The year 2011 marked a watershed moment in the Middle East. Mass demonstrations facilitated by the new media, such as Facebook and Twitter, uprooted the political landscape of the region and either overturned or seriously destabilized several long-lasting Arab dictatorships. While the political developments were cautiously greeted with optimism by many in the West as a sign of democratization, Iran full-heartedly hailed the transformative events as an “Islamic Awakening” based on its own Islamic revolution in 1979. From Tehran’s point of view, the regional uprisings signaled Iran’s ascendant power and influence in the Middle East as a result of the toppling of pro-American autocracies, the rise to power of like-minded Islamic political parties, and the increased political opportunities created by the instability that has ensued in the Arab world.

Iran’s perspective on these developments was further bolstered in September 2012 by the protests that erupted across the Muslim world in reaction to the inflammatory film clip “Innocence of Muslims,” and by the images of angry Egyptians scaling the walls of the U.S. Embassy in Cairo and burning the American flag—an eerie reminder of events that had occurred more than three decades earlier in Iran. Not only did the protests provide Iran with additional justification for its use of the term “Islamic Awakening” to describe these tumultuous political developments, but they also offered Iran the opportunity to display its revolutionary credentials yet again from its preferred position as the vanguard of the Islamic world. Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, Iran’s Supreme Leader, issued a message concluding that “our Muslim brothers and sisters...
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throughout the world should know that these futile and desperate moves by the enemies of the Islamic Awakening are a sign of the greatness and importance of this uprising..." Four days later, Sheikh Hassan Nasrallah, the leader of Lebanon’s Hezbollah, made a public appearance for the first time since December 2011 to underline the importance of the protests, directed against what he claimed to have been an “unprecedented” attack against Islam. Many within Iran have even claimed that these developments marked the second regional “wave” of the Islamic Awakening.

But what does Iran actually mean by the Islamic Awakening? Why does it make such declarations? And what are its goals? At the most basic level, the Islamic Awakening represents the strategic narrative Iran has developed to frame the Arab uprisings. However, to properly recognize the meaning and significance of this portrayal, we must understand how Iranian discourse on the Islamic Awakening has come to be shaped and developed in the first place. Accordingly, this Brief focuses on the Iranian conceptualization of the “Islamic Awakening” and the domestic ideological context in which it took shape.

This Brief begins by introducing readers to the concept of the Islamic Awakening and discusses how the Islamic Republic of Iran has utilized it since 2011 as a platform to extend its influence over regional developments. It then proceeds to contextualize Iran’s narrative of the Islamic Awakening within the domestic ideological context of the regime, from two different perspectives. The first is in the framework of the soft war—within which the Islamic Awakening plays a political role. The second is the regime’s renewed emphasis on the Islamization of the social sciences and the need to develop alternative systems of governance based on Islamic thought—representative of the ideological roots of the very idea and foundation of the Islamic Awakening. The Brief concludes with a discussion of the political ramifications that the discourse of the Islamic Awakening holds for the regime. Iran’s use of soft power in the framework of the Islamic Awakening is not simply a means of projecting its power across the region. It is, just as importantly, a means of domestic regime support and empowerment.

What Is the Islamic Awakening?

The term “Islamic Awakening” is of course not new within Iranian discourse, and has been commonly used to describe the contemporary resurgence of Islamic identity and ideology within the Islamic world. The term began gaining wider usage by the Iranian regime, however, in response to Muslim protests against what it called acts of Western “Islamophobia,” such as the offensive Danish cartoons depicting the Prophet and the French bans on the Islamic veil. In particular, in November 2010, just a month prior to the beginning of the protests in Tunisia, in his yearly message to the Hajj pilgrims in Mecca, Ayatollah Khamenei stated that “the expansion of the Islamic Awakening in today’s world,” as a result of the Iranian revolution, “is a truth that signals a bright future for the Islamic ummah [nation].” He further added that “the ‘Anti-Islam Front,’ which oppressively ruled Islamic nations and states for two centuries and exploited their resources, is witnessing a drop in its influence and . . . the daily advancement and deepening of the Islamic Awakening [against it].” A short time thereafter, on the thirty-second anniversary of the Iranian revolution in February 2011 and as popular protests spread across the region, Khamenei declared that “today’s events in North Africa, the country of Egypt, the country of Tunisia, and other countries have another meaning, a special meaning, for the Iranian nation. This is what has always been called the Islamic Awakening... Today it is showing itself.”
Since this declaration, the discourse of the “Islamic Awakening” has been fervently disseminated not only by Iranian media outlets but also within Islamic seminars, political organizations, and university associations, and especially among the Islamic Revolutionary Guards. The collapse of pro-American regimes was lauded as a sign of Iranian soft power and a momentous heralding of the rise of Islam in the political order of the region. For example, Yadollah Javani, head of the political bureau of the Revolutionary Guards, stated that as pro-American dictatorships fell across the region, the position of the United States, Israel, and the remaining Arab states had become more precarious and unstable, while the power of Iran was only expanding.6

