

Iran's history is a narrative of resistance and steadfastness against successive waves of aggression. Today, as the Ramadan War has begun and the Iranian nation once again faces a great test



Mehdi Chapari :

The Uncontainable Land Power at the Heart of Eurasia

Dr. Sedigheh Owj ,
Dr. Farahmandzad

Attack and Destruction of Hospitals and Health Centers during the Aggression of the Zionist Regime and the United States against the Islamic Republic of Iran

page 2



Dr. Arash Karami, Secretary
of the Provincial Issues Assembly of Ilam Province

Iran on the Threshold of Victory: A Strategic Analysis of National Strengths in the Ramadan War from the Perspective of Border Security and National Solidarity
Iran's strategic depth in the Ramadan War lies not only within its geographical borders but also in the extensive network of the Axis of Resistance.

page 6



Dr. Seyed Yaser Ziaee, Associate
Professor of International Law

Elucidation of the Legal Position of the Islamic Republic of Iran Regarding Military Action Against Military Objectives of the United States Within the Territories of Iraq, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Qatar, Jordan, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia

Article 51 of the United Nations Charter recognizes the "inherent right of self-defence" if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations. Self-defence constitutes an exception to the prohibition on the use of force and is permissible against the territorial integrity, independence, or sovereignty of a state.

page 3



Dr. Sediqeh Avooj
Dr. Mohsen Qaemi Khoragh

Attack on Water Infrastructure: as an Instrument of War for the Purpose of Exerting Maximum Pressure on the Civilian Population in the Context of the U.S. Aggression against Iran

Following a series of widespread violations of international law, human rights, and humanitarian law by the United States and the Israeli regime in their aggression against the territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran, we are witnessing the targeting of desalination plants in the south of the country.

page 4



Mostafa Pakniat, Faculty
Member, Alzahra University

The Necessity of Changing : International Legal Structures: Transition from the Passive State of Self-Defense

Throughout various epochs of history, human beings, when confronted with aggression, have instinctively acted to repel it. In other words, natural persons are living entities endowed with the right to life, who are entitled to take action against those who seek to destroy their life and existence or harm their physical integrity.

page 5

Attack and Destruction of Hospitals and Health Centers during the Aggression of the Zionist Regime and the United States against the Islamic Republic of Iran

Dr. Sedigheh Owj , Dr. Farahmandzad



From the initial hours of the aggression against the territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran, commencing on Saturday, February 28, 2026, the aggressor regimes of the United States and the Zionist entity have, in an inhumane act constituting a grave violation of human rights and international humanitarian law, deliberately attacked relief and medical facilities.

As a direct consequence of these unlawful attacks, 25 medical centers, 41 rural and urban health houses, and 21 emergency bases have been severely damaged. Furthermore, 18 ambulances have been rendered inoperative, and 9 hospitals have been completely incapacitated due to the extensive scope of the destruction inflicted upon them. In addition to the material damage to these protected places and equipment, 11 members of the health corps, including physicians, nurses, and paramedics, have been martyred, and 53 others have been injured.

The protection of medical personnel, equipment, and

health centers during armed conflict constitutes a fundamental and unequivocal principle of international law, repeatedly affirmed and codified in international legal instruments. Article 12(1) of Protocol Additional I to the Geneva Conventions of 8 June 1977 explicitly stipulates that “medical units shall be respected and protected at all times and shall not be the object of attack.” Furthermore, Article 15(1) of the same Protocol mandates that “civilian medical personnel shall be respected and protected.” These protections are further reinforced by Article 11(1) of Protocol Additional II, which states that “medical units and transports shall be respected and protected at all times and shall not be the object of attack.”

It is also imperative to recall that under Article 8(2)(b) (xxiv) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court of 1998, “intentionally directing attacks against buildings, material, medical units and transport, and personnel using the distinctive

emblems of the Geneva Conventions in conformity with international law” constitutes a war crime.

Such manifest war crimes are in clear and direct contravention of the express provisions of the Geneva Conventions, their Additional Protocols, and established international human rights standards. Accordingly, these acts fall squarely within the definition of war crimes under international criminal law.

