EDICIONES
COMPLUTENSE

Representation of History of Ancient Iran in First Pahlavi King Discourse (1925-1941) to Build a Territorial Identity in the Framework of Governmentality Concept

Ehsan Lashgari[1]

Abstract. Within the framework of the governmentality idea, the territorial identity consists of a group of symbols and procedures that are expressed in a particular period of history and given precedence over other symbols. According to this perspective, the national identity is not just a natural phenomenon but rather something that the political establishment builds over time and stabilizes as a communal memory, with the possibility that it will be rebuilt in the future. The goal of the current research is to examine how Iranian territorial identity developed during the First Pahlavi era, from 1925 to 1941, using the theoretical framework of the discourse of governmentality. The findings indicate that the construction of the national identity in the First Pahlavi era has been based on the unifying interpretation of the history of ancient Iran in the direction of solidarity of ethnic groups and social classes. According to this supposition, charismatic leadership was the only thing that could ensure spatial justice between the various ethnic and social groups. Through the nation's and the territory's adaptation to space, this element could also stabilize the Iranian people's territorial identity.
Keywords: Identity; Governmentality; Political Geography; Ancient Iran; First Pahlavi.

[es] Representación de la historia del antiguo Irán en el discurso del primer rey Pahlavi (1925-1941) para construir una identidad territorial en el marco del concepto de gubernamentalidad

Resumen. En el marco de la idea de gubernamentalidad, la identidad territorial consiste en un conjunto de símbolos y procedimientos que se expresan en un determinado período de la historia y se les da precedencia sobre otros símbolos. Según esta perspectiva, la identidad nacional no es solo un fenómeno natural sino algo que el estamento político construye a lo largo del tiempo y se estabiliza como una memoria comunitaria, con la posibilidad de que sea reconstruida en el futuro. El objetivo de la investigación actual es examinar cómo se desarrolló la identidad territorial iraní durante la era del primer Pahlavi, de 1925 a 1941, utilizando el marco teórico del discurso de la gubernamentalidad. Los hallazgos indican que la construcción de la identidad nacional en la era del primer Pahlavi se ha basado en la interpretación unificadora de la historia del antiguo Irán en la dirección de la solidaridad de los grupos étnicos y las clases sociales. Según este supuesto, el liderazgo carismático era lo único que podía garantizar la justicia espacial entre los diversos grupos étnicos y sociales. A través de la adaptación al

[1]   Department of Geography, Yazd University, Yazd (Iran).
       Email: Lashgari@yazd.ac.ir
       https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2810-8390

espacio de la nación y del territorio, este elemento también podría estabilizar la identidad territorial del pueblo iraní.
Palabras clave: identidad; gubernamentalidad; geografía política; antiguo Irán; primer Pahlavi.

[pt] Representação da história do Irã antigo no discurso do primeiro rei Pahlavi (1925-1941) para construir uma identidade territorial no quadro do conceito de governamentalidade

Resumo. No quadro da ideia de governamentalidade, a identidade territorial consiste em um conjunto de símbolos e procedimentos que se expressam em um determinado período da história e têm precedência sobre outros símbolos. Nessa perspetiva, a identidade nacional não é apenas um fenômeno natural, mas algo que o establishment político constrói ao longo do tempo e se estabiliza como memória comunitária, com possibilidade de ser reconstruída no futuro. O objetivo da presente pesquisa é examinar como a identidade territorial iraniana se desenvolveu durante a primeira era Pahlavi, de 1925 a 1941, usando o referencial teórico do discurso da go-vernamentalidade. Os resultados indicam que a construção da identidade nacional na primeira era Pahlavi baseou-se na interpretação unificadora da história do Irã antigo na direção da solidariedade de grupos étnicos e classes sociais. De acordo com essa suposição, a liderança carismática era a única coisa que poderia garantir a justiça espacial entre os vários grupos étnicos e sociais. Através da adaptação da nação e do território ao espaço, este elemento poderia também estabilizar a identidade territorial do povo iraniano.
Palavras-chave: identidade; governamentalidade; geografia política; antigo Irã; primeiro Pahlavi.

Introduction

Governmentality is known as a string of relationships in a specified period created by the guidance of the institutions of government, organizing the process of identity building and the methods of thinking and behaving (Parker, 2000 [2007, p.20]). In other words, governmentality is realized in the framework of institutions, knowledge, and the disciplinary actions of political power. The political and ideological thoughts, through formulating specific discourses, have spatial consequences and, as soon as they become operational in the territory, start to build their desired territory (Mayhew, 2009, p.390). Foucault, introducing the concept of governmentality, believed that from the 18th century on, with the formation of modern government, many of the methods used in prison to control criminals were utilized as the bio-power in other disciplinary institutions influenced by the political-historical

power, such as the schools, army, hospitals, etc. It can be said that human sciences that claim they can recognize and improve human life help with the creation of a society whose main characteristic is all-out control of life (Foucault, 1975 [1999, p.289]).