In an international conference on “Youth and the Islamic Awakening,” held in Tehran in January 2012, Qassem Suleimani, commander of the Guards’ Quds Force, claimed that the victory of Hezbollah over Israel in the “Thirty-three Day” war in 2006 and the victory of the Palestinians in the “Twenty-two Day” war in 2009 had been critical for empowering and emboldening Islamic movements in the region.7 He added that “the Islamic Republic of Iran has the capability to organize this movement and to facilitate the establishment of Islamic governments that will fight against the ‘Arrogance’ [a term employed by the regime in reference to ‘Western imperialist forces’]” across different Arab countries, such as in Jordan. Moreover, in an attempt to highlight the ideological ramifications of the Iranian revolution’s power in fomenting the current uprisings, Iranians have mapped out what they regard as the different waves of the Awakening that have emanated from its epicenter in Iran—with some individuals, including Mohsen Rezai, Secretary of the Expediency Council, claiming that the economic protests in Europe and the Occupy Movement in the United States represent the second and third waves.8

To effectively propagate this view, Iran established the World Assembly for the Islamic Awakening under the chairmanship of Ali Akbar Velayati, an influential former foreign minister and a possible contender in the 2013 presidential election. Since the onset of the regional protests, he has organized several international conferences and workshops each year to instill this Islamic vision among Arab participants and to forge a basis for intellectual and political cooperation across the region. These forums have not only encouraged attenders to focus on the unique ways in which Islam can be integrated into the political order of their respective states—thereby inserting Iran directly into the internal debates being conducted within Islamic political parties across the Arab world—but have also served to bring home to them that Islamic politics and independent development can successfully go hand in hand. Thus, Iran’s achievement is pointed up in areas such as producing the highest rate of scientific growth in the world9 and successfully integrating women in higher education.10 As can be imagined, the Iranian nuclear program effectively plays into enhancing the image of a powerful and independent Islamic state.

Contrary to what is commonly assumed, however, Iran’s narrative of the Islamic Awakening and its promotion of Islamic government are not tied to an Iranian state model—or to any other specific institutional model, for that matter. Thus, at the First International Conference on the Islamic Awakening held in Tehran in September 2011, attended by more than 700 delegates from 84 countries, Khamenei noted that “system-building is your pivotal and main task; a complex and challenging affair,” but one that “can be achieved through different methods and forms depending on the particular conditions that exist across the diversity of countries.”11 By stressing the multitude of paths that could be taken toward the goal of constructing an Islamic state—a theme he has repeatedly stressed—Khamenei signaled that there is no one single model to emulate; rather, he maintained, Arab Islamists must all be involved in developing new modes of Islamic governance that will be suitable for their local contexts. But their sights, he insisted, must be set on a single vision: “The ultimate goal must be a unified Islamic ummah [nation] and the establishment of a new Islamic civilization based on religion, rationalism, science, and morality.” Moreover, Khamenei firmly warned foreign delegates to “not allow secular, or Western liberal, or extremist nationalist, or leftist Marxist models to be imposed on you.”