The deliberate targeting of these protected facilities represents a flagrant violation of the cardinal principle of distinction, which obliges parties to a conflict to distinguish at all times between civilian objects and military objectives. Attacks on healthcare infrastructure, given their profound and far-reaching consequences for the lives and well-being of the civilian population, are devoid of any legal justification whatsoever. Regarding the allegations proffered by the enemy suggesting that the targeted centers were being utilized for military purposes, it is essen-

tial to invoke the established legal presumptions and principles. The principle of precaution, reflected in Article 52 of Additional Protocol I, establishes a clear presumption: “In case of doubt whether an object which is normally dedicated to civilian purposes, such as a place of worship, a house or other dwelling or a school, is being used to make an effective contribution to military action, it shall be presumed not to be so used.”

Furthermore, as defined by Additional Protocol I, military objectives are strictly limited to “those objects which by their nature, location, purpose or use make an effective contribution to military action and whose total or partial destruction, capture or neutralization, in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definite military advantage.” This raises the critical and unanswered question: what definite military advantage could possibly be derived from the destruction of a hospital or medical center?

In light of these considerations, the claims advanced by the aggressors and their supporters regarding their adherence to human rights and humanitarian principles are profoundly and demonstrably challenged by these attacks. The deliberate targeting of hospitals and relief centers starkly exposes the profound contradiction between the stated rhetoric and the actual conduct of the governing authorities of the United States of America and the Zionist regime.

A Collective of International Law Scholars

Elucidation of the Legal Position of the Islamic Republic of Iran Regarding Military : Action Against Military Objectives of the United States Within the Territories of Iraq, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Qatar, Jordan, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia

Dr. Seyed Yaser Ziaee, Associate Professor of International Law



Article 51 of the United Nations Charter recognizes the “inherent right of self-defence” if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations. Self-defence constitutes an exception to the prohibition on the use of force and is permissible against the territorial integrity, independence, or sovereignty of a state. A manifestation of state sovereignty is its military installations, which may constitute a legitimate objective. The crucial element in this context is the application of the concept of “armed attack” to modern military structures, particularly the establishment of extraterritorial military bases. The terrain for a state’s military bases within another state may be either owned by or leased to the foreign state. In both scenarios, the terrain remains under the sovereignty of the host state. This raises the question: does an attack on such bases constitute an act of aggression against the territory of the host state? Aggression by a foreign state, which gives rise to the right of self-defence, can manifest

in two situations: either with the consent and support of the host state, or without that state’s consent. In the first scenario, it follows that the host state is also considered a participant in the aggression and may itself be subject to measures in self-defence. This principle is reflected in Article 3, paragraph (f), of the General Assembly’s Definition of Aggression (Resolution 3314 of 1974). In the second scenario, however, it must be noted that while attacking the military installations themselves is permissible within the framework of self-defence, the question remains whether this simultaneously constitutes an act of aggression against the air and land territory of the host state. The principle prohibiting the harmful use of territory is a cornerstone of international law, representing a form of obligation to prevent acts originating from within a state’s territory that would be detrimental to other states. Just as various resolutions oblige states to refrain from consenting to the use of their territory for terrorist activities,

this obligation can be extended to states harbouring an aggressor, as both constitute international delicts. Therefore, the very act of such toleration towards an aggressor state constitutes an internationally wrongful act.

Although self-defence against the host state itself may not be permissible, the necessity to counteract the aggressor state that has initiated the armed attack remains. Reconciling these two imperatives—respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the host state on one hand, and the right of the victim state to maintain its security and combat the aggressor on the other—gives rise to doctrines such as “limited war,” the “use of force short of war,” or “limited self-defence.” To elaborate, the use of force, beyond the physical military act, contains a mental element signifying hostile intent or aggression. For instance, if a state’s military aircraft crashes unintentionally or a missile is launched erroneously and strikes another state’s territory, it is not perceived as aggression. In such a case, while there may be explosions and damage, what has occurred is certainly not an act of aggression against the host state. The International Court of Justice, in the Oil Platforms case, also considered the element of intent, stating that it was not proven that the mining of the USS Bridgeton was done with the “specific intent of harming” that vessel.

Accordingly, if these military operations are conducted without the intent to harm the

sovereignty of the host state, but are directed against the military bases of the aggressor state located within that country, they cannot be considered an aggression against the host state perpetrated with the intent to harm its sovereignty.