Thus, the function of power dominates the territorial space through special ideological works, and it is doing it in a way that the society's people become inclined towards the internalization of the ideological and normative aspects of the power and the manifestations of the national identity are manifested in the geographical space. These structures formulate the identifiable identity-social changes in the form of temporal and spatial variables and put them under a bureaucratic discipline (Giddens, 1982 [2000, p.17]). The understanding of the construction and change in the nationalism components under the impact of discourses and ideologies is one of the key topics in the framework of the concept of governmentality in this respect. The function of governmental institutions and governments can be specifically examined within the framework of this approach as the agents and exegetes of nationalism. This idea examines the processes by which government-supported discourses or semantic systems arrange how people are perceived based on their identities.

In such an approach, instead of researching the truth and falsity of nationalist norms and symbols, which do not exist based on the interpretive methodology, the way they are constructed by the political-historical government is emphasized (Mouffe, 2012, pp.45-46). Generally, consistency, cohesion, or divergence of the ethnic groups in a country is, to a high extent, the product of the performance of a collection of political leaders, institutions, and ideologies that organize the construction of a homogenous general identity by standardization of the common language, flag, national anthem and access to historical events. Therefore, the national identity does not have merely a natural aspect, but it is a constructed item stabilized as collective memory by the political power, and its collapse and reconstruction are possible (Braden & Shelley, 2000, p.146). Thus, in the definition of Iranian identity, various governments in the contemporary century, according to their attitudes and priorities, have highlighted and emphasized one or more elements of identity formation.

However, some political sociology approaches to examine how territorial identity is presented individually in light of discourse-geographical characteristics and contend that spatial-temporal elements of formulation are absent in constructed concordances (Livingstone, 1995, p.5). In other words, the dominance of the concept of a generalization of linear transition in the writings about the emergence of territorial identity, including in Iran, constrains the realization of the recognition of spatial-temporal individuality in this formulation. Recognition of the national identity as a symbol of historical discourse allows the extraction of effective spatial-temporal components, methods, and processes in its construction (Branch, 2016, p.2).

In this regard, with the emergence of the Pahlavi Dynasty and the First Pahlavi era, an identity formation was implemented in the opposite direction to the semicolonial nature of the former sectarian monarchy. The discourse-cultural articulation of First Pahlavi was based on the elements such as nationalism, anti-Arabism, antiquity, Westernism, and modernization and standardization of clothing. Meanwhile, one of the important elements of this discourse is the prioritization of the introduction of ancient Iran's history to construct the national identity. In this era, a deep gap is created in the society's identity pattern organization, and a new formulation of the

territorial identity emerged, which more and more organized the common identity based on the interpretation of the history of ancient Iran. The current has sought to analyze and represent the use of ancient Iran's history in the construction of the territorial identity in the First Pahlavi era from 1925 to 1941, in the framework of the concept of governmentality. In this regard, first, in the theoretical chapter of the study, the concept of territorial identity in the framework of the governmentality approach of Foucault would be defined based on the theoretical documents. Then, through the combination of this definition with the symbolized elements of ancient Iran's history in the First Pahlavi era, the articulation and adaptation of the nation-territory elements in the direction of the construction of territorial identity have been discussed.

1. Theoretical Framework: Territorial Identity and Governmental Discourses

In recent decades, the origin of the territorial identity, or the same concept of nation, has been very controversial, and even the reality of the presence of nationality has been questioned. This controversy is to some extent due to the question of whether the nations are deeply rooted and ancient or a relatively new phenomenon. Some scholars argue that the nations have existed centuries before nationalism, and they have had a historical nature (Muir, 1997 [2000, p.115]). On the contrary, some others believe that the cultural features and gaps are limitlessly formable and used by the elite. In their view, the nation is a relatively new phenomenon that has emerged in new conditions and is ideally suitable for those conditions. This group thinks that the nation can be constructed, and the politicians create the nations (Nazari, 2007, p.152).

In the framework of Foucault's governmentality concept, nationalism has been a modern phenomenon that emerged in the framework of modern government discourse, during which the territorial integrity and socio-political destiny of the inhabitants of the land were linked (Häkli, 2001, p.406). Therefore, for the inhabitants of the country to feel more unified, a collection of teachings was required. From a historical perspective, the development of nationalism discourse results from the need for political power in the modern period to create a unified political identity for the citizens living within a nation's borders. In other words, the process of nation-formation took place as a result of the development of the modern government, which gave the process of identity formation a political dimension by teaching its citizens that they share a shared history, homeland, and place of origin.