Given this vision of a united Muslim community, it is noteworthy that Iranian discourse does not make any distinctions between the Shia and Sunni denominations within Islam. In fact, the regime has repeatedly argued that any conflict between the two groups stems from foreign plots that seek to sow discord and division within the Islamic world.12 Iran’s apprehension of a possible sectarian drift, of course, is partly owing to the Shias being a minority religious group in the Islamic world—as a result of which the Islamic regime has always striven to remove any possible sources of tension between the two sects. In October 2010, for example, in a move that was praised by Ahmad al-Tayyib, the Grand Sheikh of Al-Azhar in Egypt, Ayatollah Khamenei forbade Shias from insulting any of the companions and wives of the Prophet who were respected by Sunnis.13 He issued the fatwa after a Kuwaiti Shia cleric insulted Aisha, one of the Prophet’s wives.

The narrative of the Islamic Awakening therefore serves as the strategic vision Iran communicates to the Islamic world so as to guide it beyond Western models of governance and toward a reassertion of Islamic
thought in the public arena. Muslims, according to this narrative, should theorize about and experiment with how to construct a just Islamic polity within their local contexts. Iran thus projects its soft power—and expands its patronage networks—by providing support to Arab Islamists seeking to construct Islamic states without demanding that they emulate the specific structures of the Iranian regime. It also provides recognition and a platform to those opposed to U.S. policy goals in the region, thereby advancing larger Iranian foreign policy objectives. Yet, as Khamenei has frequently stressed on other occasions, the creation of an international Islamic civilization—which currently does not exist in the world—represents the pinnacle of Iran’s own revolutionary vision. As a result, the discourse of Islamic Awakening not only advances Iran’s foreign policy objectives but, just as importantly, bolsters and invigorates its domestic ideology as well—a topic that will be more fully discussed in the following section.

### Iran’s Domestic Ideological Context

While Iran’s narrative of the Islamic Awakening emphasizes the political developments that have occurred outside of Iran’s borders, it is nevertheless fundamentally rooted in the Islamic Republic’s own domestic ideological context and the regime’s interest in projecting its “soft power.” As such, the importance of this narrative must be analyzed from two different yet related perspectives. The first is in the context of the “soft war,” which is the ongoing ideological conflict within which the regime perceives itself to be engaged. The second is within the broader history of the regime’s focus on the Islamization of the social sciences. Since the Islamic revolution, Iran has stressed the development of models of governance and society alternative to those of the West and the modern social sciences, based on Islamic thought. Accordingly, this section looks at how the narrative of the Islamic Awakening is a logical development of both of these outlooks.

#### The “Soft War”

At the time of the regional uprisings in 2011, the Iranian regime was already engaged in a highly ideological campaign which it referred to as the “soft war” (jang-e narm). The campaign represented Iran’s growing fears of “soft” threats to its rule, as demonstrated by the popular mobilization that occurred following the contested June 2009 presidential election. The green movement, led by opposition candidate Mir-Hussein Mousavi, not only produced the largest protests the country had witnessed since the revolution but also fueled an unprecedented degree of infighting within the ruling elite over the very nature of the Islamic regime.

In response to these developments, a couple of months after the election of 2009, Ayatollah Khamenei delivered a speech to elite university students declaring that Iran was in the midst of a “soft war”:

> Today the Islamic Republic and the Islamic system are confronting a huge war, but a soft war...Now, in a soft war, who must come to the arena? Certainly the gifted student thinkers, meaning that you are the young officers of the front confronting the soft war... The goal is clear: The goal is the defense of the Islamic system and the Islamic Republic in the face of a comprehensive movement relying upon force and deception and money and huge, scientifically advanced media capabilities. This Satanic current must be confronted.¹⁴

While Khamenei had previously made references to terms like the “soft invasion,” “soft threats,” and even “soft overthrow,” this was the first time that he used the term “war.” In the midst of the mass protests by the “green movement,” which were perceived by many hardliners to be a Western-led coup attempt, the Leader’s declaration signaled the heightened level of ideological conflict the regime assessed that it faced—one that he described as no less significant than the Iran-Iraq war itself.¹⁵

