

153

Publisher

The Foreign Ministry of
the Islamic Republic of
Iran

Executive Director

Saeed Khatibzadeh

Editor-in-Chief

Mohammad Reza
Dehshiri

Managing Editor

Mohsen Chitsaz

Layout

Sahar Hosseini Sanati

In the Name of God

The Journal of

Foreign Policy

Vol. 39, No. 1, Spring 2025

Editorial Board

- Jamshid Momtaz, Professor, University of Tehran
- Mohammad Reza Dehshiri, Professor, School of International Relations of Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Abbas Maleki, Professor, Sharif University of Technology
- Reza Musa Zadeh, Professor, School of International Relations of Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Hossein Pourahmadi, Professor, Shahid Beheshti University
- Mohammad Hasan Sheikholeslami, Associate Professor School of International Relations of Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Hadi Azari, Associate Professor, Kharazmi University, Tehran
- Mandana Tishehyar, Associate Professor, Allameh Tabataba'i University



Address: Shaheed Aghaei St. Shaheed Bahonar Ave. (Niavaran)
Tehran- Iran

P.O. Box: 19395/ 1793

Tel: (+98 21) 2280 26 41 - 2280 2656 - 2280 2657

Fax: (+ 98 21) 22 80 26 49 - 22 80 26 43

Website: <http://fp.ipisjournals.ir/>

Price: 500000 Rials

*According to regulatory guidelines of scientific publications
of the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology,
approved on 23/11/2019, this Journal Possesses the C
Degree in 2021 evaluation.*

Contents

Articles

- **Strategic Cooperation between Iran and Russia: Enhancing Status and Challenging Unilateralism**
Elham Keshavarz/Parsa Hejazi
- **Analysis of Economic Relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Armenia Based on the SWOT Model**
Rahbar TeleiHur/Aida Mizban
- **The Islamic Republic of Iran's Foreign Policy toward Malaysia: Status, Challenges, and Needs**
Sajjad Atazadeh
- **The Role of the Brookings Institution in Formulating US Foreign Policy against the Islamic Republic of Iran: A Case Study between 2016-2020**
Majid Abbasi/Reza Bakhshiani/Hanieh Daneshvar
- **Ontological Insecurity's Impact on the Foreign Policy of the Israeli Regime**
Mostafa Tarin/Ahmad Jansiz
- **Examining the Areas of Change in Joe Biden's Foreign Policy Compared to Donald Trump Based on the Theory of National Role Perception (2021-2024)**
Elham Rasooli Saniabadi/Iman Pishva/Saeed Attar
- **The Evolution of U. S. Cultural Diplomacy toward Mexican immigrants after the Cold War**
Mohammad Sameie/Mohammad-Hassan Sheikholeslami/Alireza Ghezili
- **The US-China Chip War: Examining Political and Legal Aspects within the Framework of International Relations**
Alireza Rezaei/Mehdi Eskandari Khoshkhoo

Strategic Cooperation between Iran and Russia: Enhancing Status and Challenging Unilateralism

The security dynamics of the West Asia region have underscored the necessity for a dynamic Iranian foreign policy doctrine aimed at enhancing its status and level of engagement in regional power interactions. Consequently, strengthening military and political relations with Russia has been framed as a strategic approach in Iran's foreign policy behavior. The central research question, therefore, is: what capacities within the bilateral relations have facilitated the expansion of military cooperation and political engagements between Iran and Russia, elevating their interactions to the level of strategic relations and alliance? This study, employing a descriptive-analytical method, seeks to examine the political, security, and military relations between these two actors, aiming to demonstrate that the formation of a convergent foreign policy in Iran-Russia relations stems from their shared understanding and perception of "status." In this context, countering U.S. unilateralism, enhancing military capabilities, and achieving a relatively higher status; maximizing power/security in cooperative relations; dissatisfaction with current status and striving to maximize power/security to elevate status have collectively contributed to deepening cooperation, aligning long-term objectives, and fostering mutual understanding on strategic issues. Additionally, economic cooperation and a shared belief in the role of a common adversary in future relations have played pivotal roles in shaping profound relations and strategic cooperation between Iran and Russia.

Keywords

Iran's foreign policy, Russia, status, countering unilateralism, strategic cooperation.

Extended Abstract

Introduction

The evolving security environment of West Asia and the international system in general has compelled the Islamic Republic of Iran to follow a more dynamic and assertive foreign policy to enhance its regional and international status. In this situation, Iran has increasingly turned to Russia as a strategic partner to counter U.S. unilateralism, build military capabilities, and rebalance its position within the global hierarchy. This article analyzes the escalation of Iran-Russia relations through the lens of "status theory" in international relations, emphasizing that the desire for prestige, recognition, and influence is driving both countries toward more intense cooperation. The research builds on recent empirical studies but provides a novel twist in explaining the partnership founded on shared dissatisfaction with current international status and shared aspiration to improve it.

Following the theoretical model developed by T.V. Paul, the article contends that both Tehran and Moscow are motivated by a perceived gap between their current and rightful place in the international order, based on historical legacy and power capability. This "status inconsistency" creates both a psychological and strategic imperative to foster alliances that challenge the current unipolar structure. Iran and Russia have a strategic vision of the United States as a destabilizing force trying to contain their regional involvement and international positions. Their alignment is not simply a reaction but also a proactive effort to define a more friendly international order through participation in multilateral forums and security agreements.

Methodology

Methodologically, the research is a qualitative, descriptive-analytical study based on documentary and library sources, the primary objective of which is to analyze the strategic logic of bilateral cooperation. The

evidence confirms that military and defense cooperation—particularly in the post-war context in Ukraine—has evolved from asymmetric exchanges to more symmetrical mutual support. Iran's provision of drones and military technologies to Russia is a role reversal and an indicator of Tehran's growing defense capabilities. These exchanges also yield symbolic benefits by projecting a new image of Iran as a military innovator and reliable partner and allowing Russia to sustain its war effort under extreme international pressure.

Beyond the military realm, the two states are connected by a common security worldview shaped by parallel experiences with domestic turmoil, color revolutions, and terrorist menace. They consider foreign-backed upheavals as threats to their existence and responded with increased intelligence sharing and policy coordination. Their geopolitical interdependence—founded on geography, energy transit, and sanctions-driven economic collaboration—has also clinched bilateral relations. Iran's extensive history of dodging sanctions has been especially helpful to Russia since the war began in Ukraine, foreshadowing a shift toward increased economic interdependence.

Despite the partnership still having its tensions—Russia's tense relations with Israel and Gulf states or its inconsistent support for Iran in the UN Security Council, for instance—the fundamental strategic logic remains intact. Both nations benefit from shoring up the other's position in global politics, and their shared oppositional stance toward the West is enough glue to withstand occasional disagreements. Furthermore, joint efforts to create a multipolar global order, reduce dependence on Western institutions, and increase regional power projection enhance the long-term outlook for the relationship.

