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Abstract

More than 30 years ago, one of the main objectives of what was called “Cultural Revolution” in Iran was the production of endogenous and/or Islamic knowledge in social sciences and humanities. International Relations (IR) was not an exception. Since then Iranian IR community has witnessed changes in curricula, institutional support for endogenous theory-building, formation of modern Islamic educational and research centers, publication of journals encouraging endogenous knowledge, and the like. Many believe, however, that in general IR in Iran is not really endogenous. This article is an attempt to give a portrait of the state of endogenous IR in Iran. It seeks to show the way in which Iranian IR community understands endogenous IR and IR theorizing and how this has been reflected in their work. The first part of the article is a concise history of attempts to make IR endogenous; the second part consists of views of IR scholars about endogenous IR; the third part is a review of IR scholars’ publication in order to show its relevance (or irrelevance) to endogenous IR. The article concludes with some suggestions for endogenous theorizing and research in Iran.
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Introduction

IR in non-western world and theorizing international relations from a non-western point of view have been among issues raised more seriously during the last decade against the “exile” of the Third World by the mainstream IR (Barnett 2002: 49). What is called the “monopoly over the construction of knowledge” (Ayoob 2002: 29) has led to challenges against American, Eurocentrist, or western nature of IR theories. Unlike behaviorist ideal for generalizable universal theories, post-positivist IR is aware of the fact that “theory is always for someone or for some purpose” (Cox 1981: 128) and that even civilizations constitute epistemological foundations for understating world differently (Cox 2002). Thus various perspectives form different parts of the world may lead to a variety of understandings, conceptualizations, and theorizations. Post-structuralists, Critical Theorists, Feminists, and more recently, Post-colonialists have been among those calling for marginal voices to have their say in international relations. The result has in part been attempts to identify non-western understandings of international relations. Iran as a country inheriting an ancient civilization and an Islamic country is not an exception. Furthermore, it might seem to be a more appropriate candidate for producing a non-western knowledge of IR. Not only its Islamism and its anti-hegemonic foreign policy but also the fact that during the last three decades or so the authorities have called for producing “Islamic” and sometimes what is called ‘bumi’ (“native”, “indigenous” or “endogenous”) knowledge/theories in the country may lead one to expect non-western, Iranian IR to already exist.

The question here, however, is how IR scholars in Iran see endogenous knowledge and in what ways have they have contributed to its development. What do they believe endogenous knowledge to be? Is it extracted from Iranian sources, Islamic sources, Iran’s historical and geographical requirements, national interest of the country, Iranian politicians’ ideas, or is it based on theories produced by Iranian scholars? This article is an attempt to give a portrait of the state of endogenous IR in Iran by showing the ways in which Iranian IR community understands endogenous IR and IR theorizing and how this has been reflected in their work. IR scholars’ understanding of endogenous or Iranian knowledge of international relations is established on the basis of the results of a survey research conducted in autumn 2014; and the discussion on their work is based on previous research on the field as well as a review done by the author.

The first part of the article is a review of the existing literature on the state of IR in Iran. The second part deals with a concise history of attempts to make IR endogenous. The views of IR scholars about endogenous IR are examined in the third part. Then, through a review of IR scholars’ publication, its relevance to endogenous IR is evaluated. The article concludes with some suggestions for endogenous theorizing and research in Iran.

Literature Review

The state of IR in Iran has become the focus of some research during the last decade. One may find three main foci of research about the field: 1) IR teaching; 2) IR research; and 3) IR theorizing. In many of these studies, endogenous IR is discussed in more or less detail.
Mohammad Sotudeh (1384) in his evaluation of teaching, research, and theory-building in international studies in Iran, finds many shortcomings can be removed and potentialities that can be strengthened. What he calls for includes a serious attempt for clarifying ‘the perspectives of Iran and Islam on international relations, the nature of international system, and other international issues on the basis of religious and native culture’ and paying attention to the ‘necessity and possibility of theory-building’ and actual ‘theorizing’ on IR in Iran. This theorizing should be “appropriate for an Islamic country” and have the potential for “solving” its problems.

