

BEYOND MATERIALIST HEGEMONY: TOWARD A THEORY OF TRANSCENDENTAL STATECRAFT AND ONTOLOGICAL RESISTANCE IN IRANIAN FOREIGN POLICY

Muhammad Jawad Shigri

PhD Scholar , Preston University Kohat (Islamabad Campus)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18267809>

Keywords

Ontological Security, Transcendental Statecraft, Iranian Foreign Policy, Revolutionary Identity, Imam Khomeini, Sacred Costs, Resistance Economy, Axis of Resistance.

Article History

Received: 18 November 2025

Accepted: 03 January 2026

Published: 16 January 2026

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Muhammad Jawad Shigri

Abstract

This paper challenges the prevailing materialist paradigms in International Relations (IR) by introducing the concepts of *Transcendental Statecraft* and *Ontological Resistance*, specifically through the lens of the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy. While Neorealist and Liberal Institutionalism frameworks often predict the collapse or moderation of revolutionary states under extreme economic pressure, this research argues that such states prioritize "Ontological Security"—the preservation of revolutionary identity and metaphysical meaning—over material comfort or physical survival. By analyzing primary ideological sources from Imam Khomeini and Ayatollah Khamenei alongside secondary IR literature on identity security, the study demonstrates how the Iranian state utilizes "Sacred Costs" and trans-territorial missions, such as the Palestinian cause, as constitutive anchors for state legitimacy. The paper concludes that the survival of the "Idea" offers a more robust explanation for state resilience in the 21st century than traditional market-based or kinetic power metrics.

INTRODUCTION

The study of International Relations (IR) has long been dominated by Westphalian paradigms that prioritize material capabilities, economic interdependency, and territorial sovereignty as the primary metrics of state power. Within this intellectual landscape, the "National Interest" is almost exclusively defined through the lens of rational-choice theory, where states are viewed as unitary actors seeking to maximize their physical security and wealth. However, the historical trajectory of the Islamic Republic of Iran presents a profound anomaly that necessitates a fundamental

re-evaluation of these materialist assumptions. This introduction seeks to frame the systemic divergence of the Iranian model, proposing that its endurance is rooted not in the management of resources, but in the preservation of a metaphysical identity.

1.1. The Problem: The Failure of Rationalist Predictability

The central puzzle in contemporary International Relations (IR) is the enduring resilience of the Islamic Republic of Iran against sustained, multi-dimensional pressure. For over four decades,

Western analytical frameworks—primarily Neorealism and Liberal Institutionalism—have consistently predicted either the systemic collapse of the Iranian state or its pragmatic moderation. These theories operate on the foundational assumption of **Materialist Rationality**: the belief that states, as rational actors, will inevitably pivot their foreign policy to avoid economic ruin or physical destruction.

According to the "Realist" logic, a state facing the combined weight of "Maximum Pressure" sanctions, international isolation, and military encirclement should naturally seek a "Grand Bargain" with the global hegemon to ensure its material survival. However, Iran's persistent defiance—most notably its uncompromising stance on the Palestine issue and its refusal to integrate into the Western-led financial order—defies these rationalist projections.

The academic problem is twofold: First, traditional IR theories lack the variables to explain why a middle power would intentionally incur "irrational" economic costs to maintain ideological positions. Second, the collapse of the Soviet Union (a superpower with vast resources) compared to the survival of revolutionary Iran (a sanctioned middle power) suggests that "National Interest" cannot be measured by material wealth or military hardware alone. Consequently, there is a theoretical void in explaining how a state maintains systemic stability when it intentionally rejects the materialist path to prosperity. This paper addresses this gap by identifying a non-materialist logic of survival that Western paradigms have systematically overlooked.

1.2. The Thesis: Ontological Security over Material Comfort

This paper proposes that the endurance of the Iranian state is a result of a sophisticated prioritization of **"Ontological Security"** over material or physical comfort. While conventional IR focuses on the security of borders and resources, Ontological Security refers to the "security of being"—the need of a state to maintain a consistent sense of self, agency, and historical mission. I argue that for the Islamic Republic, the abandonment of its foundational ideological pillars—specifically its anti-hegemonic stance and the defense of the Palestinian cause—is

perceived by the leadership not as a pragmatic compromise, but as a form of "Identity Death."