This research implies that the Iran-Russia relationship is increasingly strategic rather than tactical. While forged initially as a response to acute regional crises like the Syrian crisis, it has evolved into a broader, status-based partnership with implications for global

power structures. The joint pursuit of status and security, material cooperation, and common threat perceptions have driven the relationship to the threshold of strategic partnership. To sustain the momentum, however, there is a need to codify bilateral agreements, manage potential rivalries, and align long-term geopolitical agendas. As global uncertainty deepens and Western pressure persists, Iran and Russia can be anticipated to maintain their alignment as part of a broader effort to reshape the international system along the lines of their preferred identities and roles.

Expanding on the Strategic Dimensions and Implications

The strategic cooperation between Iran and Russia is not merely a bilateral convenience but a significant factor influencing the broader geopolitical landscape. Both countries perceive the current international order as skewed in favor of Western powers, particularly the United States, whose dominance they seek to challenge. This shared perception fuels their desire to establish a multipolar world where power is more evenly distributed. By aligning their foreign policies and military strategies, Iran and Russia are effectively pooling their resources to create a counterbalance to Western hegemony.

This partnership also reflects a sophisticated understanding of international status as a dynamic and contested concept. Both nations are acutely aware that status is not only about material capabilities but also about recognition and legitimacy within the international community. Their cooperation, therefore, serves a dual purpose: enhancing their tangible power through military and economic collaboration and signaling their rising status through visible acts of partnership and defiance against Western pressures.

To address these challenges, it is imperative for both countries to institutionalize their cooperation through formal agreements and regular high-level dialogues. Aligning their long-term geopolitical agendas will help mitigate misunderstandings and foster a more

resilient partnership. Furthermore, engaging in multilateral forums and building coalitions with other like-minded states can amplify their efforts to reshape the international order.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the strategic cooperation between Iran and Russia represents a significant development in contemporary international relations. Driven by shared aspirations for status, security, and influence, their partnership challenges the unipolar dominance of the West and seeks to establish a more balanced global order. As they continue to deepen their collaboration across military, economic, and diplomatic domains, the Iran-Russia axis is poised to remain a pivotal force in shaping the future of global politics.

Analysis of Economic Relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Armenia Based on the SWOT Model

The South Caucasus region has long held significance for both regional and extra-regional powers, whether as a neighbor or a sphere of influence. Among the key regional powers are Russia, Iran, and Turkey. The ethnic, cultural, and historical ties, as well as geographical proximity and political-economic cooperation between the Islamic Republic of Iran and this region, are of great importance. The South Caucasus, located north of Iran, consists of three republics: Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Georgia. Since their establishment, Iran has maintained broader and stronger relations with Armenia, with economic cooperation being particularly noteworthy.

Establishing strong and extensive relations in all fields with neighboring countries can be a fundamental condition for a nation's favorable diplomatic ties, security enhancement, and emergence as a regional power. In this context, political cooperation, economic relations, and geopolitical dynamics play a crucial role. Therefore, Iran, too, must develop and expand its relations with neighboring countries to safeguard its security and position itself as a leading regional power. Strengthening ties with Armenia, in addition to preventing Iran's isolation, would hinder the formation of hostile blocs along its borders. Improving the economic conditions of the regional republics through economic cooperation would enhance stability and security, foster development, and counteract the influence of foreign and extra-regional powers.

Extended Abstract

Introduction

The South Caucasus region has long held significance for both regional and extra-regional powers, whether as a neighbor or a sphere of influence. Among the key regional powers are Russia, Iran, and Turkey. The ethnic, cultural, and historical ties, as well as geographical proximity and political-economic cooperation between the Islamic Republic of Iran and this region,

are of great importance. The South Caucasus, located north of Iran, consists of three republics: Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Georgia. Since their establishment, Iran has maintained broader and stronger relations with Armenia, with economic cooperation being particularly noteworthy.

Establishing strong and extensive relations in all fields with neighboring countries can be a fundamental condition for a nation's favorable diplomatic ties, security enhancement, and emergence as a regional power. In this context, political cooperation, economic relations, and geopolitical dynamics play a crucial role. Therefore, Iran, too, must develop and expand its relations with neighboring countries to safeguard its security and position itself as a leading regional power. Strengthening ties with Armenia, in addition to preventing Iran's isolation, would hinder the formation of hostile blocs along its borders. Improving the economic conditions of the regional republics through economic cooperation would enhance stability and security, foster development, and counteract the influence of foreign and extra-regional powers.

Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative approach, utilizing a descriptive-analytical method. Data collection was conducted through documentary and library research, referencing books, academic journals, and reputable scientific websites. Data analysis was performed using the SWOT model, examining the factors influencing Iran-Armenia economic relations, with an emphasis on internal strengths and weaknesses as well as external opportunities and threats.

Discussion

The SWOT analysis is one of the most essential tools for systematically evaluating an organization's internal and external environment. It consists of four key analytical factors: Strengths (S), Weaknesses (W), Opportunities (O), and Threats (T)

SWOT analysis is a crucial strategic management tool that aligns internal weaknesses and strengths with external threats and opportunities. It provides a systematic analytical framework for identifying these components and formulating a strategy that best matches them. According to this model, an optimal strategy minimizes weaknesses and

threats while maximizing strengths and opportunities. In assessing the economic relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Armenia, the following strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (as outlined in the table below) were identified.

Table 1: Strengths (S)

1	Geographic proximity
2	Friendly bilateral relations
3	Shared regional interests
4	Iran's energy resources

Table 2: Weaknesses (W)

1	Weak transportation/support infrastructure
2	Limited Armenian market capacity
3	Lack of trade item diversity
4	Economic sanctions against Iran
5	Armenia's economic dependence on other states

Table 3: Opportunities (O)

1	Armenia's connection to the Eurasian Union
2	Joint economic agreements/projects
3	Energy cooperation (gas-electricity barter deal)
4	North-South Transport Corridor
5	Tourism potential for economic growth

Table 4: Threats (T)

1	Regional competition/geopolitical tensions
2	External pressures (international actors)
3	Economic fluctuations

Results and Findings

Through analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in Iran-Armenia economic relations, four key strategies emerged as research findings:

1. Aggressive Strategy (SO)

This strategy focuses on maximizing internal strengths to exploit environmental opportunities. In Iran-Armenia relations, Iran can leverage its geographical position, friendly relations, and energy resources to capitalize on opportunities presented by:

- The Eurasian Union
- Joint economic agreements
- The North-South Transport Corridor
- Tourism potential

Iran's position in the North-South Corridor, combined with friendly Armenia relations, facilitates strengthened goods and energy transportation. Additionally, bilateral energy cooperation (e.g., gas-electricity barter agreements) could develop joint infrastructure projects, ultimately enhancing trade, tourism, and economic ties. This strategy aims to increase Iran's regional market share and strengthen its geopolitical position.