The research conducted by Nasrin Mosaffa and her colleagues (1386) on the developments in teaching and research in PS and IR is an attempt to evaluate (and give suggestions for promoting) the quality of the two fields in Iran. A significant aspect of this evaluation was based on panels in which IR scholars gave their ideas about the structural and institutional influences on the development of the field. Here the suggestions for an Iranian IR is more focused on producing and teaching a knowledge that can meet “Iranian society’s particular needs” and is based on its “historical and social context” (228).

Hajiyousefi’s work on teaching IR theories in Iran shows how both class discussions and the material used in IR courses rely on western sources and no particular mechanism is devised to make them “contextualized” and more appropriate for Iranian audience (Hajiyousefi 1389).

Dehghani-Firoozabadi and Meghdadi-Mazidi (1392) in their article on ‘Changes in the Theoretical Studies of IR in Iran’ argue that a distinction can be made between two categories of work: 1) those that have paved the way for theorization, made it possible and/or favorable (including jurisprudential IR; conceptualizing Iran’s foreign policy; and general discussion on theorization) and 2) major theorizations (including pre-theories, theoretical schemas, and limited or grand theories). Their work covers a vast literature but is limited to the work inspired by Islamic ideas and in particular Islamic jurisprudence. They make a distinction between jurisprudential understanding of international relations that sees such understanding be located in Islamic scripts and seeks to find them through *ijtihad* (clergy’s special method of inferring Islamic rules from the scripts) and constitutionalist approach that seeks to constitute theories on the basis of Islamic assumptions. They find the former as the task of clergymen and the latter that of IR scholars. Here *bumi* knowledge is limited to Islamic theorizing of international relations.

In ‘Feasibility of Conceptual Change in Iranian IR Scholars’ Work’ (Dorjani and Mirkooshesh 1392), the authors argue that although IR theoretical concepts have a western origin, some have changed when used by Iranian scholars. Their study shows how concepts such as national interest and identity (self and other) have been seen from a different angle on the basis of Iranian/Islamic sources that inspired the IR scholars. Thus one may suggest that they see the implications of “traveling concepts” (Said 1983) an important aspect of IR theorizing in Iran.

In general, it seems that the need for Iranian knowledge and theory of international relations is recognized in the work dealing with the state of the field. Yet except for those who clearly limit it to knowledge and theory based on Islamic assumptions, others emphasize contextualization which is open to broader interpretations.
International Relations in Iran: The Ideal of an Endogenous Knowledge

Modern academic system was introduced to Iranians in the late 19th century. Although the formation of the University of Tehran in 1934 is rightly depicted as the first systematic effort to establish a western-style modern university, an older academic institution that had been formed in 1899 was the “School of Politics” for training Iranian diplomats. International Relations was deemed as a subfield of Political Science and was a part of its curriculum (Mosaffa 1386: 152-153).

From the very beginning, political science in general and IR in particular were more legally oriented due to the influences of French tradition and the institutional arrangement that made the two departments as the basis of the Faculty of Law and Political Science. In 1965 an academic research Center for International Studies was formed in the University of Tehran, again with an emphasis on studying international law and international organizations. Of course at Melli (National) University, which was formed more on an American model, Politics and Economics were in the same faculty and Law School was institutionally separated. And at the University of Tehran some “Americanization” effort took place in the 1960’s (Mosaffa 1386: 162-164)

Both in the School and later in the University of Tehran and other universities that were formed in the course of time, the curricula, syllabi, and the material to be taught were inspired by or translated from European, and later American, sources. All that was taught and produced through these institutions were either translations of Western texts or inspired by them. The articles and books were not even directly related to Iran’s foreign relations. Some would claim that there was little relevance between Iranian position in the world and the knowledge that was produced at the universities.

The Islamic Revolution in Iran that led to the termination of dynastic rule in Iran and the formation of the Islamic Republic in 1979 was a turning point. It has been represented not only as a political revolution but also as a socio-cultural revolution seeking transformation in all aspects of social and political life. Hence one of the major orientations of the Islamic Republic has been the Islamization of various aspects of life and denouncing some aspects of western culture. This has had implications for academia.

The first attempt to de-westernize and Islamicize universities was in 1980 when the universities were shut down after the Cultural Revolution. One of the major goals of the Cultural Revolution was a comprehensive revision of the curricula and syllabi in order to make them Islamic and free from negative impacts of the West. The Supreme Council of the Cultural Revolution was formed to realize this as one of its main objectives (see Sotudeh 1384). The revised curricula included some general courses on Islam for all majors and, as far as Political Science was concerned, included courses on Islamic thought and Islamic history relevant to Politics and IR besides most of the previous courses. A close cooperation between seminaries and universities was also on the agenda.