The central thesis of this work is that Iran practices **"Ontological Resistance"** as a survival mechanism. By rejecting the materialist "melons" of the Westphalian order in favor of revolutionary purity, the state secures the loyalty of its ideological core and preserves the metaphysical integrity of the system. This theory suggests that the high economic costs incurred by Iranian foreign policy are not "failures" of rationality, but are instead "investments" in the state's ontological stability. Consequently, what appears to be an "irrational" defiance in Western capitals is, in the Khomeinist paradigm, the only "rational" path to ensuring the state does not suffer the internal collapse experienced by materialist empires like the Soviet Union.

1.3. Methodology: Qualitative Synthesis and Ideological Analysis

To investigate the mechanics of Transcendental Statecraft, this research utilizes a qualitative methodological approach centered on the analysis of primary ideological and political sources. The study is grounded in a textual analysis of the foundational political theology of Imam Khomeini, specifically examining his directives regarding the "World Mission of Islam" and his rejection of economic-centric governance. This is supplemented by an evaluation of the strategic discourse of Ayatollah Khamenei, particularly his conceptualization of the "Resistance Economy" and "Strategic Defiance."

Furthermore, this paper employs a comparative historical analysis, contrasting the Iranian experience of "Hard Tests"—such as the Eight-Year War and the "Maximum Pressure" era—with the systemic failures of materialist empires like the Soviet Union. By mapping ideological pronouncements against actual state behavior during crises, the methodology seeks to demonstrate a causal link between the preservation of ontological identity and long-term systemic resilience. This approach allows for a deeper understanding of the "Missionary State" model, moving beyond quantitative metrics to explore the metaphysical drivers of 21st-century international relations.

2. The Crisis of Materialist Hegemony

To understand the unique survival of the Iranian model, we must first analyze the inherent fragility of the global systems that preceded and currently surround it. Both the Marxist-Leninist project of the 20th century and the Liberal-Capitalist hegemony of the 21st share a common philosophical denominator: **Historical Materialism**. Both systems posit that the ultimate stability of a state is contingent upon its ability to master the material world—through either state-controlled distribution or market-driven accumulation. This section argues that the crisis of the modern global order stems from this materialist reductionism, which ignores the metaphysical needs of the state and its citizenry (Khomeini, 1981).

2.1. The Failure of Dialectical Materialism: The Soviet Anomaly

The collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) remains the most significant challenge to traditional Realism. By every material metric—territorial size, natural resource endowment, nuclear parity, and a centralized industrial base—the Soviet Union was a formidable entity (Waltz, 1979). Yet, in 1991, it vanished from the map without a major external kinetic war.

From the perspective of **Ontological Resistance**, the Soviet collapse was not merely an economic failure of the command economy, but a crisis of "Ideological Exhaustion." When the Soviet leadership began the processes of *Glasnost* and *Perestroika*, they attempted to "modernize" the system by introducing materialist incentives borrowed from the West. In doing so, they inadvertently destroyed the state's ontological security (Steele, 2008). Once the "Mission" of global proletarian revolution was replaced by the pragmatic goal of increasing consumer goods, the state lost its sacred reason for existence.

Unlike the Iranian model, which embraces "Sacred Costs" to maintain its soul, the Soviet elite attempted to trade their identity for material efficiency. The result was a systemic hollow-out; without a metaphysical anchor to justify the hardships of the state, the institutional loyalty of the military and the bureaucracy evaporated. The Soviet anomaly proves that even a superpower cannot survive once its "Life-Support System of Meaning" is disconnected. This

stands in stark contrast to the Iranian experience, where the state intensified its ideological purity during periods of material scarcity, thereby ensuring its ontological survival (Khamenei, 2014).