2. Reorientation Strategy (WO)

This approach seeks to mitigate internal weaknesses by capitalizing on external opportunities. Iran's transportation/logistics infrastructure deficiencies could be addressed through:

- North-South Transport Corridor development
- Economic agreements with Armenia/Eurasian Union
- Market diversification in Eurasian markets

The strategy also involves enhancing bilateral cooperation to offset economic sanctions, particularly through energy barter trade (electricity-gas) with Armenia. This enables Iran to use regional opportunities to reduce domestic vulnerabilities.

3. Smart Offensive Strategy (ST)

This strategy employs internal strengths to minimize external threats. Iran's geographical position and North-South Corridor role allow:

- Creating alternative transport routes for goods/energy
- Countering geopolitical pressures
- Using energy resources strategically against foreign pressures

Energy exports through barter agreements enhance sanction resistance, while friendly Armenia relations help manage regional geopolitical tensions.

4. Defensive Strategy (WT)

This approach reduces external threats by addressing internal weaknesses. Key solutions include:

- Developing North-South Corridor routes to overcome transportation deficiencies
- Expanding bilateral economic cooperation to counter Armenia's market limitations
- Increasing trade diversity to mitigate sanction impacts
- Utilizing energy barter agreements to reduce threat effects

This strategy helps Iran minimize damage from internal weaknesses and external threats while creating new cooperation opportunities.

The SWOT analysis of Iran-Armenia economic relations reveals significant development opportunities despite existing threats and weaknesses. The countries' strategic geographical positions - particularly through the Norduz border crossing - create a strong foundation for expanding economic interactions by facilitating transit to Eurasian/European markets. Furthermore, Iran's energy resources and Armenia's gas/electricity import needs establish ideal conditions for long-term energy cooperation. Addressing existing weaknesses and obstacles could substantially strengthen bilateral economic relations.

The Islamic Republic of Iran's Foreign Policy toward Malaysia: Status, Challenges, and Needs

Malaysia has always enjoyed a special place in the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The current article, using a descriptive-analytical approach and library tools, aims to investigate the relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran in the period of 2010 to 2020. It intends to answer the question: "What has been the course of relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Malaysia in the years 2010 to 2020 and what factors have prevented further expansion of relations?" The findings of the research indicate that in the economic field, except for the early years of the decade under review, we have witnessed the deterioration of relations; however, in the political arena and issues such as the nuclear program of the Islamic Republic of Iran or the wars in Syria and Yemen, the approach of the two countries has been less divergent. In addition, it was found that the main factors hindering the expansion of relations between Kuala Lumpur and Tehran have been US sanctions, Malaysia's relations with Saudi Arabia and the issue of Shiite branch of Islam.

Keywords

Foreign Policy, Sanctions, Southeast Asia, Shiism.

Extended Abstract

Introduction

The present article, with a descriptive-analytical approach and using library tools, sought to examine relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Malaysia between 2010 and 2020, and aimed to answer the question: "What was the course of relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Malaysia between 2010 and 2020, and what factors prevented further expansion of relations?"

The research findings indicate that in the economic field, except for the early years of the decade under review, we have witnessed a decline

in relations; however, in the political field and on issues such as the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear program or the wars in Syria and Yemen, the approaches of the two countries have diverged less. The main factors hindering the expansion of relations have also been the lack of sufficient will on both sides, US sanctions, Malaysia's relations with Saudi Arabia, and the Shiite sect.

Discussion

In analyzing the bilateral relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Malaysia, it points out several essential points: First, as is clear from the economic statistics of trade between the two sides, the greatest trade boom between the two sides occurred in 2012 and 2013, and even after the JCPOA, we did not witness a repetition of the previous trade volume. Since 2014, the amount of trade between the two countries has always been less than \$750 million, and in 2020 it reached a figure of about \$500 million. This shows that one of the main components in the expansion of relations between the two countries is the "will" and "desire" of the parties, meaning that in the years when the governments of the Islamic Republic of Iran have pursued the Look East policy more seriously, we have witnessed an increase in trade relations between the two sides.

One of the main potentials in Iran-Malaysia relations is the economic issue. To deepen economic relations between the two countries, two areas of activity should be carried out: First, given that one of the main problems in this area is the lack of recognition of each other's economic capacities by the two countries, it is necessary to develop a comprehensive study program to familiarize oneself with Malaysia's capacities and also to implement a promotional and explanatory program to familiarize Malaysians with Iran's economic capacities. Another important point is the activation of the private sector, which, due to its lack of involvement in bureaucratic administrative mechanisms and its lesser restrictions on sanctions, can have a suitable economic contribution to the country.

The next component is the transformation of the Iranian issue into a controversial issue in Malaysia's domestic politics. Past experience shows that when Mahathir Mohamad or a group more aligned with him rule the country, it is possible to establish warm relations between Iran and

Malaysia, as can be seen in the assistance provided by Mahathir's late government to the Islamic Republic of Iran to circumvent sanctions and his stances in condemning the US crime against Major General Soleimani. In fact, the "Mahathir Mohamad factor" may be considered one of the main factors in the expansion of relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Malaysia. This is while we have witnessed the deterioration of relations between the two countries during the presidency of governments close to the West, such as the government of Najib Razak.

Conclusion

Although the existing literature on Iran-Malaysia relations defines the issue of Shiism as one of the main factors, the author believes that this issue, despite its importance, is secondary and is not considered one of the main factors determining the relations between the two countries; Shiites are a very small minority in Malaysia and are not as important as they are shown in the media. In addition, there are unconfirmed reports indicating the desire of the Mahathir Mohamad government to expand Shiism in the country to counter Wahhabi extremist beliefs. Therefore, by explaining the doctrine and clarifying the doctrinal distinction between the various Shiite sects, and making it clear to the public and Malaysian elites that the aforementioned Shiites are themselves opposed to the Islamic Republic and are not compatible with this system, we can attempt to resolve the differences.

The Role of the Brookings Institution in Formulating US Foreign Policy against the Islamic Republic of Iran: A Case Study 2016-2020

The Brookings Institution has a leading role in shaping US democrats' foreign policy and provides new political ideas in the United States. This study adopts a descriptive-analytic method and content-analyzes the Brookings' reports in three distinctive categories. The present study also adopts a statistical approach to calculate the weight and share of Iran related reports that are published at this think tank. The results indicate that Brookings Institution's policy, including the three categories of International Affairs, Defense and Security and Middle East has a significant effect in shaping Biden administration's Iran foreign policy. According to the statistical data, about 82 percent of Brookings Institution's reports on Iran, concentrate on International Affairs and Defense and Security. Finally, the application of Game Theory for analyzing Brookings' strategies towards American Defense Security in Iraq, indicates that the US needs military bases in Iraq and also needs to increase these military bases' security to combat the Iranian related militia. According to the game that is designed by the Brookings' experts, the US needs to back the Iraqi Prime Minister (PM) to accomplish this end. Iran also needs to ensure its' security against US attacks; therefore, it needs to back the Iraqi militia. According to the Brookings' experts, if Iran and the US choose the above-mentioned options, the result will be a Nash Equilibrium between the two countries and the selection of any other option won't result in a desirable outcome for the either parts.