Since the late 1980’s, postgraduate IR programs have begun to be offered on the basis of the curriculum endorsed by the Supreme Council of Cultural Revolution. Yet the curriculum is very similar to what can be seen in any IR MA or PhD program. No specific Islamic course is
included. Courses on Iran’s Foreign Relations, Third World and World Politics, and International Implication of the Islamic Revolution are the only ones that deal somehow with particular concerns of Iran. Yet in the syllabus of some courses, sessions have been devoted to considering relevant Iran’s concerns.

Besides the expansion of universities all over the country offering programs similar to those that were followed in major universities, some specific institutions were established to promote the idea of Islamic Political Science and International Relations; including Imam Sadeq University, Mofid University, Bagher-ol-oloom University, and some research centers especially in Tehran and Qom. These institutions offered IR graduate and undergraduate programs that included more courses on Islamic thought and jurisprudence. In the course of time, they began publishing works in which Islamic ideas and concepts were applied to international relations, yet most of them were at the conceptual level, neither did they lead to IR theorizing nor to empirical research inspired by Islamic ideas.

Political and religious leaders have occasionally referred to the failure of universities in producing Islamic knowledge and theory- especially in humanities and social sciences. The adjective Islamic was later accompanied or substituted by “bummi” (endogenous/native) which has not been defined in detail but seems to mean relying on native sources for conceptualizations and theorizing. Thus a surge of “Islamicization” and “nativization” has found momentum since the mid 2000’s. It has so far led to a draft curriculum for Political Science and International Relations which has not been embraced by the Political Science community due to alleged inconsistencies.

At the same time since the mid 2000’s some prominent IR scholars, more or less independent of the officially pursued endogenization of the field, have found interest in endogenous knowledge in IR. Some younger scholars too show more interest in such investigations. They might be said to have been more influenced by the developments in IR and the rise of criticisms against its not being an “international discipline”. In what follows I try to show the ways in which Iranian scholars from various persuasions understand endogenous IR, its possibilities, and its limitations.

**IR Scholars and Endogenous IR**

Iranian IR scholars, as can be expected, are not monolithic in their understanding of endogenous IR, neither do all of them agree on its necessity or even possibility. From the very beginning of the emergence of the idea in the early 1980’s, there was serious resistance on the part of more positivist-minded scholars who did not see any possibility for a non-scientific, i.e., non-positivist, approach to IR. To them, science requires strict ways of doing it, scientific methodology should guide all research and investigation in the field, and theorizing consists of producing verifiable statements. In any social condition with any cultural or civilizational background, objective observations are required for reaching various hypotheses that may be tested afterwards. From this point of view, the only influence of the context on conducting knowledge could be found in relevant topics and questions. Although there are strong criticisms against existing IR, these scholars believed, only those are justifiable that are formulated in scientific terms. Some others, while not positivist, see science or even knowledge in general as intertextual. Hence they deny the possibility of purely endogenous knowledge. They, however,
welcome any attempt for producing knowledge inspired by local sources and/or from particular experiences.

At the other end of the spectrum, we may find scholars who see the necessity of a knowledge that is based on Islamic/Iranian ideas and ideals. This knowledge is not a positivist one; rather it is somehow against some of the basic terms of a scientific approach. It cannot and should not be value-free but should be at the service of promoting Islamic ideals.

On the basis of a survey conducted in autumn 2014, this variety can somehow be explained through their understanding of the nature of science, meaning and scope of theory, and the like. The findings of this survey suggest some significant points to which I turn below. The questionnaires, consisting of 30 questions, were sent to 92 IR scholars who were identified and whose email addresses could be found. Forty six of them replied to the questions. Therefore, one may expect the result to be representative.