The emergence of nation-state as a modern concept is rooted in the Peace of Westphalia in which all judicial, military, educational, and financial affairs within the territory were handed over to the government, and gradually all the instruments of power and political-military influence that had previously been scattered among different classes, guilds, etc. were transmuted within this institution (Tabatabaei, 2004, p.143). Before the Peace of Westphalia, the individual's political identity was derived from the king, tribal leaders, and landowners, while after this treaty, this identity was taken from the king and the dynasty and delegated to the land and the nation. Therefore, the three elements of the land, the nation, and the government reached a spatial consistency, and with the decline of the ethnic and regional ties, the national identity and territorial nationalism instilled by the government were

organized within the framework of the geographical borders of the country. The modern government, by weakening the local powers and developing the common language and identity through the uniform educational system, fulfilled the political construction of the society under the name of the nation (Ertman, 2005, p.367).

However, the components of territorial identity formation can be changed by the political-historical discourses at any period. The formation of identity is the product of the discourse processes and, more precisely, a part of discourse controversies, and as a result, it is dynamic and changeable (Elden, 2007, p.30). Therefore, recognition of the mechanisms of identity meanings stabilization, especially on the national scale, is indicative of how the socio-historical elements are organized to adapt with the elements of the land and the nation (Wendt, 1992, p.126). In genealogy, what is important is the focus on the events that form structure, not the structure as a natural and trans-historical phenomenon. Accordingly, in the history-making events, relative to knowledge/power, a modern pattern of governing the bodies and minds emerged by the realization of the individual can clearly express his stand in the face of the world and others. Thus, the formation of the national identity in the framework of the concept of governmentality is a unique phenomenon in any country and cannot be generalized. The most important function of the authoritarian government from the social aspect is the harmonization of the society in the framework of a common identity, which varied in different countries, based on historical requirements, especially the function of the political forces in the rule.

In the framework of Foucault's governmentality approach, the influence of the government on the construction of the national identity can be realized by two mechanisms; one is the mechanism of the governmental institutions such as the government, the army, the police, the courts, the prisons, etc. which deal with the force, and the other is the ideological mechanism of government which is the software of national identity formation by the government (Foucault, 2004 [2013, p.34]). Although the religious, economic, and cultural groups might be sources for determination of the identity alienation, ultimately, the outcome of their actions is manifested in the political government, and for example, a religious group may have the chance to play a role in the determination of this alienation and change its religious identity into a political act in the framework of a political process (Schmitt, 1932 [2013, p.65]). Highlighting and introducing a part of the history by the government is considered as the main factor constructing the nationality, and the specified characteristics that are now known as the constructors of the national identity, are formed based on the ability of citation of ancestors (Mills, 1962 [2004, pp.40-41]), and it can be adapted with the nationalist ideas. Therefore, the main core of nationalism is made based on a form of public culture that tries to mobilize the citizens to love their nationality and defend their land (Smith, 2004, pp.19-20).

Foucault has therefore given the populace and security within the framework of the concept of governmentality in his study of the role of territorial governmentality (Foucault, 2004 [2007, p.69]). Absolute equilibrium and discipline are only possible within the framework of this concept when all inconsistencies between the lower levels of one final institution are resolved and this final institution is maintained within the framework of the concept of government. One of the reasons the government deals with the organization of social and cultural relationships and determines the disciplinary criteria is the contradiction of interests between the social and cultural forces and institutions because each party has specific interests that are

generally contradictory, and these contradictions can be delegated to neither party. Therefore, the presence of an independent institution is necessary, and the government takes responsibility here. With the birth of the government, the discipline, wisdom, and freedom of individuals, which cannot be provided by the family and civil society, are guaranteed (Lancaster, 1959 [1992, p.54]). As a result, civil society is an actual government that is not formed yet, since it contains the tensions and separation between the social forces, control of which depends on the vertical organization of civil society, manifested in the concept of political governmentality (Jahanbegloo, 1995, p.21).

In this regard, one of the epistemological consequences of governmentality is the guidance of social and human sciences prescriptions towards the provision of strategies needed for the achievement of social solidarity and homogeneity. In other words, the need for processes that are universal and unifying, and at the same time alienating, leads to the emergence of epistemological fields in literature, history, and culture to identify and find a set of symbols to create a common identity, such as a phenomenon named the nation with a specific identity created by interference of political hegemony to give a meaning to this unity against the rivals. Especially with the increase in population movement, individuals feel less identity and attachment to a specific place, and that is the reason the governmentality processes have intensified the definition of identity and nationality compared to the past. Therefore, an important part of the social sciences is the result of the governmental-political institutions for the creation of required justifications to make territories and differentiation. This need requires the mobilization of an important group of elites and scholars of the social sciences, including social and political geographers.