Keywords

Brookings Institution, American Foreign Policy, American Defense Security, Iran, Iraq.

Extended Abstract

Introduction

This study seeks to explain the goals of the Brookings Institution regarding Iran and to achieve this goal, it has used the game theory model. The present study examines the hypothesis that the Brookings Institution has had the greatest impact in confronting resistance groups in Iraq and confronting Iran's missile capabilities and has worked to change the regime of the Islamic Republic of Iran. In order to examine the validity of this hypothesis, the second section reviews the literature on think tanks, the classification of American think tanks, types of think tanks in terms of funding, and also reviews game theory. The third section introduces the Brookings Institution, its prominent figures, the partisan orientation of each of these individuals, and the financial sponsors of this think tank. In the fourth section, the reports of this think tank regarding Iran will be categorized and subjected to content analysis. The fifth section quantitatively examines the share of Iran reports in the volume of intellectual activities of this think tank using a statistical approach. Finally, in the sixth section, the Brookings Institution's strategy analysis will be presented within the framework of game theory.

Material and Methods

The Brookings Institution plays an important role in shaping the foreign policy of the Democratic government of the United States and in generating ideas for it. The present study, using a descriptive-analytical approach, examines the content of the think tank's reports on Iran in three separate categories; then, using a statistical approach, calculates the position and contribution of Iran in the activities of this think tank. The analysis of the Brookings Institution's reports indicates that the policy lines of this think tank towards Iran in the three areas of international affairs, defense and security, and the Middle East have a significant impact on the formation of US foreign policy towards Iran. Based on statistical data, about 82 percent of the think tank's reports on Iran focus on the two areas of international affairs and defense and security. Finally, by applying game theory and analyzing the strategy presented by the Brookings Institution on the issue of ensuring America's defense security through Iraq, it is shown that the United States needs to maintain American military bases in Iraq and increase the security of these bases in order to ensure its defense

security against Iranian resistance groups, and to achieve this goal, it must support the Iraqi Prime Minister. Iran, in turn, must support resistance groups in order to ensure its defense security and reduce the risk of an American attack on Iran. According to the Brookings Institution, choosing these two options by the United States and Iran will lead to the formation of a balance of tension, and choosing any other option will lead to a decrease in the expected returns of both countries.

Results and Discussion

The findings of this study show that the Brookings Institution, as one of the leading think tanks in the United States, conducts special studies on issues related to Iran, including international affairs, defense and security, and the Middle East, and Iran has occupied the third place in the think tank's study portfolio after the European Union and China. Following the assassination of General Soleimani and Iran's military retaliation against the United States in 2020, the Defense and Security Research Department has occupied the largest number of reports on Iran at 46 percent. This research department has examined topics such as Iran's retaliation for the martyrdom of General Soleimani, the US focus on Iraq to confront the Iraqi Popular Mobilization Forces, and also confronting Iran's missile and nuclear capabilities. The think tank continuously provides its reports to Congress and US policymakers in order to guide US foreign policy against Iran. The results obtained indicate that this think tank, given its long history of supporting the Democratic Party of the United States, has a significant impact on the policies adopted by the Biden administration.

An examination of the strategy presented by the Brookings Institution regarding maintaining defense security within the framework of game theory indicates that the strategy of supporting the Iraqi Prime Minister is considered a stable equilibrium from the perspective of the think tank's thinkers, in such a way that the US government's support for the Iraqi Prime Minister will lead to the maintenance of US military bases in Iraq and also increase the country's ability to confront resistance groups. Given this equilibrium situation designed within the framework of game theory is considered a Nash equilibrium and the US Democratic government will not change this equilibrium situation. Because choosing any other option will lead to a decrease in the expected return of the US government.

Ontological Insecurity's Impact on the Foreign Policy of the Israeli Regime

Since the Israeli regime's inception, safeguarding and strengthening security has remained a central preoccupation of its leaders. To that end, they have sought to expand power and ensure security through diplomacy, psychological operations, and both covert and overt military measures. Within this context, ontological security—understood as existential security—derives from the regime's ideological and geopolitical imperatives. Grounded in constructivist theory and employing a descriptive-analytical method, this article asks: How has ontological insecurity shaped the foreign policy of the Israeli regime? It contends that the Israeli regime's foreign policy, which is based on an aggressive policy or cooperation and convergence, by expanding both engagement and confrontation in the foreign-policy arena—categorize states as allies, adversaries, or occasionally neutrals, interpreting their behavior as threats or opportunities. Guided by these perceptions, they forge or sever relations and, when necessary, turn to confrontation. The findings show that this evolving environment has prompted Israeli leaders to recalibrate their tactics, adopting diverse approaches to realize their security objectives. Consequently, through aggressive and belligerent policies—or, conversely, through military and arms cooperation and convergence—they endeavor to navigate existing challenges and crises.

Keywords

ontological insecurity, Israeli regime, foreign policy, United States, Islamic Republic of Iran.

Extended Abstract

Introduction

The migration of Zionist Jews from a multitude of countries—each bringing its own linguistic and cultural distinctiveness—to Palestine fractured Israel's social cohesion, reshaping it into a heterogeneous,

internally diverse society. This transformation has generated numerous tensions and crises throughout the territory. Within this environment, the presence of vulnerable, threat-prone areas has compelled Israeli leaders to consistently place security provision and maintenance at the top of their agenda. In addition, the conflicting and contradictory strands of Zionist identity narratives—exposed by internal doubt and by critiques from historians and international-relations scholars—have been a major source of the regime’s domestic security challenges and threats. As a result, this issue has given rise to concern and anxiety and has led to a sense of existential insecurity within Israeli society.

Literature Review

The persistence of these challenges within Israeli society has compelled the regime to remain continuously engaged in ongoing debates concerning existential security. Ontologically, feeling secure and assured entails possessing both conscious and unconscious answers to the fundamental existential questions that define one’s essence and identity. Essentially, an individual experiencing existential insecurity lacks a coherent sense of continuity in their personal narrative. Consequently, individuals and political actors construct identity through specific self-narratives. On this basis, states pursue ontological security because their historically constructed self-conception—articulated through narrative—connects the past, present, and future. Accordingly, any condition that threatens the established routines or habitual practices of individuals or states generates a crisis. In such situations, the natural response of individuals and states is to take action to eliminate the disruptive circumstances. When this concern and anxiety persist, their continuation ultimately culminates in the emergence of an existential crisis.

Methodology

According to constructivist thought, a social-security challenge or crisis arises whenever a potential or actual force is perceived as a threat to the identity of individuals within a society. In other words, constructivism maintains that the identity of any human collective—

whether ethnic, religious, or linguistic—is inseparable from its very existence; thus, any threat to these identity components is viewed as a threat to the group’s existence and security itself. In the field of foreign policy, the constructivist school contends that, beyond the objective distribution of power emphasized by rationalists, it is the perception and interpretation of that distribution—shaped by a nation’s worldview and assumptions—that enable states to engage with their surroundings. Identity allows nations to infuse the world with meaning, to categorize other actors, and to construct a hierarchical reality in which distinctions between “self” and “other,” and between friend and foe, are clearly established.