2.2. The Decay of Liberal Capitalism: The Crisis of Materialist Abundance

If the Soviet Union failed due to a lack of material efficiency, the Liberal-Capitalist model, led by the United States, is currently experiencing a crisis of "Materialist Abundance." Liberalism assumes that the "Social Contract" is based on the state's ability to provide perpetual economic growth and individual liberty (Fukuyama, 1992). However, this model is inherently fragile because it possesses no "Sacred Buffer" to withstand periods of contraction.

In the 21st century, the Western world has faced recurring recessions, systemic debt, and high inflation. Because the American "National Interest" is tied strictly to the "Logic of the Market," economic downturns immediately translate into social fragmentation, political polarization, and a loss of faith in the state's legitimacy. Unlike a state practicing **Ontological Resistance**, a Liberal state has no language to explain "suffering" to its citizens. In a system where "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness" are defined through consumption, an economic sanction or a recession becomes an existential threat to the social order (Mitzen, 2006).

Furthermore, the US model faces a paradox: even without the external sanctions that Iran faces, it struggles with internal "Ontological Decay." As the materialist promise fails to satisfy the human need for deeper communal meaning, the society fractures. This demonstrates the "Westphalian Limit"—the point at which a state, no matter how wealthy, becomes unstable because it lacks a transcendental identity to bind its people during times of hardship. The Iranian survival, therefore, offers a radical counter-evidence: a state can survive with significantly fewer resources if it possesses a "Transcendental Statecraft" that provides meaning beyond the market.

2.3. The Westphalian Limit: The Exhaustion of the Secular Nation-State

The crises of both Communism and Capitalism reveal what may be termed the "Westphalian Limit."

Since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, the international system has been premised on the secular nation-state as the ultimate unit of political organization. This model assumes that sovereignty is purely territorial and that the state's primary function is the rational management of its internal affairs (Morgenthau, 1948). However, this secular-materialist framework is increasingly unable to manage "Meta-Physical Challenges"—conflicts over identity, sacred values, and civilizational mission.

The Westphalian model fails because it treats citizens as "economic units" or "legal subjects" rather than "moral agents." When a state like the US faces internal polarization, it attempts to solve it through legal reform or economic stimulus, which are material solutions to what is essentially a spiritual and ontological crisis. Similarly, the USSR attempted to solve its decline through administrative restructuring. Both failed to realize that a nation-state requires a "Transcendental Anchor"—a purpose that exists outside of time and geography—to remain cohesive under pressure.

Iran's rejection of the Westphalian norms of "neutrality" and "national interest" (in favor of Islamic Solidarity and the Palestine issue) is often viewed as "irrational" by IR scholars. Yet, this very rejection is what allows Iran to surpass the Westphalian Limit. By defining sovereignty as a **Divine Trust** rather than a legal contract, and by defining its mission as **Trans-Territorial**, the Iranian state gains a resilience that secular states cannot replicate. It creates a "Missionary State" that is psychologically and structurally prepared for the hardships of history, proving that in a post-materialist world, the most durable states are those that refuse to be bounded by the secular-materialist horizon (Khomeini, 1989).

3. Defining Transcendental Statecraft

While Western statecraft is designed to manage the "City of Man"—focusing on the accumulation of wealth and the preservation of order—the Iranian model is built upon **Transcendental Statecraft**. This philosophy posits that the state is not an end in itself, but a vehicle for a higher moral and spiritual purpose. In this framework, political and military actions are judged not only by their material outcomes but by their alignment with a "Transcendental Mission." This section identifies the

fundamental pillars of this model and how they differ from the rationalist norms of the 21st century.

3.1. The Theocentric Pivot: From "The Market" to "The Divine Mission"

The most significant departure of Transcendental Statecraft from the materialist model is the "Theocentric Pivot." In Liberalism, the center of the political universe is the "Market," where individual interests are balanced to create stability. In Communism, the center is the "State Apparatus" as the manager of labor. In the Iranian model, the center is the **"Divine Mission"** (Taklif) (Khomeini, 1981).

This pivot fundamentally changes the definition of "National Interest." For a materialist state, the interest is to maximize trade and minimize sanctions. For the Theocentric state, the interest is to remain faithful to the "Path of Truth," regardless of the economic cost. This is the philosophical origin of Imam Khomeini's rejection of an economy-centric state; to him, the purpose of the 1979 Revolution was to create a society that serves God, not a society that serves the global financial system (Khomeini, 1979).

