions. Classic revolutions or modern revolutions of the 20th century, such as the Russian, Chinese, and Cuban revolutions, were all carried out in the name of a material and man-made ideology that required independence from sacred and noble things such as religion; But in the Islamic revolution, except for the minority who followed the materialistic schools and were digested in the process of the revolution, the majority of people achieved their revolution for religion and in the name of religion. Alvin Toffler believed that the

Islamic Revolution of Iran, led by Imam Khomeini (RA), acted as if there was no way in the name of modernity and western lifestyle at all (Marandi, 1997:118).

Another issue worthy of consideration is that most revolutions were carried out by a professional revolutionary minority, but the Islamic revolution was carried out by appealing to the mass of people under the guidance of a charismatic leader. The point that Foucault deals with is that in the Islamic Revolution of Iran, there is not an effect of internal and external struggles of different social classes and major social confrontations of one class or one party that has the authority of the driving force and the whole nation follows it. This issue is also one of the main reasons for the difference between this revolution and other revolutions. Foucault also states in response to those who analyze Iran's Islamic Revolution in terms of economic problems and consider it a problem on the path to modernization: Iran's economic problems during the present time of the revolution are not so big that people in groups of hundreds of thousands and millions ones come into the streets and fight in front of guns; They want an Islamic government and are looking for "spiritualism in politics".

In Foucault's works, we can look at the Iranian revolution from the perspective of the power of disciplinary society. Disciplinary societies are contrasted with early modern societies that were organized around the centralization of authority in the hands of absolute rulers. In these societies, social order was maintained by an absolute ruler who had the power to take or grant the right to life or demand obedience. For example, in early modern Europe, law was considered the manifestation of the sovereignty of an absolute ruler. It was also a violation to challenge and attack the absolute ruler. The guilty person was punished with torture to prove the authority of the absolute ruler. Torturing the bodies of

wrongdoers was a way to publicly display the repressive and absolute power of the ruler. In a disciplinary society, order is maintained through control technologies such as space segregation, time management, confinement, surveillance, and the examination system that categorize human beings in order to normalize social behavior. If the typical institution in societies is based on the absolute power of the king, in the disciplinary society, it is based on the army, factory, hospital and prison. Maintaining order is done by a system of techniques and disciplinary discourse rather than by a hierarchy of rulers and subjects. From this point of view, it is possible to observe the control confrontation between the government of Iran (the Shah) and the leader of the protests (Imam Khomeini).

For Foucault, the soft and scattered face of power among the people who are spread and dispersed in a relational and network manner is very important. In the Iranian revolution, Foucault points to the emergence of this soft and at the same time very influential figure of power and believes that the king had removed the normal and official powers, but unaware that the distributed and networked power was strengthened by this action. Foucault shows the alignment of two definitions and two faces of power well. He considers the king and the army as a symbol of naked power and pure violence, and in contrast to the general will of people and their collective power, he considers them to be the software aspect of power. What has surprised me in Iran is that there is no struggle between different elements. What makes all this beautiful and yet important is that there is only one confrontation. A confrontation between all people and the power that threatens the people with its weapons and police. We don't have to go far, this point can be found immediately; On one side, the will of people and on the other, machine guns (Foucault, 1979:39). In fact, Foucault believes that the real and basic power should be sought in this software aspect, and indeed this

face was revealed in Iran. According to him, the difference between the Iranian revolution and other revolutions is that one side of the dispute is a fully armed regime and the other side lacks naked power, but at the same time has hidden and invisible power.

One of the keywords of Foucault's works in the discussions of the Iranian revolution is the collective will. Public will can be seen in religious, non-religious consensus, male, female, poor, rich, etc., in different strata of people who wanted common and general good. It means the destruction of the Pahlavi regime, which was the epitome of corruption, dependence on the West, tyranny and lack of identity, and Foucault rightly points to all these issues. According to Foucault, this revolution has brought an absolutely collective will to the fore, and in history, few nations have achieved such a success. The collective will have been a political myth that lawyers and philosophers use it to analyze or justify institutions, facilities, etc. It is a theoretical tool; No one has ever seen or touched the "collective will" in person, and I personally thought that the collective will was a category like God, or spirit, something that could never be seen.