Building on these definitions, Israeli leaders judge the current global landscape as either “tolerable” or “intolerable,” thereby classifying other states as friends, enemies, or neutral parties and interpreting their actions as “threats” or “opportunities.” Consequently, designating friend or foe—and deciding how to respond—derives from the intersubjective expectations of the actors and their understanding of both themselves and others. This process ultimately shapes their sense of security or insecurity.

Discussion

In Israeli society, when identity symbols and the collective belief system are subjected to doubt and scrutiny, a sense of social insecurity emerges—an unease perceived as a threat to existential security. Indeed, the absence of a comprehensive national identity within Zionist society can itself be viewed as a social-security threat. These perceived threats, together with the resulting ontological insecurity, have shaped the Israeli regime’s foreign-policy strategy, impelling it to engage with or confront other countries after classifying them as friends, enemies, or, at times, neutral actors. Meanwhile, internal protests within the territory—intensifying in recent years—have weakened the political structure and undermined the regime’s legitimacy. Moreover, the external and international environment has consistently served as a powerful and multifaceted reference point in the foreign policy of the Israeli regime, and shifts in this arena may lead to changes in the regime’s external behavior.

Moreover, security challenges and perceived threats have been the chief forces shaping the Israeli regime's foreign-policy strategy. These threats have propelled Zionists, on one hand, to adopt aggressive, belligerent stances and, on the other, to forge military and arms partnerships with selected states. Accordingly, the regime's drive to expand its arsenal of unconventional weapons and preserve its policy of nuclear ambiguity has plainly impeded progress toward a Middle East peace settlement, while also supplying a pretext for the Jewish state's continued reliance on pre-emptive doctrine. Within this framework, Israel's special relationship with the West—particularly the United States—has been pivotal in advancing these policies. Every choice the regime makes in its dealings with Washington is conditioned by structural imperatives rooted in that bond, and U.S. foreign-policy agendas have, in turn, shaped Zionist positions toward both allies and adversaries, steering decisions on arms races, deterrence, and strategic defense.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it can be concluded that the anxiety and concern generated by the potential collapse of both state and society has plunged Zionism into a profound state of ontological insecurity. In response, this condition has drawn the Israeli regime into an unrelenting preoccupation with perceived threats to its identity markers, compelling it to maintain a constant sense of fear over its security. The intensity of this fear is plainly reflected in the regime's foreign-policy posture, with its effects visible in Israeli society—surfacing in strategies and behaviors such as a marked propensity for violence and militarism among Zionists. In this context, threat and tension have become integral to the very fabric of the regime's existence.

The Israeli regime, claiming that it faces threats from its Arab and Islamic neighbors, has shaped its military, diplomatic, and intelligence strategies in alignment with any form of aggressive rhetoric or posture. Within this paradigm, the Jewish state's political practices—guided by the leadership's militarized mindset—have coalesced into an adventurous and confrontational foreign policy. In practical terms, Zionists have anchored their national-security doctrine on several

pillars: offensive operations such as pre-emptive wars, preventive strikes, and targeted assassinations; cultivating ties with states on the Arab world's periphery through the periphery doctrine; adopting deterrence measures—particularly nuclear deterrence; and relying on the broad support of a superpower like the United States to advance expansionist aims. Moreover, by leveraging its influence with major powers and capitalizing on their global standing, the Israeli regime continually frames both internal and external dangers as grounds for expanding its military capabilities— an approach that has fostered a security dilemma in the Middle East—one that has grown increasingly complex with each passing day.

Examining the Areas of Change in Joe Biden's Foreign Policy Compared to Donald Trump Based on the Theory of National Role Perception (2021-2024)

With the election of Joe Biden as the 46th President of the United States from the Democratic Party, US foreign policy changes in many subjects that were different from Donald Trump's foreign policy. The main aims of this study is to understand these changes from a theoretical framework. The main question is that how we can analyze Bidens foreign policy change from the perspective of national role perception theory? In response to this question, the main hypothesis of this article is that by using national role theory as a cognitive theory in foreign policy analysis, it is possible to analyze US foreign policy change based on the national roles defined by Biden for the US as a "respected and transformative leader", "liberal hegemon", "defender of democracy and peacekeeper", "responsible for the problems of the international system", and also "trusted leader towards partners and allies". This research is methodologically explanatory analytical research (investigating the relationship between two variables: perception of national role and change in foreign policy). Data analysis is based on case-based theory and data collection through documentary research as a primary source and the use of reliable virtual sources and documents as secondary sources.

Keywords

Biden, National Role Theory, Perceptions, Trump, Foreign Policy Change.

Extended Abstract

Introduction:

With the election of Joe Biden as the 46th President of the United States from the Democratic Party, US foreign policy changes in many subjects that were different from Donald Trump's foreign policy. The

main aims of this study is to understand these changes from a theoretical framework. The main question is that how we can analyze Bidens foreign policy change from the perspective of national role perception theory? In response to this question, the main hypothesis of this article is that by using national role theory as a cognitive theory in foreign policy analysis, it is possible to analyze US foreign policy change based on the national roles defined by Biden for the US as a "respected and transformative leader", "liberal hegemon", "defender of democracy and peacekeeper", "responsible for the problems of the international system", and also "trusted leader towards partners and allies".

literature review:

By reviewing the existing literature on the foreign policy of the Biden administration, several categories of works can be mentioned. Some of the works have analyzed Biden's foreign policy towards a region or issue or a specific country, such as Iran. For example, in the article "The Biden Administration and the Policy of China's Rise in the Indo-Pacific," Kesharian Azad and Mirtorabi (2014) examine how the Biden administration is containing China in the Indo-Pacific. Jamshidi et al. (2014) also examine the US strategy in the West Asia region and its impact on Iran in the article "Threats and Opportunities of the US Grand Strategy in the Biden Era in West Asia on the Strategic Management of the Islamic Republic of Iran." The main question of this research is what is the US strategy in the West Asia region and what impact does this strategy have on Iran's security. Rahimi (2014) also examines the US strategy of containing Iran in the article "Analysis of the US Containment Strategy towards the Republic of Iran with Emphasis on the Biden Era."

The second part of the works, with an emphasis on a comparative approach, compares Biden's foreign policy with that of previous presidents, including Trump, on a specific issue. For example, Talei Hoor (1402) in his article "A Comparative Study of Trump and Biden's Foreign Policy Towards the Islamic Republic of Iran" examines the issue of what Trump and Biden's foreign policy towards the Islamic Republic of Iran has been. The main question of this research is: What are the differences and similarities between Trump

and Biden's foreign policy towards the Islamic Republic of Iran? Keyvan Hosseini et al. (1402) also examine the emerging global energy order and the role of Trump and Biden on energy diplomacy and US economic policies, and its consequences for global energy management in their article "A Comparative Study of US Energy Diplomacy 2016-2023". The main question of this article is: What are the differences and similarities in US energy diplomacy between 2016 and 2023?