Sixty three percent of the respondents believe that social science explanatory statements are universal or almost universal and this rises to about 78 percent as far as the achievements of IR are considered. Almost 90 percent see normative statements or statements with normative connotations more contextual. The same holds for statements on foreign policy. They seem to believe that particular actors are the “source of diversity” in international relations (Hudson and Vore 1995: 210). Empirical verification is important for the validity of descriptive/explanatory statements about international relations according to more than 74 percent of the respondents. These show that the majority of IR scholars in Iran, similar to their western counterparts, see empirical evidence as a major source of validation of knowledge claims as far as the study of international relations is concerned. At the same time, 65 percent of scholars believe that the existing IR is western and, at least partly, in the interest of the west. They see, however, that existing IR theories are helpful in explanation. Constructivism (by 37 percent) and Realism (by 32 percent) are deemed as the most helpful theories. Critical theories, historical sociology, and institutionalism are less popular but still some see them as the most persuasive approaches and 13 percent suggest that the explanatory power of theories depends upon the particular contexts in which they are used but all are more or less helpful. Not even one single respondent refuses western theories altogether.

When it comes to their understanding of endogenous knowledge, there seem to be some inconsistencies. More than 65 percent see the production of endogenous knowledge dependent upon the formation of endogenous theory. And perhaps that is why 76 percent see little or no endogenous knowledge of IR in Iran. However, when they are asked if they see part of their work to be endogenous, 50 percent have a positive evaluation based on having based their work on Islamic/Iranian sources (not Islamic/Iranian theory). 76 percent see the importance of applying existing IR theories according to Iran’s particular needs and/or interest as a criteria for producing endogenous knowledge.

As they mostly believe in the lack of endogenous theory of IR in Iran, when the scholars are asked about its reason, most of them do not find the influence of factors such as westernism of scholars, lack of institutional/financial support, tight schedule of scholars, and the persuasiveness of existing IR as a determinant factor. The factor that most of them find more important is the
lack of relevant endogenous knowledge in other disciplines such as sociology, psychology, philosophy of knowledge and the like that IR theory-building can rely on.

Iranian scholars definitely do not want to see IR knowledge in Iran be limited to endogenous products. Not even one of the scholars see optimal IR knowledge in Iran to be limited to endogenous knowledge and more than 78 percent very strongly or strongly refuse this. More than 72 percent see empirical validation necessary for statements inspired/informed by local sources. More than 67 percent of the scholars believe that any endogenous knowledge needs to be linked to existing IR achievements and 89 percent of them see this as a condition for its existence. Only 21.7 percent of the respondents see a possibility for producing Islamic knowledge of international life delinked from existing achievements of IR.

Thus one may see that while the lack or rareness of endogenous knowledge and therefore its production are important to most of the IR scholars, most of them neither want it to be isolated from existing IR nor any of them likes to see it as a monopolized knowledge.

**IR Publication in Iran: Endogenous Knowledge?**

IR academic publication in Iran consists of books and peer review journal articles. Most of the published books are translations from foreign texts. These include IR classics, theoretical work, books on regional and international developments, foreign policy (especially that of the US), and textbooks. There are many textbooks for various courses in IR authored by Iranian scholars. These, however, usually rely on foreign sources (especially English) except perhaps for courses on Islam and Iran’s history of foreign relations.

Until a decade ago journals published translations of foreign articles or book chapters besides articles by Iranian scholars. But following some changes in regulations, only authored articles are published in peer-review journals. These are either based on research (in a broad sense of the word) on various issues of international relations and foreign policy, or have a more conceptual/theoretical tone. Here I offer a concise review of IR publications on the basis of some research done during the last few years.

A research on IR articles published in the oldest academic journal of politics in Iran, the journal published by the University of Tehran, shows that major issue areas covered by Iranian scholars from 1960 to 2011 include IR theories (29.28 percent), security, war, and peace (26.77 percent), foreign policy and bilateral relations (22.4 percent), IPE (11.29 percent), international law and organizations (8.78 percent), and gender (1.2 percent). As far as geographical coverage of the articles is considered, Iran’s foreign relations is covered more than other countries, followed by articles on the Middle East/Asia, and the US (Moshirzadeh and Naeeni 1392).