2. Findings Research

2.1. The Tribal Society of Pre-modern Iran and the Construction of a Territorial Identity Based on a Universal Interpretation of the History of Ancient Iran

Before the evolution of the authoritarian government in Iran, the construction of power was based on the reproduction and dispersion of the sources of power, and although the method of power enforcement was authoritarian, the construction of power was decentralized and sectarian (Aleghafour, 2001, p.40), the method of production, failure in the formation of the nation in the modern concept, and the powerfulness of centrifugal forces left no space for administrative-political concentration. On most occasions, the tribal chief owned the authority in the territory they ruled, and with the emergence of powerful kings, they were fully obedient to the government. Sometimes, they established a government, and sometimes, they caused its collapse. Sometimes they entered the war with the neighbors to support the Iranian government, and sometimes they raided the country, helping the neighbors. In times of drought, they raided towns and stole from commerce caravans. Due to their barrier positions, the tribes and nomads in Iran's periphery made particular use of this geopolitical capacity and had a greater impact on the political system. This procedure was also successful in slowing down the expansion of Iran's boundaries. The rural and agricultural production methods founded on feudalism and sectarianism essentially needed a decentralized system to rule the country. The tribal

leadership attended to the various internal political needs of the tribe and modified relations with neighboring territories, and the tribal society was also usually autonomous in its affairs and sphere of influence.

The development of national identity was hampered by the tribe members' identification with their own group (Cottam, 1979 [1999, p.54]). As soon as they noticed indications of weakness in the dominant political system, the lack of national feeling among them caused the tribes and ethnicities to diverge. One of the reliable indicators of Iran's political system during periods when the central government was weak was anti-government sentiment (Hajiani, 2001, p.120). Religion was the only thing that could bring people together during the Qajar era, and in some instances, it even helped to improve relations between the people and the government. It also helped with equipment and public mobilization (Seth, 1995, p.55).

The 16-year reign of the First Pahlavi (1925-1941) is usually referred to as the modern authoritarian government in which the nation-state formation discourse and national identity formation were on the agenda. This government eliminated the regional centers of power in Iran to advance nation-building and put the realization of unity between tribal, ethnic, and regional identities based on a comprehensive interpretation of the history of ancient Iran, to build a national identity (Abdi, 2001, p.55).

In this era, the discourse of accreditation of ancient Iran's history sought to motivate patriotism among various tribes and ethnic groups and provide the necessary legitimacy to subdue tribal and ethnic leaders. This genealogical interpretation prioritized the necessity of modeling the national identity of Iranians from the social organization of ancient Iran. In this discourse-based model, the explanation of the presence of unity between the tribes in ancient Iran led to the formation of unity in plurality among the ethnicities and social classes in the First Pahlavi reign, and in the absence of the formation of a nation-based nationalism, the peaceful coexistence increased the ability to create unity among distinct tribes. Thus, the government function in ancient Iran was represented in a way that directed the public mind towards unity despite the ethnic variety and returns to what "was considered wonderful" was manifested as the main element of identity formation. In this era, this discourse was always emphasized that the existential philosophy of government in ancient Iran was based on the equal consideration of all social, lingual, and ethnic classes and the conceptual manifestation of social justice, and the justice had deep roots in the Iranian identity.

2.2. Construction of Territorial Identity based on Ancient Iran History Symbolization in the First Pahlavi Era

Nationalism idea was introduced to Iran by Iranian intellectuals in the early 20th century. But the Iranian society at that time still had the serf lord social pattern and was not ready to accept these concepts. In other words, the development of the nation concept in Europe was the result of social contract emergence and law, which was formed after urbanization development and bourgeois class growth. While at this point, most of Iran's population was rural or even had a nomadic life pattern. Also, the ethnic dispersion pattern in Iran, which is center-periphery, was an important obstacle to the consistency of the nation and citizenship.

Therefore, the First Pahlavi government paralleled the effort for administrative renovation, it required referring to the historical visual symbols that could provide the necessary bases for the creation of the political legitimacy of the First Pahlavi reign, and referral to ancient Iran's history realized this goal (Keddie, 2003 [2011, pp.168-169]). The government function in ancient Iran was represented in a way that led the public mentality towards unity due to the existence of a common habitat amid ethnic diversity. In the framework of the governmentality concept, common vision creation by the dominant discourse about territory is a key element in the production of a common identity. This was even though until then, many Iranian people still preferred local identity over national identity and introduced their identity based on membership in a geographical region and membership in a tribe. But from this time on, the national identity symbol was formed based on political power will by highlighting ancient Iran's history and the king's unique role.