These researches don't pay attention to Bidens foreign policy changes in compared to the Trump administration from the perspective of the perceptual theory of foreign policy analysis, and specifically from the perspective of national role theory, which justifies the innovative aspect and research necessity of this article.

methodology:

This research is methodologically explanatory analytical research (investigating the relationship between two variables: perception of national role and change in foreign policy). Data analysis is based on case-based theory and data collection through documentary research as a primary source and the use of reliable virtual sources and documents as secondary sources.

discussion:

The theory of "national role" has been examined by Holsti. In his theory, Holsti tried to establish a connection between the perception of the national role of domestic decision-making leaders and their foreign policy orientations. In his opinion, the understanding and perception of the national role by elites and leaders fundamentally plays an important role in foreign policy choices. This theory is one of the perceptual theories that emphasizes the perception and knowledge of the decision-making elites of the environment and the role of their beliefs and belief systems in foreign policy choices and decisions.

Therefore, based on this theory, in analyzing and explaining the differences and similarities in foreign policy orientations during different presidential eras in the United States, including Biden's presidency, attention should be paid to this president's different

perceptions of America's national role. In this regard, the first point that can be used to identify the perception of the national role by a decision-making leader in any state, including the United States, is the speech acts of that leader, the acts expressed during and after the election debates.

The second point is the national security document. On October 12, 2022, Biden's 48-page National Security Strategy document was released, which outlines US aims and priorities in looking to the world. The document emphasizes that America will once again engage and cooperate with the world and the international system, and that this constructive engagement will be fundamentally to overcome the challenges of yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

conclusion

Based on an examination of Biden's speech acts, as well as the study of the US National Security Document and how others are represented in this document, and how the US state deals with issues of the international system, the most important subjects of change in US foreign policy based on the defined roles are:

- How to deal with China as US main rival in the framework of a rebalancing strategy, the continuation of the trade war with China, which can be expressed as this aspect of Biden's foreign policy towards China, is a kind of continuation of US foreign policy in the continuation of the Trump administration's trade war policy.
- Biden's foreign policy towards Russia. In general, the Biden administration's foreign policy towards Russia has been characterized by the policy of "confrontation and containment through the imposition of unilateral and multilateral sanctions," and in this area, we can see a kind of continuity in the Biden administration's orientation towards continuing the Trump administration's policy of containment and sanctions.
- Changes in the Biden administration's foreign policy towards international organizations in the form of a return strategy
- Change in Biden administration's foreign policy towards the European Union in the form of a return to multilateralism

- Changes in the Biden administration's foreign policy in the field of environmental approaches in the form of multilateral diplomacy on climate issues
- Changes in the Biden administration's foreign policy towards NATO and the arms control regime
- Changes in Biden Administration's Immigration Policies
- Changes in Biden Administration's Foreign Policy Approach to the Middle East and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Therefore, this study attempted to examine the foreign policy changes in Bidens administration compared to the Trump administration, based on Biden's perceptions of US national roles (with an emphasis on his rhetoric and the 2022 National Security Document). In each subject, we examine how the other was represented in the National Security Document, and then we study the practical actions that was taken.

The Evolution of U. S. Cultural Diplomacy toward Mexican immigrants after the Cold War

This study critically examines the role of U.S. cultural diplomacy in shaping post-Cold War migration relations with Mexico, focusing on its symbolic interventions and soft power mechanisms. The central question addresses how American cultural diplomacy has responded to the socio-economic needs of Mexican migrants and contributed to their integration into the fabric of U.S. society. Based on an analytical hypothesis, the paper argues that U.S. cultural initiatives—emphasizing empowerment, reshaping public perceptions of migrants, and promoting ostensibly shared values—have facilitated integration processes while attempting to mitigate the harsh effects of restrictive immigration policies. Drawing on theoretical frameworks of "soft power" and "cultural intermediation," and employing a document-based content analysis method, the study explores various dimensions of cultural diplomacy, including educational exchanges, media outreach, civil society engagement, and the mobilization of Spanish-speaking linguistic resources. The findings indicate that while cultural diplomacy has contributed to reducing migration-related tensions and enhancing intercultural dialogue, it remains constrained by structural challenges such as political polarization, the absence of a coherent language policy, and institutional limitations. Ultimately, the article underscores the potential of strategically embedding cultural diplomacy within broader migration policymaking to foster more humane, sustainable, and dialogic relations between the United States and Mexico.

Extended Abstract

Introduction

This study looks at the role of U.S. cultural diplomacy in managing migratory relations with Mexico in the post-Cold War era. The central research question explores how American cultural diplomacy, as a soft

power tool, has addressed the socioeconomic needs of Mexican migrants and facilitated their integration into American society. The hypothesis suggested that U.S. cultural initiatives emphasizing empowerment, reforming public views of migrants, and promoting shared values have created a foundation for social integration while mitigating the harsh effects of restrictive immigration policies. Adopting a critical lens, this research analyzes the symbolic and strategic interactions of the United States toward Mexican migrants.

Methodology

This study employs a documentary content analysis method, drawing on primary and secondary sources, including government documents, research reports, academic articles, and data from institutions such as the Pew Research Center. Using thematic analysis, key themes such as the role of civil society, media, language policies, and the cultural representation of migrants are extracted and examined. This qualitative approach enables the study to uncover hidden layers of political and cultural discourses, thereby enhancing the impact of cultural diplomacy on migratory relations.

Literature Review

Previous studies emphasized that U.S. cultural diplomacy toward Mexico has faced challenges such as the instability of cultural policies and structural conflicts. For example, the Real Instituto Elcano report (2008) highlights the lack of continuity in Mexico's cultural policies during the administrations of Fox and Calderón. On the other hand, Hansell et al. (2023) emphasize power imbalances in cultural programs and the reproduction of negative perceptions among Mexicans. Additionally, research by Snodgrass (2022) and Harris (2017) demonstrates that U.S. immigration policies have influenced not only migration structures but also the cultural and identity-based relations between the two countries.

The theoretical foundation of this study relies on three key concepts: Joseph Nye's "soft power," "cross-cultural transmission," and "identity politics." Soft power refers to the ability to shape others' preferences through cultural appeal and shared values. Cultural

diplomacy, as an expression of soft power, employs tools such as educational exchanges, art, and media to foster mutual understanding. The theory of cross-cultural transmission emphasizes the impact of sustained societal interactions on perceptions and social behaviors. Complementing these, identity politics examines the representation of migrants in media and public discourse, revealing how these representations redefine the boundaries between the "self" and the "other."