The soft war, however, extends beyond the challenge posed by the green demonstrations. More recently, with respect to the current nuclear standoff, Khamenei declared at a meeting with university students that the target of the soft war “is what is in your heart, in your mind, in your brain—meaning your will. The enemy wants to change your will.”¹⁶ The soft war, in other words, represents the latest ideological framework employed by the regime to analyze the threats and opportunities it faces with respect to a variety of issues. These ideas, moreover, have not remained solely at the level of discourse and political jargon. Just recently, the Armed Forces General Staff declared that it was establishing a Defense Propaganda Staff (setad-e tablighat-e defai), a Soft War Base (gharargah-e jang-e narm), and think tanks devoted to television and cinema.¹⁷

Within this context, the protests and political turmoil that erupted in the Arab world in 2011 naturally became a source of ideological contention within Iran. Many supporters of the green movement, for example, viewed the phenomenon as a continuation of their own demonstrations against the Iranian regime. With the start of the protests, Mir-Hussein Mousavi declared:
The starting point of what we are now witnessing on the streets of Tunis, Sanaa, Cairo, Alexandria, and Suez can be undoubtedly traced back to the days of the 15th, 18th, and 20th of June 2009, when people took to the streets of Tehran in the millions shouting “Where is my vote?” and peacefully demanded that they get back their denied rights.\textsuperscript{18}

Successfully framing the regional uprisings therefore became a matter of political import on the domestic scene. If the uprisings were perceived to be similar to the green protests, then the Iranian regime would be weakened and placed on the defensive: threatened by delegitimization for being likened to Arab dictatorships.

By contrast, if the Arab uprisings were believed to be reflective of broader Islamic trends in the region as a continuation of the Islamic revolution in Iran, then the Islamic Republic would be further empowered domestically: The regime would be seen as on the right side of history, and in line with the future trajectory of the Middle East. In the context of the soft war, therefore, the narrative of the Islamic Awakening provided Iran with an opportunity to brandish its ideology, point up the success of its ruling system, and counter U.S. strategic communication with respect to developments in the region. It has also permitted the regime to successfully turn outwards, toward its external environment, at a time, after the 2009 election, at which it was closely focused on its own domestic political scene—a shift of attention and discourse that provided the Islamic Republic with much-needed relief. Iran, in other words, gained the opportunity to push the soft war outside of its own borders to the larger Middle East playing field—and it has since sought to play by its own rules with respect to regional developments.

One external arena in which this conflict, in both its soft and hard forms, has been particularly challenging for Iran, however, is Syria. Iran’s depiction of the Syrian uprising differs markedly from its portrayals of other regional movements. Rather than seeing the revolt as a component of the larger Islamic Awakening—and even though the opponents of President Bashar Assad prominently include Islamists—Iran instead presents the conflict as an external conspiracy to undermine Syria as a pivotal state in the Axis of Resistance, a common reference to the close partnership between Iran, Syria, Hezbollah and Hamas in the region. From this perspective, Iran explicitly justifies its full support for Syria on the grounds that the collapse of the regime would pose a strategic loss to the country.\textsuperscript{19} That such a scenario could possibly come true, however, has been significantly downplayed in Iranian discourse.

Interestingly, Iran has also been largely silent on the impact of the Syrian conflict on Hezbollah in Lebanon, as well as on Hamas’s decision to relocate its headquarters out of Damascus. Noteworthy, too, is the fact that Iranian support for the Syrian regime, both today and in the past, has never been framed or justified on sectarian grounds, on account of the Syrian regime’s Alawi roots. Contrary to what is commonly assumed today, Iranians largely regard Iran-Syria ties as constituting a cross-denominational partnership rather than a co-religious one.

**The Islamization of the Social Sciences**

The narrative of the Islamic Awakening, however, is much more than a battle to frame the political transformations underway in the region. More fundamentally, it is linked to the very philosophy and mission the regime has systematically developed for itself since the revolution. Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, the founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran, presented Islam not simply as a matter of personal faith but, more importantly, as a comprehensive ideology and system of thought on a par with—and superior to—Western liberalism and Eastern Marxism. And this ideology not only serves as an important basis for Iran’s interest in extending its soft power, but very much relates to the creation of alternative systems of governance and society based on Islamic thought. Revolutionary thinkers from Ali Shariati to Morteza Motahhari and Ayatollah Khomeini strove to capture the “hearts and minds” of the Iranian people in their struggle against the Shah—and to persuade them of the uncultivated potential of Islam to serve as a fundamental principle of the political order and, more broadly, as a pivot of the social sciences.