Foucault also says in an interview: I don't know if you agree with my opinion or not, but we clearly observed the collective will of a nation in Tehran and throughout Iran. The collective will, which in our theories always has a general aspect, has found a clear and specific purpose in Iran, and therefore has suddenly disappeared from history. Of course, similar phenomena can be found in independence struggles and anti-colonial wars. In Iran, national sentiments are very strong. Denial of subjugation and submission to foreigners, hatred for looting and looting of national resources, rejection of dependent foreign policy, opposition to the comprehensive and open intervention of the United States, are all key elements in introducing the Shah as an agent of

the West. The national feeling was only one of the factors and elements of a more radical denial in this nation: the denial and rejection of not only foreigners, but the denial of everything that had shaped the political destiny for years and centuries. But how can the collective will gather around a person without any political history? Ayatollah Khomeini entry into Iran's social scene definitely did not have a political motive. Ayatollah looked at jurisprudence from a more modern point of view, but he can never be considered the owner a political belief along with religious knowledge. This is what Max Weber previously called charismatic leadership.

Foucault believes that Imam Khomeini, as a charismatic leader, has a personal and emotional relationship with the people: Khomeini's character is a myth. Today, no head of state and no political leader, even with the support of all the media in his country, can claim that people have such a personal and strong bond with him (Foucault, 2000: 38). Foucault summarizes the reason for this companionship and synchronization of people with the Imam from three aspects:

- 1- Khomeini is not here, he has been in exile for fifteen years.
- 2- Khomeini says nothing, nothing but no; No to the king, to the regime, to dependence.
- 3- Khomeini is not a political person, there will be no party named Khomeini and no government named Khomeini (Foucault, 1989:177).

It can be seen that the leadership of Imam Khomeini, along with other factors, is one of the important reasons for the victory of the revolution. According to Foucault, "power" is not in the hands of the rulers and in their personal property, but power has a relational and network state that is distributed in society like nervous systems and is not exclusive to a specific group or network. According to Foucault, such power

has a software nature and is not visible or tangible. According to Foucault, power is not necessarily applied through violent means, but a speech, cassette tape, book, thought, etc. can also be sources of power. Paying attention to this type of power in the analysis of the Islamic Revolution helped Foucault a lot. According to Foucault, this face of power that is spread throughout the society and every individual, if it reaches a unity, it will create a power that no force and power, no army, weapon, and naked power will be able to deal with.

Regarding the Iranian revolution, despite the poor financial situation of most people in the society, Foucault does not involve economic issues. He writes about this: "Maybe the economic problems were very serious, however, we must explain why a nation make a revolution". The movement that Iranians are looking for, seeks to introduce a spiritual element into the political life of people. I (Foucault) do not like to call Islamic government an idea or even an ideal, but it has influenced me as a political desire. Because it is an effort for politics to find a spiritual dimension (Foucault, 1979:51).

In fact, according to Foucault, religion as one of the constituent elements of culture plays an essential role in the national consciousness of Iranians. In a general view, from Foucault's point of view, religion was a refuge and an escape through which people of Iran wanted the fall of the king, and religion was a concept that provided all the wants and needs of the people from every category and class. Foucault considers the adherence of Iranian people to religion not because of their return to religious prejudices, but because it is a timeless vocabulary, ritual, and show that can accommodate the historical show of a nation that put their existence against the existence of their king. Foucault correctly realized that the identity of Iranians is mixed with religion.

Conclusion

Postmodern philosophy and discourse look at modern development as a kind of strategy of modern power and social control. In this way, the postmodern era has indicated a kind of disillusionment and loss of faith, and belief in modern metanarratives such as the metanarrative of development. Reacting to the homogenization of Western development patterns, postmodern support the different and heterogeneous situations of countries and their resistance to the westernization of modern discourse; Because their main logic is the logic of difference. It seems that the discourse of the Islamic Revolution and the structures arising from it can use the potential and capacities of postmodernism against modernity and continue its political-social life in the form of a religion-oriented regime by relying on the logic of postmodernist difference.