Discussion

The findings reveal that U.S. cultural diplomacy in the post-Cold War era, through initiatives such as educational exchanges (e.g., the Fulbright Program), media engagement, and civil society participation, has been partially successful in reducing migratory tensions and enhancing intercultural dialogue. These programs, by highlighting the positive contributions of Mexican migrants to American society and promoting shared values, have helped diminish negative stereotypes. However, challenges such as political polarization, financial constraints, and the lack of a comprehensive language policy have limited the effectiveness of this diplomacy. Moreover, cultural programs have been inadequate in addressing the root causes of migration, such as economic inequality and poverty in Mexico. The study's graphical data (e.g., public opinion trends in Mexico and migration patterns) demonstrate that cultural diplomacy has struggled to counteract anti-immigrant rhetoric during critical periods, such as the Trump administration.

The study further reveals that U.S. cultural diplomacy has played a nuanced role in addressing the economic and social dimensions of migration. Programs such as vocational training, small business grants, and community development initiatives targeted at Mexican migrants have contributed to their economic empowerment, albeit on a limited scale. For instance, projects like the *Mexican-American Leadership Initiative* have provided platforms for migrant entrepreneurs to access networks and resources, fostering economic resilience. Socially, cultural diplomacy has facilitated the preservation of Mexican heritage within the U.S. through festivals, bilingual

education, and heritage months, which reinforce dual identities among second-generation migrants. However, these efforts often remain urban-centric, disproportionately benefiting established migrant communities in cities like Los Angeles or Chicago while neglecting rural areas with newer migrant populations. The data also indicates a paradox: while cultural programs celebrate diversity, systemic barriers such as wage disparities and limited access to healthcare persist, underscoring the need for policy coherence between cultural and socioeconomic interventions. Also, a significant finding is the growing role of media and digital platforms in shaping migratory narratives. Spanish-language media outlets like *Univision* and *Telemundo*, alongside U.S.-funded digital campaigns (e.g., *SomosMás*), have become informal extensions of cultural diplomacy. These platforms humanize migrant stories, counter xenophobic discourse, and provide practical information on legal rights and integration. For example, the "*Mi Casa Es Tu Casa*" documentary series, co-produced by U.S. and Mexican filmmakers, has been instrumental in fostering empathy by showcasing migrant contributions to American communities. Yet, challenges persist: algorithmic biases on social media often amplify polarized views, and misinformation about migration policies remains rampant. The study notes that while digital outreach expands the reach of cultural diplomacy, its impact is diluted without grassroots partnerships, such as collaborations with migrant-led organizations, to ensure authenticity and trust. This duality highlights both the potential and limitations of 21st-century cultural diplomacy in navigating the intersection of technology, migration, and public opinion.

Finally, U.S. cultural diplomacy toward Mexican migrants has functioned as a flexible tool for easing tensions and promoting social integration, despite its limitations. This study underscores that the long-term success of cultural diplomacy depends on its integration with broader economic and social policies to strategically address the root causes of migration. Theoretically, cultural diplomacy can be envisioned not as an instrument of domination but as a bridge for intercultural dialogue and the redefinition of human relations in a turbulent world. The study calls for a reevaluation of cultural

policymaking, emphasizing geographic equity, linguistic capacities, and the involvement of civil society to enhance the role of cultural diplomacy in managing migratory challenges.

The findings of this study highlight that U.S. cultural diplomacy, while not perfect, has become a crucial soft power tool in managing the complex migration relationship with Mexico. By encouraging intercultural dialogue and promoting shared values, these initiatives have developed alternative narratives that counterbalance the often punitive aspects of immigration policy. Nevertheless, the research uncovers essential tensions between the symbolic and substantive effects of such diplomacy. Although programs like educational exchanges and media campaigns effectively humanize migrant communities, they often function in isolation from the wider structural reforms required to tackle the root causes of migration, such as economic inequality, violence, and climate vulnerability in Mexico.

Conclusion

The study highlights three key areas for transformative action: First, cultural diplomacy must be integrated into a comprehensive policy framework that links it explicitly with development aid, trade agreements, and labor mobility programs. For instance, pairing Fulbright scholarships with targeted investments in Mexican higher education could reduce "brain drain" while strengthening institutional capacities. Second, the geographic and demographic scope of cultural initiatives requires expansion beyond urban hubs to include marginalized sending communities in rural Mexico and underserved migrant populations in the U.S. interior. Third, the evolving digital landscape demands innovative approaches, such as AI-driven multilingual platforms for civic education, to combat misinformation while preserving the human-centric ethos of cultural exchange.

Critically, this research challenges conventional binaries in migration studies. Cultural diplomacy operates neither as a panacea for systemic inequities nor as mere propaganda, but as a contested space where identities are negotiated. The backlash during the Trump era demonstrated its fragility, yet its resurgence under Biden confirms its adaptability. Future success hinges on recognizing migrants not as

policy "problems" but as transnational actors whose cultural capital can reshape bilateral relations. This necessitates depoliticizing cultural budgets and establishing independent binational councils to insulate programs from electoral cycles.

Ultimately, the Mexico-U.S. case offers broader lessons for global migration governance. In an era of rising nativism, cultural diplomacy provides a counter-model—one where borders may harden economically but remain permeable culturally. Its promise lies not in eliminating conflict, but in sustaining channels of empathy that outlast political crises. As remittances, diaspora networks, and hybrid identities redefine 21st-century sovereignty, the fusion of cultural and migratory policies may well determine whether nations choose walls or bridges in the decades ahead.

The US-China Chip War: Examining Political and Legal Aspects within the Framework of International Relations

Economic and technological conflict between countries has accelerated significantly in recent years. The chip war between China and the United States is perhaps the most significant conflict, as it accounts for many types of countries' competition with an intricate economic, technological, legal and political dimension. Therefore, it is necessary to analyze the multifaceted dimensions of the chip war through both legal and political lenses. This study intends to answer the following research questions: What are the legal and political dimensions of the US-China chip conflict? To what extent does the conflict affect international relations? Using a descriptive-analytical approach, the study examines the history of chip technology, reviews international trade laws, investigates some aspects of intellectual property rights (IPR) and national security issues, and analyzes the political and economic implications of the conflict on global supply chains and third countries. The study concludes that the chip war is catalyzing substantial transformations in global supply chains, in which countries are trying to disengage from one another. Third-party countries are likewise impacted by the chip war, where their foreign relations and economic outcomes may change out of necessity. The chip war between two nations transcends a mere competition in economics and technology; it carries profound legal and political implications that significantly reshape the contours of international relations.

Keywords

China, United States, Chip, War, Diplomatic Relations.