The newly established Islamic regime immediately began to institutionalize this vision in the cultural and scientific realm by means of what was called the “cultural revolution” (enghelab-e farhangi). The universities across Iran were closed for three years in the early 1980s in order to Islamize them; after they reopened, many university professors were systematically purged, and some curricula were changed to incorporate Islamic classes. Despite these changes, however, the content of the modern social sciences themselves was minimally altered; the regime was not successful in Islamizing the social sciences and retained modern texts and Western foundational theories by default. Accordingly, no significant Islamic alternatives were developed in any of the social science disciplines, such as economics, sociology, or political science. The Iranian “Cultural Revolution” turned out to be more about reining in universities on the criterion of political allegiance to the Islamic Republic than about offering profound alternative models and theories for constructing a modern society based on Islamic thought.
Thereafter the regime’s emphasis on the social sciences remained minimal for many years, until the turn of the new century. In 2001, Ayatollah Khamenei returned the official focus of political attention to the issue of the social sciences by declaring the start of a new movement: the “software movement” (jonbesh-e narmafzari). The “software” of the Islamic Republic, in contrast to its “hardware,” refers to the programmatic ideas and doctrines according to which a governing system is constructed and run. In an address to the students and professors of Amir Kabir University of Technology in Tehran, Ayatollah Khamenei introduced the goals of this new movement:

A university must be able to bestow a deep and fully comprehensive software movement to the country and this nation so that individuals can, with these indigenous suggestions and frameworks and scientific innovations, construct the true structure of a developed and just society based on Islamic thoughts and values.20

In other words, the purpose of the software movement is to formulate the theoretical ideas, both philosophical and social scientific, necessary to engage in “system-building” (nezam-sazi) and construct a true Islamic polity.

The focus on theoretical software highlights the Supreme Leader’s personal interest in ideological and cultural issues, and his drive to curtail the rising threat posed by the more liberal and secular reformist discourse that had been taking shape in the country. In the 1990s, for example, Khamenei warned of the “cultural invasion” (tahajom-e farhangi), a reference to the increased Westernization and secularization of Iranian society in the post-Iran-Iraq war period. Less sweeping in scope than the software movement, however, the battle against cultural invasion was mostly a repressive push by Iranian government forces to limit and constrain the public space available for individual autonomy. The regime augmented the power and jurisdiction of its disciplinary forces, particularly the Basij, to crack down on immoral and un-Islamic behavior.

The reality, though, is that the program to combat cultural invasion was far from successful—a fact that was not lost on the theocrats as they observed Mohammad Khatami’s election as president in 1997. The regime concluded that it needed to defend and justify its ideological positions in a more sophisticated manner against reformist arguments, and not rely so heavily on “hard power” coercive methods. The consequent renewed attention accorded by the regime to upgrading its soft power was explicitly manifested in the “software movement.” The problems of the Islamic Republic, the regime concluded, could be solved only by truly transforming itself into an Islamic government based on new Islamic theories.

Importantly, the increased secularization and Westernization of Iranians, according to this view, was the fault of the modern and Western institutions of the Islamic Republic itself and not a consequence of the improper cultural inclinations of the people, as had been assumed in the 1990s. This position was even evident with regard to the green protests, with Mohammad Reza Naqdi, head of the Basij organization, claiming that “the foot soldiers of the sedition (fima) [a reference to the 2009 protests] are being trained and recruited by the Western social sciences in the universities.”21 From the regime’s perspective, then, the social sciences currently taught in Iranian universities, which are based on Western conceptions and theories, have to be Islamized to ensure its very security. The university system, and the social sciences in particular, accordingly became the main arena of soft conflict again at the turn of the new century and has remained so until today.