Consequently, the Iranian government does not view foreign policy as a series of "deals," but as a series of "duties." This explains why Iran maintains its stance on Palestine despite decades of economic pressure. When the "Divine Mission" replaces the "Market" as the core driver of the state, the state gains a unique form of immunity to economic warfare. Sanctions work by creating pain in the market to force a change in the state; however, if the state's legitimacy is not derived from the market but from the Mission, the pain of sanctions becomes a "Sacred Cost" that actually validates the state's mission rather than undermining it.

3.2. The Meta-Rationality of Ezzat (Honor): Redefining Strategic Gain

In standard IR theory, "Rationality" is equated with the optimization of utility—usually defined as wealth, territory, or physical security (Keohane, 1984). Transcendental Statecraft, however, introduces a "Meta-Rationality" centered on the concept of **Ezzat** (Dignity or Honor). In this framework, it is perfectly rational to accept material destruction if it preserves the state's honor and independence.

For the Iranian state, "Ezzat" is not an abstract sentiment but a strategic asset. To submit to the "Great Satan" (the US) for the sake of lifting sanctions would be a "rational" move in a materialist framework, but an "irrational" one in Transcendental Statecraft. Submission would cause the state to lose its "Ezzat," thereby destroying the ideological bond between the government and its core defenders—specifically the Basij and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (Khamenei, 2011). Without this bond, the state would become internally vulnerable, much like the Pahlavi regime was when it was perceived as a Western client state.

Therefore, the Iranian model calculates "Gain" differently. A "Gain" is any action that strengthens the state's standing as an independent, revolutionary pole in the world. A "Loss" is any compromise that subordinates the state to a materialist power. By using "Ezzat" as the primary metric, the Iranian leadership can justify decades of economic hardship as a successful strategy for maintaining sovereignty. This redefinition of rationality explains why the "Maximum Pressure" campaign (2018-2021) failed: while Western actors attempted to disrupt Iran's "Market Rationality," the Iranian state was operating on the logic of "Ontological Meta-Rationality."

3.3. The Structural Pillar: Velayat-e Faqih and Unified Ontological Command

The operational success of Transcendental Statecraft relies upon a unique institutional structure: the **Velayat-e Faqih** (Guardianship of the Jurist). In secular Westphalian systems, power is often divided between competing materialist interests—industrial lobbies, financial sectors, and fluctuating electoral cycles. This fragmentation often leads to "Policy Drift," where a state's long-term identity is sacrificed for short-term economic or political relief. The Iranian model, however, utilizes the office of the Supreme Leader as a "Guardian of Ontological Consistency."

According to the doctrine established by Imam Khomeini, the Jurist serves as the ultimate arbiter of the state's alignment with its transcendental mission (Khomeini, 1981). This provides the Iranian system with a **Unified Command** that is structurally insulated from the pressures of the global market. While the elected branches of the government may manage day-to-day material administration, the

Supreme Leader ensures that these actions do not compromise the state's "Ezzat" or its constitutive pillars, such as the support for the "Oppressed" (Mustad'afin) (Khamenei, 2014).

This structural insulation is what enables "Ontological Resistance." Because the core strategic decisions are not beholden to quarterly GDP reports or electoral popularity, the state can sustain "Sacred Costs" over decades. In contrast to the Soviet Union, where the lack of a metaphysical guardian allowed the leadership to drift into materialist compromise, the Iranian structure prevents ideological decay from the top down. Thus, Velayat-e Faqih functions not merely as a religious office, but as a strategic mechanism designed to prevent the "Identity Death" that secular materialist states inevitably face when their materialist promises fail.

4. Ontological Resistance: Identity as Survival

While traditional International Relations theory assumes that states prioritize "physical security"—the protection of borders and populations—the Iranian model operates on the principle of **Ontological Resistance**. For a revolutionary theocratic state, the primary existential threat is not physical destruction, but "identity death." In this framework, survival is defined by the preservation of the state's transcendental meaning and revolutionary soul (Steele, 2008).