In this regard, giving importance to the historical buildings, naming many places and public symbols after the names of ancient Iran, allocating resources to discover ancient monuments and establishing institutions such as historical museums, and inserting symbols of Zoroastrianism and the kingdom of ancient Iran in the buildings of this period by the government, and promoting a sense of patriotism in textbooks which paved the way for the further development of terms such as Iranian identity in the light of the ancient monarchy. The introduction, highlighting, and frequent printing of historical books related to ancient Iran such as "Shahnameh" were noticed in this period. This was even though these books were not much noticed until the first Pahlavi. Such a model of national identity organization undoubtedly was not much consistent with the ethnic and religious democracy (Bashiriyeh, 2004, p.17), and it sought to, by relying on the elements of ancient Iran's history, introduce the First Pahlavi's measures in line with the creation of independence and revitalization of past pride and identity-formation for all classes and ethnicities residing in Iran's territory.

2.3. The dualism of history before and after Islam in Iran in the direction of nationalism building in the first Pahlavi era

On the other hand, in the First Pahlavi's discourse, the ancient Iran-based nationalism was considered an alternative to the a priori models of unity and cohesion in the form of the function of Islam. In other words, as a result of discourse alienation, a part of the history during which the Arabs and Turks had ruled, with Islam as an inseparable part, was ignored (Katouzian, 2005, p.72). In this discourse articulation, Iranian history was divided into pre- and post-Islam eras, and with the production of more content about pre-Islam, the appraisal of the administrative-political system pre-Islam, was emphasized. Also, reviewing the status of historical figures of this period, such as Zarathustra, Barbad, Ardashir, Darius, and Cyrus, and celebrating them as national heroes, was among other examples of governmental identity-making in the First Pahlavi era. Most of the literary genres, including poetry, drama, and fiction, were influenced by the nationalist discourse of ancient Iran. In the First Pahlavi discourse, it was emphasized that the nationalism derived from ancient Iran should replace Islam in the formation of social identity.

In this regard, important changes were made to form a non-Islamic nationalist identity, among which was taking the judiciary out of the hands of the clergy and

turning it into a non-religious form (Fazeli, 2019, p.106). In this regard, in 1934, the Endowment Law was enacted and implemented to reduce the influence of religious leaders, and thus the endowments that had had the clergy until then were handed over to the government. Besides, the political government sought to, by reducing the common speech diversity among ethnic groups and focusing on a single national language, create a type of national self-awareness based on the common Persian language. Since the differentiation with the Arabs had to become explicit, the language, as the difference, found a key role. In other words, in this discourse, it was interpreted as if the Arab raid of Iran in the Sassanid era had ruined their civilization, and the Persian language as a unifying factor could establish a universal identity between the ancient Iranian and modern era. Therefore, the language policy construct in the First Pahlavi era moved from the common Persian language towards the single Persian language, and the policy of monolinguals became the basis for national identity in Iran.

Also, in 1934, the First Pahlavi announced in an order that the name of the country must be written "Iran" in international correspondence, which was indicative of the Arian originality of people in this land, and another measure to form the national identity. The symbolic word "Iran" has always served as a unifying force to clarify the cause for the existence of the nation, having the largest potential to foster loyalty and fortify the national will to fully encompass the Iranian nation with all ethnicities and groups. Another discourse-creating tool used during the First Pahlavi period to diminish the influence of Islamic teachings and foster the development of a shared national identity was the modification and unification of the calendar based on the Solar Hijri calendar and the abandonment of the Lunar Hijri calendar and the Arabic months.

Generally, the identity discourse of the First Pahlavi was filled with patrimonialism symbols and elements that reconstructed the national identity, not around the concept of identity in the first hand (Ansari, 2003, p.33), but in the light of the charismatic kingdom. Although this model had arisen in the minds of the elite before the emergence of the Pahlavi Dynasty, in this era, elements such as the Persian language, patriotism, and Arian race were also added to it to provide the required elements and the way for Westphalian country-building was paved. Stabilizing this process, the increase in the budget backed by the oil income also could supply the required instruments for the establishment of the institutional exegetes of this discourse. In this regard, the establishment of the "Academy of Persian Language" in 1935 with the intention of the coinage of foreign words, especially Arabic words, was among the governed institutions that sought to form an identity based on the alienation of the language (Afzali, 2009, p.144).