Theories produced by IR scholars worldwide have always attracted Iranian scholars. In the 1980’s the theoretical articles were mostly encyclopedic pieces that gave a general portrait of a particular theory or theorist. Since the 1990’s, one can see more interest in discussing a particular aspect of a theory, discussing less known or more helpful theories, or recent theoretical developments.
As far as international developments are concerned, issues related to security, conflict, and foreign policy are considered as more important than economic, institutional, and legal ones. If on the basis of what many Iranian scholars see being ‘endogenous’ in a loose sense of the term, that is, being in the interest of the country, we may see articles on the foreign policy of Iran and its significant ‘others’ have such a characteristic. That is why Iran, the Middle East (especially Israel, Iraq, and more recently, Turkey), and the US have a significant place in articles. Another research done on articles in the most important peer-review journals suggests the same: 47 percent were about Iran’s Middle East policy, 21 percent dealt with Iran’s relations with the US and Europe, and 13 percent with Iran’s nuclear issue (Moshirzadeh, Mahroogh and Abbasi Khoshkar forthcoming).

In methodological terms, 72 percent of the articles on Iran’s foreign policy during 2009-2013 have applied positivist, 27 percent interpretivist, and 1 percent critical methodologies. Realism was the dominant theoretical approach in these articles followed by liberalism and constructivism. Only in 5 percent of the work a new framework developed by the authors were used, some of which were a sort of synthesis of existing theories. (Moshirzadeh, Mahroogh and Abbasi Khoshkar forthcoming).

If endogenous knowledge is defined in more strict terms, it is usually perceived that we need to have endogenous theories. In what sense and to what extent can we speak of Iranian or Islamic IR theory? There is little agreement over the exact definition of theory. Sometimes it refers to a system of ideas (Yaqing 2010) or abstract statements based on analytical categories that give a pattern to observations of the outside world. In traditional understanding, theories refer to philosophical interpretations of the world including descriptive, explanatory, and normative statements. Sometimes theory refers to a set of statements that organizes a field (Acharia and Buzan 2010). In a very strict positivist sense of the word, theory refers to a set of operationalized concepts linked to each other in the form of generalizable hypotheses that are confirmed to become laws (citation). Kenneth Waltz (1979) maintains that theories cannot be limited to or equivalent to a set of laws. Rather they show why the associations identified in laws obtain. In other words, to him, laws are descriptive and theories are explanatory.

Following Acharia and Buzan (2010), I take an extended meaning of theory which is not limited to positivist understanding of the term. It includes theory in the more strict sense of the word; political theory as far as it contains statements about ‘international’ relations; political elites’ conceptualizations of and approaches to international life; and application of Western conceptualizations and theories to local contexts.

Islam has been the most important source of aspiration for endogenous theorizing and conceptualizations in Iran. A body of work that can be seen as representing an Islamic approach to international relations has been produced in Iran both before (one article) and after the Islamic Revolution of 1979. Part of this is produced by Shiite clergymen and part is based on their work but has been written by lay scholars. A part of this looks like international law from an Islamic point of view (especially what is produced by Shiite jurisprudents) and another part includes more explanatory or normative content (Dehghani-Firoozabadi and Meghdadi 1392).
As far as theorizing from an Islamic point of view is considered, it can be said that four basic approaches to Islamic theorizing of IR are distinguishable: 1) those authors who see Islam as an encompassing set of ideas with a specific unique true theory for any aspect of life including international relations that should be extracted from Islamic sources on the basis of Islamic jurisprudence (e.g., Javadi Amoli 1387); 2) those who see theorizing on the basis of Islamic jurisprudence possible as one way of understanding international relations (for example, Dehghani-Firoozabadi 138; 13); 3) scholars who see international system as a modern phenomenon with no precedence in Islamic sources and therefore regard it as a realm where human reason should guide our understanding of it (Salimi 1391) and only some philosophical anthropological Islamic principles such as non-conflict can be used as a guide to theory-building (Salimi 1390); and 4) scholars who consider Islamic ideals as a source of prescriptive/normative theory of international relations and Islamic scripts and concepts as an inspiring source for developing hypotheses and later theories but believe that they should be validated at the international level.

As far as theoretical concepts are concerned, concepts such as power (Mirahamadi and Ajili 1389; Poshtdar and Shekardast 1392); order (Dehghani-Firoozabadi 1391), war and peace (Barzanoi 1384; Ghavam and Fateminezhad 1388; Mahallati ND; Mirkooshesh and Noorisafa 1392; Seifoori and Tofighianfar 1392; Soltani 1388; Eftekhari and Mohammadi-Sirat 1392; Ajili and Esmaeeli 1392), security (Eftekhari 1383; Akhavan Kazemi 1386), terrorism (Hosseini 1387; Hatami 1390), identity (Atai and Behestani 1389) globalization (1390) have been explored on the basis of Iranian literature and culture and Islamic sources to show how they differ from contemporary understandings in international relations.