4.1. Beyond Physical Security: Protecting the "Soul of the Revolution"

Ontological Resistance posits that a state's physical apparatus is merely a shell for its ideological core. If the Islamic Republic were to sacrifice its revolutionary principles to ensure economic comfort or military safety, it would cease to exist in an ontological sense, even if its borders remained intact. This "Soul of the Revolution" is protected through a permanent stance of defiance against hegemonic norms. By refusing to conform to the "Liberal International Order," the state maintains its internal consistency and the loyalty of its ideological vanguard, who view themselves as guardians of a sacred trust rather than mere citizens of a Westphalian state (Khamenei, 2011).

4.2. Palestine as a Constitutive Anchor: Identity vs. PR

A common misconception in Western analysis is that Iran uses the Palestine issue as a "soft power" tool to win "Arab hearts and minds." However, the theory of Ontological Resistance suggests that Palestine is a **Constitutive Anchor**. Support for the Palestinian struggle is not a choice made for public relations; it is a requirement for state identity.

To abandon Palestine would be to invalidate the theocentric basis of the 1979 Revolution, which defined itself by its opposition to "Global Arrogance" (Istikbar) and its support for the "Oppressed" (Mustad'afin) (Khomeini, 1989). By anchoring the national identity to a trans-territorial moral cause, the state ensures it cannot "drift" into the materialist sphere of the Western-led order. Thus, the Palestine issue serves as the "Compass" of the state's ontological security, ensuring that the mission remains pure regardless of regional geopolitical shifts (Mitzen, 2006).

4.3. The Doctrine of Sacred Costs: The "Melon" Philosophy

The survival of the Iranian state is predicated on the **Doctrine of Sacred Costs**. This doctrine rejects the materialist notion that state success is measured by prosperity. As Imam Khomeini famously noted, the Revolution was not fought for "cheaper melons," but for the restoration of Islamic dignity and independence (Khomeini, 1979).

This "Melon Philosophy" provides the state with a unique resilience: when economic hardship occurs, it is framed not as a failure of governance, but as a "Sacred Cost" of independence. This redefinition of cost allows the leadership to maintain high-cost policies (such as the nuclear program or regional alliances) because the value of "Ezzat" (Honor) is perceived as infinitely higher than the material value of GDP growth. In this meta-rationality, "Purity" is always prioritized over "Prosperity."

5. Empirical Evidence: Survival Through "Hard Tests"

The validity of "Transcendental Statecraft" is proven through the state's performance during existential crises, which are characterized in the revolutionary discourse as "**Hard Tests**" (Emtihan-e Sakht).

5.1. The Eight-Year War (Sacred Defense): Surviving Isolation

The first major empirical test was the 1980–1988 Iran-Iraq War, known in Iran as the "**Sacred Defense**." During this conflict, Iran faced a superior military force backed by both the US and the USSR. Realist logic suggested that Iran should have collapsed or sued for a humiliating peace early on. However, by framing the war as a spiritual struggle against the "Taghut" (oppressors), the state mobilized its population through the "Karbala Paradigm." The ability to survive an eight-year war without superpower backing remains the foundational evidence that a state bonded by a "Sacred Mission" can overcome extreme material disadvantage.

5.2. The Sanctions Era: The "Resistance Economy"

The contemporary empirical evidence of Ontological Resistance is found in the "**Resistance Economy**." Faced with the most comprehensive sanctions regime in modern history, the Iranian state did not pivot toward Western-style liberalization. Instead, it adapted its philosophy to emphasize self-reliance and internal production (Khamenei, 2014). The "Resistance Economy" is not merely a survival tactic; it is a philosophical adaptation that turns economic isolation into a tool for achieving "Esteqlal" (Independence). By decoupling its survival from the "Great Satan's" financial systems, the state reinforces its ontological independence.