This perspective is also consistent with the doctrine of necessity and the concept of servitude. Under the doctrine of necessity, a state may, for the purpose of safeguarding its essential interests, breach certain international obligations that do not involve the use of force. This could, for example, entail a violation of a state’s air or land sovereignty without the use of force, which inherently requires the mental element of intent. Based on the concept of servitude or right of passage, a state could, in exercising its inherent right of self-defence, pass through the airspace and land territory of neighboring states to achieve its objective, which is the exercise of the right of self-defence. Consequently, in an attack on US military bases in regional countries, including Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, the UAE, Qatar, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, and Iraq, invoking the principles of non-abuse of territory, necessity, and servitude, the use of force without the intent to commit aggression against the host state is conceivable. Furthermore, it can be argued that by designating CENTCOM forces as a terrorist entity, the Islamic Republic of Iran is also acting pursuant to the legitimate obligation to combat terrorism within the territories of other states.

Attack on Water Infrastructure as an Instrument of War for the Purpose of Exerting Maximum Pressure on the Civilian Population in the Context of the U.S. Aggression against Iran

Dr. Sediqeh Avooj, PhD in International Law

-Dr. Mohsen Qaemi Khoragh, Faculty Member at Shahid Beheshti University



Following a series of widespread violations of international law, human rights, and humanitarian law by the United States and the Israeli regime in their aggression against the territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran, we are witnessing the targeting of desalination plants in the south of the country. Pursuant to Article 54, paragraph 2, of the 1977 Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts, the destruction of objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population, such as drinking water installations and water supply

resources and equipment, is prohibited. Furthermore, the International Law Association, in its 1976 Madrid Rules on the protection of water resources and installations in times of armed conflict, paid particular attention to this matter.

In this light, the aggressive action by the Israeli regime and the United States can be assessed as a potential strategy. This is because armed conflict, unlike peacetime which gradually exacerbates water scarcity and crisis, intensifies the crisis in terms of scope, duration, and also threatens the status quo. Moreover, one of the consequences of using water infrastructure as a tar-

get in armed conflicts is the forced displacement of civilians—the very strategy implemented by ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

Therefore, if we consider the purpose of all rules and regulations of the law of armed conflict to be the preservation and survival of human beings, especially civilians, and the reduction of human suffering to a minimum, these regulations are founded upon a clear distinction and discrimination between combatants and civilians. However, the protection of water constitutes an exception to the principle of distinction and is strikingly aimed at the survival of both combatants

and civilians, being absolutely based on the equality of human beings. Consequently, the deliberate attack on water installations, when they are not military objectives, in the ongoing hostilities by the United States and the Israeli regime constitutes a war crime pursuant to Article 8(2) (b)(ii) of the Rome Statute.

It is noteworthy that the attack on the Qeshm desalination plant was launched from the U.S. Al Juffair base in Bahrain. Consequently, in a reciprocal action, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) targeted parts of a desalination plant in Bahrain. A Collective of International Law Scholars

The Necessity of Changing International Legal Structures: Transition from the Passive State of Self-Defense

Mostafa Pakniat, Faculty Member, Alzahra University



Throughout various epochs of history, human beings, when confronted with aggression, have instinctively acted to repel it. In other words, natural persons are living entities endowed with the right to life, who are entitled to take action against those who seek to destroy their life and existence or harm their physical integrity. States, too, attain existence by virtue of their sovereignty and have the right to act against other states that seek to undermine their political independence and territorial integrity. The United States and Israel have committed aggression against Iranian territory, and it was Iran's natural right to defend itself. In light of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and based on the requirements of the right of self-defense: 1) the two aforementioned states carried out a military attack on Iranian soil; 2) Iranian official authorities had

exhausted diplomatic channels for the establishment of international peace and security; 3) Iran's defensive operation was proportionate to the enemy's attack, and no target other than enemy bases was struck; 4) Iran's military operation was conducted after the enemy's military attack.

What the author of these lines seeks is not to elucidate the evident right of self-defense of our beloved country, but rather to underscore the necessity of changing international legal structures. This is because the existing structures are incapable of securing international peace and security and of withstanding the bullying of powers. The right of self-defense itself bears a passive and defensive character, and is unable to afford the possibility of obtaining redress and reparation for all damages inflicted upon the country. To compensate

for these damages, a new design must be conceived and a novel legal mechanism must be taught to the world.