2.4. The Governed Interpretation of Charismatic King Position in Ancient History and its Consequences in the Construction of National Identity in the First Pahlavi Era

The presence of climatic and natural diversity in the Iranian Plateau has led to the emergence of various micro-cultures in the Iranian territory. In other words, due to the placement of mountains, rivers, deserts, forests, etc., various subcultures and local symbols have emerged in Iran, and the Alborz and Zagros mountain ranges, with the natural separation of the center from the periphery, have caused the

emergence of distinct subcultures around the Iranian land. Therefore, the diversity of the natural environment is the basis and infrastructure of the cultural diversity in Iran, and the formation of residential areas has usually occurred in the shelter of relatively closed and limited areas, and as a result, has led to the formation of self-sufficient and introspective economic and cultural systems (Hafeznia, 2002, p.46). Thus, different inhabitants of modern Iran have been and are a heterogeneous collection of different racial, lingual, religious, cultural, and national ethnicities, and they have not had the required social cohesion and homogeneity in any period of their common history, and that is why the critical point of identity has been always present in them. The issue of coexistence and political management of ethnic diversity became an important issue, especially with the advent of nationalism and nation-state thought after the First Pahlavi.

In the Pahlavi era, the nationalism discourse first revolved around the charismatic leadership of the king. In this assumption, the basis of the monarchy's legitimacy was the spiritual relationship of the king with the Almighty God, and it was introduced as the only factor that could realize the enjoyment of divine gifts and the establishment of spatial justice. Charismatic leadership was a phenomenon inspired by ancient Iran, emphasized as one of the most important factors of solidarity of Iranians in the First Pahlavi era.

It was with the formation of the constitutional revolution in Iran in 1906, for the first time were recognized some elements of modern government such as the constitution and people's participation in their political destiny through the electoral system. But during the constitutional revolution, modern institutions and territorial identity in Iran could not be sustained due to some factors such as insecurity, anarchy, famine, political regionalism, and a deadly disease epidemic. As a result, in the first Pahlavi discourse; The powerful king's role in ancient Iran was highlighted to establish the security and national identity in the society and the constitutional provisions were on the sidelines of this dominant discourse. This discourse relied more on the king and his charismatic position in ancient Iran's history than on democratic processes and institutions to build territorial identity.

The political intellectuals and elite who explained this discourse also considered the only way to liberate the country from the internal political tensions and conflicts and prevent the intervention of the foreign powers, to be the accession to power of "a powerful yet peacemaker ruler" and a charismatic figure who can organize a modern construct of the national identity in Iran. In other words, the exclusive role of political leadership justice influenced the consistency of this era's royal nationalism and the priority of the position of charismatic political leadership. The common phrase "The God, the Shah, the Homeland" reflected this precedence of the Shah over the country at the time (Ghezelsofla *et al.*, 2012, p.12). In the framework of this discourse of difference, enjoyment of natural gifts in different regions of the Iranian Plateau, and the ethnic and lingual diversity have been among the factors that have made the charismatic rulers especially important, as the bases of justice, as Shahriar (the Shah) has been the absolute ruler who enjoyed the divine guidance, and it is different from the definition of an authoritarian ruler who violated the rights of others (Abrahamian, 1998, p.65). Even in the official literature of this era, instead of a representation of the concept of ethnicities, the focus was placed on the Iranian land's inhabitants who lived under the charismatic constitutional kingdom.

In this discourse, for the formation of the national identity, the interpretation of historical myths, texts, and inscriptions of ancient Iran was repeatedly used to confirm the characteristics of a charismatic king who has the characteristics of a judge, e.g., "Deioces," the first Median king in Iran was introduced king due to his justice (Rezaeirad, 2000, p.299). Even the reconstruction and affluence in ancient Iran were closely tied to the kings' justice, and the presence of a charismatic king guaranteed the country's development and progress, in Iranian thought, the world has been an infinite battleground between good and evil, and this battle is finally ended with the victory of the good and defeat of Satanic forces by the fair rulers (Naghibzade & Izadi, 2016, p.810). This governed discourse believed that the model of the society's political management is not public knowledge, but it requires a power that sought to blend spirituality with political leadership, in a way that the nation is not a form of an aware political society, but a unique historical-political collection that should be rehabilitated and prepared for growth under the guiding policies of a charismatic kingdom, and the politics is the scene of application of power on the ordinary people who achieve the social solidarity through obedience to the king.