5.3. The Comparison: Why Materialist Empires Crumble

When compared to materialist empires, the Iranian model shows superior resilience under pressure. The Soviet Union, despite its nuclear parity, collapsed because it attempted to save itself through materialist reform (*Perestroika*), which destroyed its ideological soul. Similarly, the Liberal-Capitalist model faces internal decay when the market fails to provide constant growth. Iran has survived over 45 years of hybrid war specifically because it refuses to "normalize." By accepting the "Hard Test," the Islamic Republic maintains a high level of institutional purity and avoids the "Identity Exhaustion" that leads to the death of materialist states.

6. The Global Implications of the "Third World View"

The Iranian model offers a revolutionary "Third World View" that challenges the binary of the Cold War and the unipolarity of the 21st century.

6.1. A New Model for the Global South: Independence from the "Great Satan"

For nations in the Global South, the Iranian experience provides a blueprint for **Independence from the Dollar**. By demonstrating that a state can survive—and even expand its influence—while being completely excluded from the Western financial architecture, Iran challenges the "Great Satan's" primary tool of hegemony. This model suggests that sovereignty is not granted by international recognition, but earned through the refusal to submit to materialist dictates.

6.2. The Trans-Territorial Strategy: Ideas Beyond Borders

Finally, the Iranian model proves that **ideas bypass physical borders and sanctions**. Through its "Trans-Territorial Strategy," Iran projects power through a network of non-state actors (the Axis of Resistance) who are bonded by ideology rather than financial contracts. Because this influence is built on "Hearts and Minds" and a shared transcendental mission, it cannot be defeated through kinetic or economic means alone. This signals the end of the Westphalian era and the rise of a new paradigm where "Logic" and "Identity" are the ultimate currencies of power in the international system.

7. Conclusion

7.1. Transcendental Statecraft as a Viable Alternative

Transcendental Statecraft represents a significant departure from the materialist binary of the 20th century. While Liberal Capitalism and Communism rely on the state's ability to satisfy material appetites, the Iranian model demonstrates that a state can derive immense resilience from its metaphysical "Being." It proves that the "National Interest" is not a fixed economic calculation but a flexible ideological construct. As global materialist systems face increasing "Ontological Decay," the Iranian alternative suggests that the most durable states are

those whose foundations are anchored in a transcendental purpose rather than a fluctuating market.

7.2. Final Assessment: The Survival of the Idea

The central thesis of this research—**Ontological Resistance**—concludes that the survival of the "Idea" is more critical to state longevity than the survival of the "Market." In the final analysis, the Iranian experience refutes the end-of-history narrative. It shows that a state willing to endure "Sacred Costs" for the sake of its identity can outlast adversaries with vastly superior material power. This "Survival of the Soul" over the "Survival of the Machine" serves as a profound challenge to modern International Relations theory, demanding a new academic focus on the role of transcendental logic in the 21st-century global order.

REFERENCES

- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. Free Press.
- Institute for Compilation and Publication of Imam Khomeini's Works. (n.d.). *Imam-Khomeini.ir*. <https://www.imam-khomeini.ir/en>
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Khamenei, A. (2011). *Address to the IRGC commanders: The concept of Ezzat in foreign policy*. Office of the Supreme Leader.
- Khamenei, A. (2014). *General policies of the resistance economy*. Islamic Republic of Iran.
- Khamenei, A. (2019). *The second phase of the revolution: Strategic patience and the hard test*. Office of the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran.
- Khomeini, R. (1979). *The melon speech: Addressing the materialist critique of the revolution*. Islamic Research Institute.
- Khomeini, R. (1981). *Islamic government: Governance of the jurist (Velayat-e Faqih)*. Institute for Compilation and Publication of Imam Khomeini's Works.
- Khomeini, R. (1989). *The last will and testament of the leader of the Islamic revolution*. Islamic Propagation Organization.

Mitzen, J. (2006). Ontological security in world politics: State identity and the security dilemma. *European Journal of International Relations*, 12(3), 341–370.

Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace*. Alfred A. Knopf.

Office of the Supreme Leader. (n.d.). *Leader.ir*.
<https://www.leader.ir/en>

Steele, B. J. (2008). *Ontological security in international relations: Self-identity and the IR state*. Routledge.

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. McGraw-Hill.