Extended Abstract

Introduction

In the present era, technology is recognized as one of the most important determinants of national power and economic development

of countries. The semiconductor industry and chip production are of particular importance as the main infrastructure of many new technologies. The chip industry not only affects electronic and digital products, but also acts as a driver for innovation and progress in other industries. For this reason, competition in such an area has become one of the most central issues in international relations. The chip war between China and the United States, as a clear example of this competition, reflects the increasing tensions that arise from the two countries' efforts to dominate the global market for advanced technologies. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the bipolar system, the United States claimed the position of undisputed power as the most powerful state in the international system, an actor that has the ability to direct international rules and procedures alone. The United States, as one of the pioneers of the semiconductor industry, has begun to impose tariffs, sanctions, and trade restrictions to limit China's access to sensitive and advanced technologies, concerned about China's rapid advances in this field. On the other hand, China, with long-term planning and large investments in the semiconductor industry, is seeking to reduce its dependence on foreign technologies and increase its domestic capabilities. China's efforts have not only strengthened its position in global markets, but also increased political and economic tensions and competition. China is considered the most important player in BRICS, and this grouping has a China-centric nature. Changing the international environment, strengthening its international identity, increasing its influence and bargaining power, and confronting the negative image of China are among the most important goals that China seeks through cooperation with BRICS. China has always emphasized that regional countries can solve their regional problems through regional integration, and has tried to prevent the United States from expanding its presence and influence in the region under the pretext of fighting terrorism. China's rise to power and its emergence as a great power and its fundamental role in international politics are not in dispute. The present study attempts to identify the legal and political dimensions of the China-US chip war with a detailed and comprehensive look and analyze their effects on international politics and relations. In this regard, issues

including, first, the emergence of chip technology, second, the definition and historical context of the chip war, third, the political and legal framework of the chip war, fourth, the competition between China and the United States, fifth, the battle between China and the United States over chips, sixth, the legal dimensions of the China-US chip war, and seventh, the consequences of the chip war on international relations will be examined and analyzed.

Literature review

Given the increasing dependence of various industries on new technologies, especially chips, any tension between China and the United States could jeopardize the global supply chain and cause serious economic, social, and political consequences at the global level. In addition, the legal dimensions of such a war, such as violations of intellectual property rights and international trade rules, have created new challenges in international relations. The main question of the present study is what are the legal and political dimensions of the war between China and the United States over chips and how do these dimensions affect international relations? The assumption of the present study, which is expressed in a descriptive-analytical manner, is that the war between China and the United States over chips has profound political and legal dimensions that can lead to changes in global power systems, economic structures, and international legal procedures. This means that the war over chips will affect not only trade competition but also the international order and balance of power. In previous studies, cases such as the trade war between China and the United States and its effects on international economic policies have been examined. For example, in a book titled “The War of Chips: The War Over the World’s Most Vital Technology” by Chris Miller, he briefly and limitedly considered some specific political dimensions of the chip war, but did not provide a more comprehensive examination of the political and legal dimensions and their effects on international relations.

Methodology

The present article follows a descriptive-analytical method to analyze the data obtained from library studies.

Discussion

The China-US war has not only led to changes in the way chips are produced and distributed, but also caused countries to seek to create independent supply chains and reduce dependence on each other. Countries, especially Asian countries that have become heavily dependent on Chinese technologies, are exploring ways to reduce this dependence. Countries such as South Korea and Taiwan are trying to achieve relative self-sufficiency in chip production by strengthening their infrastructure and investing in research and development. Investment in this field increases competition in the global chip market and, at the same time, pushes other countries to develop indigenous technologies. In addition, some countries are seeking to diversify their sources of supply to prevent the negative effects of the chip war on the economy. For example, Southeast Asian countries such as Vietnam and Malaysia are trying to become known as new centers of chip production by attracting foreign investment and developing related industries. Due to the restrictions imposed by the United States on Chinese companies, some companies have decided to move their production centers to other countries. The changes are in favor of countries that are currently recognized as new manufacturing centers and can take advantage of such an opportunity to attract foreign investment. Large technology companies such as Apple and Nintendo are exploring new options for manufacturing their products, including moving production lines to other countries such as India or Mexico. Moving production lines to other countries not only helps reduce dependence on China, but also creates jobs and economic growth in the destination countries. Changes in the global supply chain are increasing the price of chips and reducing access to advanced technologies. Increased production costs caused by supply chain changes are leading to higher prices for cars and electronic products. Reduced access to advanced technologies may slow down the innovation process in various industries. The increase in US tariffs

on export prices has reduced Chinese companies' exports to the US. (Jiao, et al., 2022: 1576) The chip war has not only economic dimensions, but also increased political tensions between China and the United States. Political tensions lead to the formation of new alliances and changes in the foreign policies of countries. The chip war is part of a larger geopolitical competition that includes economic, military and political influence at the global level. The United States is trying to form a front against China by cooperating with its allied countries and thereby limit China's influence. Increased tensions between China and the United States may affect diplomacy and international negotiations. Instead of cooperation, countries move towards more intense competition and cause instability in international relations. In this regard, countries must adopt new diplomatic policies to protect their national interests, which may include sanctions, new trade agreements, or even military cooperation. Concerns about national security and potential threats may lead countries to increase military budgets and strengthen defense capabilities. In addition, focusing on national security reduces attention to human and social issues at the global level. Therefore, it is necessary to focus on possible future developments that will cause political and economic changes (Colantone & Stanig, 2019: 51). Third countries are also affected by the chip war and must decide which side to support or how they can exploit these tensions. Smaller countries may be pressured to choose one of the sides, which threatens their political independence. Also, some countries are trying to take the advantages of both sides by adopting a neutral approach. Others use the current situation as an opportunity to attract new investments and partnerships. Economic or political pressures cause social discontent or internal crises in third countries, which in turn affect the political stability of those countries. It is very important to assess the US-China trade separation through the lens of global value chains.

Conclusion

The chip war between China and the United States, as a complex and multidimensional phenomenon, encompasses various dimensions, including economic, political, social, and legal. The China-US war

clearly demonstrates the increasing competition that has emerged between the major global powers in the new era of information and communication technology. The chip war has not only emerged as an economic competition, but has also become one of the main pillars of global politics. The United States seeks to maintain its position as a leader in advanced technologies, and China, with the aim of becoming a global technological power, is trying to gain more influence in this area. The competition between China and the United States has led to increased tariffs, sanctions, and restrictions, which in turn have affected the global supply chain and caused major changes in trade patterns. From the perspective of international law, the chip war has led to serious challenges in the field of international trade rules and intellectual property rights. Mutual claims of intellectual property rights infringement and national security have created a complex legal environment that requires serious attention from the international community. The current situation may lead to the creation of new laws and the revision of existing regulations to meet new needs and challenges. The chip war also has profound effects on political relations between countries. The increasing tensions between China and the United States are affecting not only bilateral relations but also multilateral relations and may lead to the formation of new coalitions. Countries must carefully decide how to exploit or prevent these tensions. Third countries are forced to take difficult positions in the chip war. Third countries must decide which side to support or how they can use this situation to their advantage. Such actions create major changes in the diplomatic and economic relations of countries and, in some cases, affect their political independence. To manage the tensions arising from the chip war, the need for international cooperation and the establishment of appropriate legal frameworks is increasingly felt. Countries should seek solutions that not only secure their national interests, but also help maintain global stability and security.