This discourse has sought to legitimize an institution and introduce it as an ancient norm and organize the new power relationships and the well-found class system, the official ideology, and the social hierarchy, and in its generality, it has acted as an emerging language system. This thought gave the political power such legitimacy that introduced it as an important factor in the creation of national solidarity and considered any political rivalry with it as illegitimate (Ahmadvand *et al*., 2016, p.16). It led to failure in the formation of independent bureaucracy, and it was in its framework that creating social solidarity at different levels with the focus on loyalty to the Shah became the main axis of the discourse of the first Pahlavi era. Also, the failed experience of a parliamentary government and weak governments coming to power in the period between Constitutionalism in 1906 and to recognition of the First Pahlavi Kingdom in 1925 paved the way for expansion of the discourse of "charismatic ruler."

Conclusion

A different model of nation and territory identity can be produced in various historical periods depending on how the formation of the national identity and the nationalism components are articulated within the framework of Foucault's governmentality. In other words, even though nationalism originated in Europe, the political elite in various nations recreated it by their discourse standards. This is because theories that contend that all nations experience the same phases of political development are at odds with the interpretation of territorial identity within the framework of governmentality.

In this regard, in the Pahlavi era, the spatial adaptation of the nation and territory by the government required the transition from a patriarchal, sectarian, and regionalist legitimacy to an all-encompassing and generalized identity on a territorial scale. For instance, the First Pahlavi's interpretation of ancient Iran's nationalism was a way that could accelerate the political geography construction of Iran by

stabilizing the spatial adaptation of nation and territory and establishing the nation-state as a systemic phenomenon.

One of the reasons that ancient Iran's nationalism was expanded in the early First Pahlavi reign was the presence of political diversity differences between the nomad leaders and the feudal. Generally, the First Pahlavi was not dependent on the traditional sources of political legitimacy, i.e., the religion and the tribe, but he put the identity formation based on ancient Iran on his agenda. In other words, in the political sphere of the Iranian feudal and tribal chiefs, there was no such familiarity with the creation of a unified collective action to create a human construct named the nation, as the tribal chiefs and the feudal bot only were not able to create a unified and homogeneous front, but also there was no complete solidarity even inside different tribes. Also, in this era, regarding the lack of possibility of the formation of civil institutions and parties independent from the institution of the monarchy, naturally, their values and norms for the formation of the national identity were not transferred to the government, so the government found an increasingly more important position in the formation of the national identity. Thus, with the elimination of traditional relationships, the creation of national identity became one of the most important tasks and authorities. In this regard, in the framework of the governmentality discourse of the First Pahlavi, a narration of the Iranian originality in ancient Iran was validated that was to some extent influenced by the oriental and archaeological studies and emphasized the originality of the historical identity of pre-Islam Iran.

The presence of charismatic political leaders in this discourse also contributed to the realization of the need for societal solidarity. The following is a list of some of the most common questions we get from our customers about our products and services. This model attempted to legitimize the charismatic king's authoritarianism, establish political authority for him and his successors, and establish a turning point for the formation of national identity in Iran's political geography. To achieve this goal, measures such as disarming, settling the nomads, promoting national education, compulsory military service, and uniforming clothing were also taken. Generally, the identity-forming discourse of the First Pahlavi era came to the result that political power alone cannot guarantee the survival of government and factors such as the inherited monarchy, instilling the idea of the divine selection of kings, protection of borders, alienation with enemies, and the formation of geopolitical realms also play an important role in the national solidarity and survival of their reign.

Acknowledgements

References

Abdi, K. (2001). Politics and the development of Archaeology in Iran. *American Journal of Archaeology*, (105), 51-57.

Abrahamian, E. (1982). *Iran between two revolutions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [(1998). Trans to Persian by A. G. Mohammadi & I. Fatahi. Tehran: Nye publisher].

Ahmadvand, S., Nozari, M. S., & Jabrayeli, N. (2016). Understanding the evolution of charismatic myth; From the Sassanid era to the Islamic era. *Journal of Social History Research*, *6(1*), 1-32.

Afzali, R. (2009). *Modern State in Iran*. Tehran: Tehran University Press.

Aleghafour, M. T. (2001). The origins of contemporary Iranian political culture. *Political Science*, *4*(16), 35-60.

Ansari, A. (2003). *The modern Iran since 1921: The Pahlavi's and after*. London: Longman.

Bashiriyeh, H. (2004). *Obstacles to political development in Iran*. Tehran: Tarhe Nou publisher [in Persian].

Braden, K., & Shelly, F. (2000). *Engaging Geopolitics*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Branch, J. (2016). Territory as an institution: spatial ideas, practices and technologies. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, *5*(2),131-144.

Cottam, R. (1979) *Nationalism in Iran*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. [(1999). Trans. to Persian by A. Tadayoun. Tehran: Kavir publisher].

Elden, S. (2007). Rethinking Governmentality. *Political Geography*, *26*(1), 29-33.