The most ambitious attempt for producing an Islamic theory of international relations has been by Dehghani-Firoozabadi, a prominent IR scholar who did his BA and MA at Imam Sadeq University and his received his PhD from Belgium. He is the pioneer of the second approach mentioned above. He believes that an Islamic theory should be based on Islamic sources including its meta-theoretical foundations. In his article (Dehghani-Firoozabadi 1389a) which was later developed to become a book (Dehghani-Firoozabadi 1393), he presents an Islamic meta-theory for international relations and explores ontological and epistemological foundations of a potential IR theory in Islamic sources and in particular the work of a 16th century Islamic philosopher, Molla Sadra. In an article on the Islamic theory of international relations, he limits himself to justify such an endeavor, clarify its assumptions, and give some very general principles such as Islamic definitions and/or description of phenomena like order, dominance, ethics, change, and justice and link them together in a general framework. What is lacking are specific statements regarding the nature of modern state and international system, causes of war, change, dominance, etc.

What Acharia and Buzan (2010) see as elites’ conceptualizations of international life is reflected in a body of work that deals with the perceptions of the two leaders of the Islamic Republic, Ayatollah Khomeini and Ayatollah Khamenei (Dehghani-Firoozabadi and Ghanbari 1392: 15). As clergymen in politics, their ideas can be seen as originating both from Islamic teachings and Iranian experience of world affairs. Some articles about the foreign policy of various administrations deal with the perceptions of Iranian presidents of international relations (e.g., Behestani 1392; Masoodnia, and Najafi 1390). Khatami’s idea of dialogue of civilizations has
been more seriously attempted to be conceptualized clearly and its similarities and differences with some IR theories be clarified (e.g., Moshirzadeh 1383; 1384; 2004; Dallmayr and Manoochehri 2007).

What is mostly seen in Iranian scholars’ work is applying existing IR theories to issue areas that are significant from an Iranian point of view. As it was mentioned above, Iranian scholars are more interested in constructivism and realism. The former’s appeal rests in its interest in non-material aspects of social life which is more relevant to Iranian and Islamic culture. Furthermore it explains the anomalies in application of materialist/realist theories to Iran’s foreign policy. That is why a constructivist analysis of various aspects of Iran’s foreign policy constitutes the theme of dozens of articles. Realism is also used for explaining different issues in international relations and foreign policy. Many Iranian scholars seek to explain Iran’s foreign policy from a realist point of view while others take realism as a point of departure to criticize aspect of Iran’s foreign policy that they do not regard as realistic. Furthermore realism is usually the preferred theoretical framework for a critical explanation of US foreign policy. There are many articles focusing on US hegemony-seeking behaviors especially in the Middle East framed in a way to delegitimize it altogether.

The latter reminds us of Edward Said’s idea of traveling theories. According to him, “the movement of ideas and theories from one place to another is both a fact of life and a usefully enabling condition of intellectual activity” (Said 1987: 226). IR ideas and theories are not exceptions; they too travel from “situation to situation” and this travel leads to new understandings and interpretations of world affairs and may nourish IR in general.

**Conclusion**

Iranian IR is perhaps less acknowledged as it actually is. In a maximalist understanding of endogenous/Iranian IR, where well-developed theories grounded in Iranian/Islamic sources are taken as its basis, it is rightly suggested that it hardly exists. Yet if it is taken to mean partial attempts for theorization and conceptualization rooted in Iranian/Islamic ideas and ideals, it exists both in IR scholars’ own work and their studies of Iranian political elite’s understanding of international life.

In a totally minimalist understanding, where relevance to situation is the criteria, one may suggest that all products of IR scholars in Iran form a “situated knowledge” which is rooted in Iran’s history, geopolitics, and socio-cultural conditions leading to particular questions and lenses through which world affairs are viewed and explained.

Somewhere in between, we see “hybrid” knowledge and theory consisting of borrowed ideas, concepts, and theories that, when discussed or applied by Iranian scholars, acquire an Iranian tone, focus, and character. What is needed, however, is a conscious attempt targeting more clarified Iranian versions of IR theories.
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