Foucault believes that Iranians want to return spirituality to the political arena with their revolution. If we consider the postmodern movement as a movement that rebelled against the teachings of modernity and the modern era, one of these teachings was excessive attention to reason, science, self-aware subject, self-foundation, etc. therefore it is not far from expected that Foucault has a nostalgic look at the lost spirituality in the field of politics, which was a product of the modern era. In addition to the effects of the Shia religion and the days of Muharram and mourning on spiritual tendencies, according to Foucault, the will of the people was also very important. According to Foucault, the will of the people is Islamic government, but the meaning of Islamic government is not limited to religious government. Rather, this word means an ideal that brings everyone together with every spectrum, group, desire, and interest.

According to the material that was presented, it can be said that charismatic leadership is not a characteristic that is inherent in all people, or in other words, all humans have this ability. Charismatic character is not always with a person

and not everyone can accept every person as a charismatic leader. In the first stage, there are factors that cause the creation and emergence of charisma. In the next stage, there are factors that are effective in the stability, intensity and weakness of charisma trait in the leader. The important point is that being charismatic is a trait that is actually bestowed upon leaders by followers. Charisma is a characteristic that depends on the observed behaviors of the leader. There is a set of behavioral components in the leader that are the cause of the emergence of charismatic traits in him. According to this conclusion, these traits can be identified and even cultivated in other people who have an inherent ability. Foucault finds all these cases in relation to Imam Khomeini and Iranian society.

According to the Islamic revolution and the religious developments, it is possible to discuss the process of negating and rejecting the Western-style modernist development theories. The issue to consider is that how the religious discourse of the Islamic Revolution went against the theoretical models of Western development and, with its own conditions and characteristics, has challenged the foundations of postmodernism and Western-style development and modernization, such as secularism, unilinear development, disregard for values and traditions and on the other hand, relying on religious values in the model of local development, it has continued its life in the form of the Islamic Republic system.

The astonishment and surprise of theorists such as Michel Foucault in the analysis and identification of the Islamic Revolution of Iran, show the power and greatness of the Islamic Revolution in the transformations of the modern era but on the other hand, it also proves the inadequacy of Western political ideas in explaining the Islamic Revolution. Even if Foucault has not reached a new approach in understanding and analyzing the theoretical

foundations of the Islamic Revolution, his action in deconstructing the control of the theoretical frameworks governing revolutionary movements in the West is commendable and his philosophical-sociological astonishment in understanding the Islamic Revolution should be considered as an astonishment based on the critical epistemology of this thinker. From this point of view, the criticism and description of such views are not ineffective in understanding the unique nature of the Islamic Revolution.

Foucault went directly to the revolutionary people in the streets to understand the Iranian revolution. According to him, the Islamic revolution is the first post-modern revolution in the present era, or in other words, the first great rebellion against the earth systems. Foucault believes that the Islamic revolution in 1978 implies the refusal of a whole culture and a whole nation to go under the burden of a kind of modernization that is antiquated in itself. To him, the secularization and industrialization of society, which is a century late, represents a type of neo-colonialism that relies on mere tyranny. The concept of political spiritualism forms the basis of Foucault's analysis of the Iranian revolution. In this way, Foucault called Iran's Islamic Revolution a post-modern revolution, and the following points can be extracted from Foucault's view:

- The Iranian people's revolution had no material and economic motivation.
- The economic problems of the Pahlavi government were not so big that people would rise up because of it.
- Iranians tried to create a transformation in their thoughts, attitude and social political lifestyle through their revolution.
- For them, Islam was both a medicine for individual pain and a cure for diseases and social defects.