Ertman, T. (2005). State formation and state building in Europe. In Janoski, T., Alford, R. R., Hicks, A. M., and Schwartz, M. A. (Eds.). *The Handbook of Political Sociology* (pp. 367-383). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fazeli, N. (2019). *Politics of Culture in Iran: Anthropology, Politics and Society in the Twentieth Century*. Tehran: Sabzan.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gallimard. [(1999). Trans to Persian by N. Sarkhoush and A. Jahandedeh. Tehran: Nye publisher].

Foucault, M. (2004). *Sécurité, Territoire, Population: Cours au Collège de France (1977-1978)*. Paris: Seuil/Gallimard. [(2007). Trans. to English by G. Burchell. *Michel Foucault, Security, Territory, Population*. London: Palgrave Macmillan].

Foucult, M. (2004). *La Naissance de la biopolitique. Cours au Collège de France (1978-1979)*. Paris: Seuil/Gallimard. [(2013). Trans. to Persian by R. Najafzadeh. Tehran: Nye publisher].

Giddens, A. (1982). *Sociology*. (1st ed.) London: Macmillan. [(2000). Trans to Persian by M. Saboori. Tehran: Nye Publisher].

Ghezelsofla, M. T., Maash Sanei, S., & Moghari, H. (2012). Sovereignty as justice; Reflections on the political thought of Khajeh Nizam al-Mulk. *Journal of Political Studies*, *5*(17), 1-30.

Hafeznia, M. R. (2002). *Political Geography of Iran*. Tehran: Samt Publisher.

Hajiani, I. (2001). Ethnic policy pattern in Iran. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, *4*(1), 119-138.

Häkli, J. (2001). In the territory of knowledge: state-centered discourses and the construction of society. *Journal of Progress in Human Geography*, *25*(3), 403-422.

Jahanbagloo, R. (1995). *Modernity, Democracy and Intellectuals*. Tehran: Markaz publisher.

Katouzian, H. (2005). *State and society in Iran: The eclipse of the Qajars and the emergence of the Pahlavis*. Tehran: Markaz Publisher.

Keddie, N. R. (2003). *Roots of revolution: an interpretive history of modern Iran*. (2nd ed.). Yale: Yale University Press. [(2011). Trans. to Persian by A. Govahi. Tehran: Elm Publisher].

Lancaster, L. (1959). *Master of Political Thought: From Hegel to Dewey*. London: Harrap. [(1991). Trans. to Persian by A. Ramin. Tehran: AmirKabir Publisher].

Livingstone, D. (1995). The spaces of knowledge: contributions towards a historical geography of science. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *13*(1), 5-34.

Mayhew, R. (2009). Historical Geography 2007- 2008: Foucault's avatars – still in the driver seat. *Progress in Human Geography*, *33*(3), 387-397.

Mills, C. W. (1962). *The Marxists*. New York: Dell Publishing Co. [(2000). Trans. to Persian by K. Deyheimi. Tehran: Louhe Fekr].

Mouffe, C. (2012). *On the political*. London: Routledge.

Muir, R. (1997). *Political Geography: A new introduction*. New York: Wiley and Sons. [(2000). Trans. to Persian by D. Mirhydar & Y. Safavi. Tehran: Geographical Organization of Armed Forces Publication].

Nazari, A. (2007). Nationalism and Iranian identity: Case study of the first Pahlavi. *Journal of Law and Policy Research*, *9*(22), 141-172.

Naghibzadeh, A., & Izadi, A. M. (2016). Comparison of legitimacy in Achaemenid and Sassanid states. *Journal of Politics*, *46*(3), 797-815.

Parker, J. (2000). *Structuration*. Buckingham: Open University Press. [(2007). Trans. to Persian by H. Ghazeyan, Tehran: Nye publisher].

Rezaeirad, M. (2000). *The foundations of political thought in the Mazdaic Wisdom*. Tehran: Tarhe nou publisher.

Schmitt, C. (1932). *Der Begriff des Politischen*. Munich: Duncker & Humblot. [(2013). Trans. to Persian by S. Safari. Tehran: Negahe Moaser publisher].

Seth, S. (1995). Nationalism and Modernity. In Camilleri, J. A., Jarvis, A. P., and Paolini, A. J. (Eds.). *The state in transition reimagining space* (pp. 273-297). London: Lynne Rienner Publisher.

Smith, A. (2002). *Nationalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press. [(2004). Trans to Persian by M. Younesi & A. Morshedizad. Tehran: Tehran Uni Press].

Tabatabaei, J. (2004). *Old and new controversy from the Renaissance to the French Revolution: History of New Political Thought in Europe*. Tehran: Sales Publisher.

Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics. *International Organization*, *46*(2), 391-425.