The narrative of the Islamic Awakening, which rose to prominence almost a decade after the launch of the “software movement,” consequently built on and deepened the ideational developments that had taken shape according to this line of thinking. In other words, the emphasis the Supreme Leader placed on “system-building” since the Arab uprisings and the First International Conference on the Islamic Awakening in September 2011 served to strengthen the ongoing intellectual innovations within Iranian Islamist discourse to counter secular ideas. The effort to Islamize the social sciences and develop Islamic “software” for the purpose of system-building now manifested itself both in the domestic arena for the Islamization of the Iranian polity and in the regional arena for the creation of Islamic states in the Arab world.22 As a result, and reflecting the ideological roots of the Islamic revolution itself, the narrative of the Islamic Awakening has revived the main ideational strand that constituted the Iranian understanding of soft power: specifically, the construction of alternative models of governance based on Islamic thought that stand counter to “liberalism” and the “liberal democratic” model. The current narrative has thus served to strengthen the theocratic foundations of the Islamic Republic domestically—thereby weakening the position of its more liberal and reformist critics—by coupling the regime’s unique mission as it has developed historically with the contemporary resurgence of Arab Islamists who seek to Islamize the political sphere across the Middle East.

**Implications of Iran’s Grand Narrative**

Iran’s strategic narrative of the Islamic Awakening is relevant to understanding not only Iranian foreign policy...
(and Middle Eastern foreign affairs generally) but, just as importantly, Iranian domestic politics. The reason is simple and, perhaps, counterintuitive: The development of Iranian thought on the Islamic Awakening—and of soft power more broadly—has been influenced first and foremost by the domestic political scene. Such thinking was spurred on not by geopolitical rivalries or by Iran’s attempts to “export the revolution,” as commonly assumed, but rather by the backlash of theocratic thinkers against their reformist counterparts regarding the very nature of the Islamic regime. Iran’s narrative of the Islamic Awakening is thus one component of the regime’s own ideological campaign to bolster the Islamic Republic and confront oppositional discourse on regime change.

Accordingly, Iranian perceptions of the Middle East are not mere readings of events that occur outside of Iran’s borders but are fundamentally rooted in Iran’s own domestic ideological scene and unique theocratic context. In this light, Iran’s decision to construct such a narrative was politically very astute. It turned a possible threat to the regime into “evidence” of regime success and an opportunity to project its soft power outwards. At the same time, the narrative contributed to strengthening the domestic theocratic discourse as it logically developed from the regime’s prior efforts to upgrade and refine its own ideological grounding.

Moreover, given its foundational roots, the narrative of the Islamic Awakening will most likely not constitute a passing or ephemeral agenda; rather, it can be expected to be a significant discourse according to which Iran will both perceive and frame regional developments for the foreseeable future. And despite possible factional disagreements that may have existed over the nature of the Arab uprisings—evident not only in Mir-Hussein Mousavi’s statements but also in similar, implicit depictions by Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, the head of the Expediency Council—the narrative today nevertheless holds across factions, at least with respect to the elites currently included within the regime. Thus, at the time of the regional protests over the film clip “Innocence of Muslims,” Rafsanjani joined in the theocratic discourse, branding the production an Israeli and Western “conspiracy” resulting from their “worries and fears” about “the wave of the Islamic Awakening.” Mohsen Rezai’s previously mentioned statements on the waves of the Islamic Awakening are another example. The discourse of the Islamic Awakening will consequently not likely change even after Ahmadinejad leaves office, nor will it depend on who wins the 2013 presidential election. It has become an official regime position irrespective of factional differences that may exist regarding other various regime policies. Finally, political analyses that posit a regional rivalry between the “Turkish model” and the “Iranian model” of government pave the way for straw man arguments—for example, over whether Iranian influence is diminishing in the region as Arab Islamic parties are more interested in emulating the Turkish model than the Iranian one. Such views reflect Western concerns and perceptions with respect to possible Islamic Iranian forms of government more than they do a nuanced awareness of actual Iranian goals for influencing the political trends in the region. Iran’s main desires are to contribute to the growing Islamization of Arab polities—in whatever shape or form that may take, detached from any specific regime or institutional model—and to encourage the increased independence of Arab states so that they do not toe the line on United States policies, particularly those that intend to isolate Iran regionally. Iran consequently seeks to employ its narrative of the Islamic Awakening that extends beyond the Iranian model to its advantage to expand its reach and pursue its interests in the region more effectively.
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