- The leadership (Imam Khomeini) and the Shiite religion played a significant role in the Iranian revolution.
- The presence of all classes from the most prosperous (airline staff) to the poorest (Abadan oil workers) in the nationwide strike.
- Foucault believed that, apart from religious beliefs, no other factor has the power to mobilize such masses.
- It is the Shia religion that has been able to launch such a political mobilization by relying on its anti-Islamic position.
- The language, form and religious content of Iran's Islamic Revolution is not a temporary, random or accidental thing.

References

1. Abul Hamad A. H. (1974). Basics of politics, Tehran: TOOS.
2. Sternberger D. (1999). Legitimacy, Vol. 1, Tehran, Research Institute of Strategic Studies.
3. Bashirieh H. (2003). Political Sociology. Tehran. Ney Publications.
4. Tajik M. (1999). Discourse Analysis, Tehran. Farhang Gadman.
5. Hatami M. R. (2004). The Foundations of Government Legitimacy in Shia Political Thought, Tehran. Majd.
6. Dike Ton A. F. (2003). Studies in Discourse Analysis: From Text Order to Critical Discourse Analysis, translated by Gholamreza Kashi and others, Tehran. Center for Media Studies and Research.
7. Duverger M. (1979). Political Sociology, translated by Abolfazl Qazi, Tehran. Javidan.
8. Dreyfus H. and Paul R. (2000). Michel Foucault Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics, translated by Hossein Bashirieh, Tehran. NEY

9. Russell B. (1946). *The World I Know*, 3th Edition, Tehran. Amirkabir.
10. Raymond A. (1981). *Basic Stages of Thought in Sociology*, translated by Baqer Parham, 2nd Edition, Tehran. Islamic Revolution Publications and Education.
11. Julien F. (1989). *Sociology of Max Weber*, translated by Abdul Hossein Nik Gohar, Tehran. Raizen.
12. Amid H. (1993). *Farhang Amid*, Tehran. Amirkabir.
13. Foucault M. (2000). *Iran: The Soul of a Soulless Youth*, translated by Niko Sarkhosh and Afshin Jahandideh, Tehran. NEY Publications.
14. Foucault M. (1989). *Beyond Constructivism and Hermeneutics*, translated by Hossein Bashirieh, Tehran. NEY Publications.
15. Ghasemi F. (2012). *Principles of International Relations*, Tehran. Mizan.
16. Galiani A. (1989). "Political Legitimacy and Stability in Iran, 57-1332" (Doctoral Dissertation), Tehran. Tarbiat Modares University.
17. Lipset S. (2006). *Legitimacy and Efficiency*, Tehran. Culture and Development.
18. Weber M. (1985). *Economy and Society*, translated by Abbas Manouchehri et al. Tehran. Molly.
19. Vincent A. (1992). *The Theories of Government*, translated by Hossein Bashirieh, Tehran: NEY Publications.
20. Alam A. (1984). *Foundations of Political Science*, Tehran, NEI Publications.
21. Lux S. (1981). *Power: Inhumanity or Satanic Evil*, translation: Farhang Rajae. Tehran. Institute of Cultural Studies and Research.
22. Leeds C. (1988). *An Introduction to Political Science*, translated by Mansour Rahmani and Hadi Khazaei, Tehran. Atta.
23. Marandi M. R. (1987). *Basis of Legitimacy of Political System in Islam*, Tehran, Atta Publications.
24. McIver R. (1975). *Society and Government*, translated by Ebrahim Ali Kany, 3rd Edition, Tehran. Book Translation and Publishing Company.
25. Morgenta H. J. (2006). *Principles of International Relations*, translated by Farhad Ghasemi, Tehran. Mizan.
26. Mousaviyan A. (2005). *Investigating the Origin of Legitimacy of Islamic Government*, Tehran. Imam Khomeini Publications.
27. Conger, Jay.A & Kanungo, Rabindra.N.(1987) *Toward a Behavioral Theory of Chrismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings*; *Academy of Management Review* Vol. 12, No. 4.PP. 637-647.