Acts contrary to international law on the part of the United States and Israel clearly corroborate the proposition that they are unwilling to abide by accepted international principles and rules, and by deriding these structures, they seek to impose heavy damages upon the country, to the extent that the mentally disturbed president of the United States openly speaks of a return to the Stone Age and the destruction of the country's infrastructure, yet no international body offers a deterring response to these baseless statements! The proliferation of poverty, numerous wars, and mass killings by these countries on the one hand, and the inaction of the United Nations Security Council on the other, ne-

cessitate that a new remedy be devised for international peace and security, and that we not confine ourselves to pseudo-legal dogmas that are the very creation of these same countries.

In any case, although Article 108 of the United Nations Charter provides for the manner of possible amendments by the will of the majority of member states, and one can draw upon the new capabilities of certain countries to change the international system, actions such as the intelligent management of the Strait of Hormuz can also serve as an opening for changing the governance relations of international waterways and a window for compensating the damages inflicted upon the country. Indeed, henceforth, it is international law that must adapt itself to new conditions and respond to emerging needs.

Iran on the Threshold of Victory: A Strategic Analysis of National Strengths in the Ramadan War from the Perspective of Border Security and National Solidarity

Dr. Arash Karami, Secretary of the Provincial Issues Assembly of Ilam Province

Iran's history is a narrative of resistance and steadfastness against successive waves of aggression. Today, as the Ramadan War has begun and the Iranian nation once again faces a great test, as Secretary of the nezam masaael of Ilam Province—the capital of the servants of Sayyid al-Shuhada—I consider it my duty to address dimensions that have received less attention.

Iran's strategic depth in the Ramadan War lies not only within its geographical borders but also in the extensive network of the Axis of Resistance. From Hezbollah in Lebanon to Hashd al-Shaabi in Iraq, from Ansar Allah in Yemen to the Palestinian resistance, Iran has built a network of strategic allies that, in critical moments, function as the country's defensive arms. This strategic depth has prevented the enemy from easily approaching Iranian territory, knowing that any attack on Iran will trigger a multilateral and coordinated response from across the region. This network, formed over decades through strategic investment, transfer of experience and technology, and building mutual trust, is now considered Iran's greatest geopolitical asset.

Iran's missile and drone capabilities also play a key role in the region's security equations as one of the most important deterrence tools. Iran has successfully produced high-precision, long-range ballistic and cruise missiles capable of targeting any point in the region. Iran's advanced drones, which have proven their effectiveness in recent



conflicts, serve as cost-effective, accurate, and powerful tools for the armed forces. This missile and drone capability, the product of Iranian experts' efforts, has forced the enemy to assess the cost of any attack on Iran as extremely high. Importantly, Iran not only possesses this technology but has also transferred it to its allies, fundamentally altering the region's security equation.

Electronic and cyber warfare is another domain where Iran has made remarkable progress. Iran's ability to hack enemy drones, disrupt communication and command systems, and attack the enemy's critical infrastructure demonstrates the country's cyber power. This capability, achieved despite sanctions and restrictions, now serves as a key tool in asymmetric warfare, challenging the enemy in an arena where it considered itself superior. Today's cyber warfare is not physical combat but a form of warfare that can paralyze the enemy's energy, water, electricity, banking, and communication infrastructure—and Iran possesses considerable capa-

bility in this domain.

The experience of the Sacred Defense is also an invaluable asset for Iran. The generation of commanders and fighters who gained experience during the eight-year war now lead the armed forces and transfer their knowledge to the new generation. This experience, gained through asymmetric warfare, crisis management, and resistance against a more powerful enemy, is being applied in the Ramadan War today. Iranian commanders know how to bring the enemy to its knees with limited resources, and this knowledge is more valuable than any advanced weapon. The experience of Operations Karbala, Fath al-Mobin, Bait al-Moqaddas, and Khaybar is now available to commanders in the form of new military doctrines.

Iran's strategic geography is another national strength. Its location in the heart of the Middle East, control of the Strait of Hormuz through which 30 percent of the world's oil passes, proximity to the Caspian Sea and Persian Gulf, and geopolitical position as a bridge between

East and West all give Iran significant leverage in international equations. The enemy knows that any attack on Iran could close the Strait of Hormuz and plunge the global economy into serious crisis—this is Iran's greatest deterrent. Additionally, the mountainous terrain covering over 60 percent of Iranian territory enables defense in depth and poses serious challenges to any enemy ground operations.

The popular mobilization force (Basij) is one of Iran's most unique strengths. Millions of Basij members present throughout the country not only serve as reserve forces during wartime but also play key roles in peacetime through public service, crisis management, and maintaining internal security. This popular force, rooted in the culture of sacrifice and martyrdom, has given Iran a human strategic depth that no other country in the region possesses. The enemy knows that even if it could defeat Iran's army, it would face millions of Basij members ready to defend the homeland to their last breath. This structure, which exists in no other country, guarantees Iran's enduring security.

Iran's indigenous defense industry is an achievement realized despite sanctions and restrictions. Iran has successfully produced a wide range of weapons domestically, from missiles and drones to tanks, aircraft, naval vessels, and submarines. This defense self-sufficiency has not only saved foreign currency but also guaranteed the country's



strategic independence. The enemy cannot disarm Iran through weapons sanctions because Iran has established a domestic weapons production chain. Reverse engineering, one of Iran's key capabilities, has enabled Iran to benefit from enemy technologies and indigenize them. Here in Ilam, the capital of the servants of Sayyid al-Shuhada, we witness the true manifestation of sacrifice and devotion. Ilam Province and its border residents have always been on the front lines of Iran's defense and have a brilliant history of sacrifice and devotion. During the Sacred Defense, Ilam was the front line of the eight-year war, and every household offered a martyr to the homeland. The people of Ilam stood empty-handed against the Ba'ath regime and, with faith and sacrifice, pushed back the enemy. This culture of sacrifice, passed from generation to generation, still flows in the veins of border residents to-

day. In the Ramadan War, too, Ilam's border residents play a crucial role. As Iran's eyes and ears, they protect the borders, gather strategic intelligence on enemy movements, provide logistical support to the armed forces, and maintain high morale with readiness to defend to the last breath. Ilam's border residents stand on the front lines not out of compulsion but because of Iranian honor and Islamic faith. Iran's active diplomacy at the international level has also played an important role in strengthening the country's position. Membership in international organizations, extensive relations with Asian, African, and Latin American countries, and an active role in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and BRICS all demonstrate Iran's multilateral diplomacy. This diplomacy has prevented Iran's international isolation and enabled it to maintain allies and trade partners despite Western

pressure. Strategic cooperation with China and Russia, two major global powers, allows Iran to resist American and European pressure and preserve its interests. National media and cyberspace are also domains where Iran has made significant progress. Television and radio networks, digital media, and cyberspace activists all play active roles in soft warfare, conveying Iran's narrative to the world. This media capability, facing the West's propaganda machine, has influenced global public opinion and demonstrated that Iran is the victim of aggression, not the aggressor. Iran's international networks, broadcasting in various languages, have conveyed the narrative of resistance to global audiences and garnered sympathy from many nations for Iran. The resistance economy that has taken shape in recent years has shown that Iran can achieve economic growth even under sanctions. Do-

mestic production, import substitution, development of non-oil exports, and utilization of domestic capacities are all achievements of the resistance economy. This economy, built on self-sufficiency and independence, now serves as the country's financial backbone in the Ramadan War, ensuring that Iran can cover war expenses. The experience of sanctions, which could have brought Iran to its knees, instead made Iran stronger and self-sufficient. Today, relying on these strategic capabilities, Iran is prepared to confront any threat. The enemy must know that the Iranian nation stood against Alexander, Genghis Khan, and Saddam, defeated superpowers empty-handed, and created miracles through faith and sacrifice. The Ramadan War, too, with God's help and relying on these strengths, will end in victory. After this war, Iran will be stronger, more independent, and more dignified.

Iran: The Uncontainable Land Power at the Heart of Eurasia :

Mehdi Chapari, Secretary of the Advisory Assembly on Provincial Issues of South Khorasan



Amid escalating regional tensions, Western analysts are once again speaking of a naval blockade scenario against Iran. However, what these analyses overlook is Iran's unique geographical and geopolitical reality: a country with 15 land borders that has transformed it into an unstoppable connective power. The Myth of Naval Blockade and the Reality of Land Connectivity Possessing the longest border network in the Middle East, Iran is not easily containable. While the Strait of Hormuz is a crucial strategic lever, Iran has never put all its eggs in one basket. Iran's extensive network of land borders guarantees that even in the most hypothetical scenarios of a naval blockade, its economy will continue to function.

Vital Corridors: The Arteries of a Resilient Economy
The North-South Corridor: The Eurasian Bridge Iran is the heart of the International North-South Transport Corridor (INSTC) – a route connecting India to Russia and Europe. Starting from the Astarabad border, this corridor has the capacity to transport 15 million tons of cargo annual-

ly, reducing transit time by up to 40%. In critical conditions, this route can become Iran's main trade artery.

The Gateway to Europe: The Bazargan Border with Turkey The most advanced land border in the Middle East is located at Bazargan. With a daily capacity of 1,200 trucks and an active railway line, this border directly connects Iran to the 500-million-strong European market. As a primary trade partner, Turkey views any disruption in trade with Iran as detrimental to its own economy.

Energy Pipelines: The Unstoppable Network Iran possesses one of the most extensive energy pipeline networks in the world:

- Oil pipeline to Turkey: 1 million barrels per day
- Gas pipeline to Turkey: 30 million cubic meters per day
- Networks under development to Pakistan and Iraq

This underground network insulates Iran's energy transfer from maritime threats.

Eastern Borders: The New Silk Road The Mahirud Terminal: The Missing Piece of the Connectivity Puzzle

The Mahirud border terminal in eastern Iran exempli-

fies Iran's untapped potential. This terminal, which can become a regional logistics hub, connects Iran to Afghanistan and thence to Central Asia. Development projects will increase its capacity to 500 trucks per day.

The Mirjaveh Border: Gateway to the Indian Ocean

Via the Mirjaveh border and connection to Pakistan's railway network, Iran gains direct access to the strategic port of Gwadar. This access enables Iran to connect to global markets through the Indian Ocean, rendering any claim of a naval blockade ineffective. Logistical cooperation agreements with Pakistan have made this route a secure and reliable corridor.

Northeastern Borders: Passageway to Central Asia

The Sarakhs and Lotfabad borders with Turkmenistan are Iran's gateways to the vast markets of Central Asia and China. These passages form a vital part of China's Belt and Road Initiative, making Iran an indispensable trade partner in continental infrastructure projects.

Railway Network: The Connective Backbone

Iran is completing its international railway network, connecting north to south and east to west. The Chabahar-Zahedan railway line, which connects to the national network and then to the Mirjaveh border, guarantees Iran's access to the Indian Ocean independently of the Strait of Hormuz. This project, along with the Rasht-Astarabad railway, transforms Iran into an international railway crossroads.

Economic Diplomacy: Irrefutable Alliances Iran's land

capability is not limited to geography. Tehran's active diplomacy has led to strategic economic alliances with its neighbors. Membership in organizations like the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and bilateral transit agreements with dozens of countries have created a network of mutual commitments, making the disruption of trade flows with Iran costly and impractical for regional partners.

Conclusion: An Unchangeable Geopolitical Paradigm Claims of a naval blockade against Iran are based on a flawed premise: that Iran is an isolated maritime power. In reality, Iran is an established land power and the pivotal connective hub of Eurasia. The unparalleled combination of multiple borders, vital transit corridors, resilient energy infrastructure, and shrewd economic diplomacy has created a multi-layered shield.

The threat of a naval blockade does not isolate Iran; rather, it highlights the global economy's dependence on this country's land connectivity network. Disrupting the flow of goods and energy through Iran means disrupting supply chains from Europe to South Asia.

By deeply understanding its geopolitical assets, Iran has demonstrated a model of "power through connection." In the 21st century, the century of connectivity, a country with 15 land gateways to the world can never be blockaded. It is itself the regulator of the continent's trade flows. Any attempt to isolate this crossroads of civilizations will only lead to the isolation of the one attempting it.