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Abstract. Islamic republic of Iran has been regarded as one of the most important and striking countries due to specific geographical state and strategic situation. Moreover, Russia federation as the largest country which remained intact owing to segregation of union of soviet socialists republics, has a prominent situation across international political agenda .in such a way, has influenced much of the most striking regional and international events. Therefore, an analysis of the relations between Iran and Russia and how deep these relations between these two countries are, enhances our understanding of the issues and predominant subject matters within international sphere and remind us of advantages and shortcomings and then makes the process of the policymaking and diplomacy as easier in line with national interests. Iran and Russia relation has an impact over the practical and theoretical trend of foreign policy of two countries. Russia and Iran cooperation has a crucial effect over the regional and international relations .In the domain of foreign policy, both sides give a special importance over how to use their own geopolitical situation and state in the international realm.
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Introduction. Iran is the only country which has common border within central Asia, Caspian sea and Caucasus, and this geographical feature cause Iran to have a distinct role across Russia foreign policy. Central Asia can get out of the geopolitical impasse through Iran. Iran and Russia are only two seashore countries adjacent to Caspian sea, in addition to accessing to this sea, these two countries have an access which Iran can use to access border waters. Iranian Historical and Cultural commonality along with central Asia and Caucasus is another advantage which Iran has across these areas. As Iran has this advantage and this causes Russians to overemphasize over the behavior of the Islamic republic of Iran across these areas. The importance of Caspian sea for neighboring countries increases as experts found great sources of oil reserves under this sea, and this is coincided with the fall of Soviet unions system and the emergence of CIS countries such as Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation . Demonstrated crude oil reservoirs of the Caspian region are equal to 16 billion barrels 5/32 (2 to 4 billion tons) and natural gas reserves of between 236 to 337 trillion cubic feet (5.4 to 7 trillion cubic meters).moreover, it is likely that there will be 163 billion barrels of oil and 328 trillion cubic feet (8 trillion cubic meters ) of other natural gas in the region .According to the estimate of the research institute, the portion of natural gas over the demanded basket of the world primary energies will reach 28 percent by 2030, and in this regard, some experts call the twenty-first century as the gas century due to the significance of the changes in relation to the future gas reservoirs. With respect to these conditions and situations, Iran and Russia encounter the double sensitivity of the superpowers towards the Caspian region . The growing strength of the influence of US in the Caucasus is one of the elements contributing to the boosting of relations between Iran and Russia . On the other hand, the presence of the United States in the Caucasus region, without any doubt is not compatible with the provisions of the National Security Doctrine of Iran and Russia.

Theoretical fundamentals and the major features of Iran-Soviet relations after the Islamic Revolution of Iran. various views and discourses have been have been taken into account regarding Iran's foreign policy over the past three decades, each of which has an impact on the formation of its nature in a specific historical contexts. According to my own view, five overwhelming discourses within foreign policy of this country have been identified which are as follows:

1. expedience-based or realistic discourse (1360- 1357 Iranian usual calendar / 1981 1979 AD) This period began with Prime Minister Bazargan and the administration of the temporary government and ended with the occupation of the United States Embassy by students following the route and path of Imam Khomeini and the resignation of Mahdi Bazargan (44 , p. 9). ). In this period, national interests were prioritized over Islamic interests, while, based on the viewpoints of the supreme leader of the Islamic revolution, country resources must be served and spent toward the goals of Islam and the poor and deprived Muslims of the world. It is apparent that realistic-based viewpoint does not last and gave it position to idealistic views after a short while.

2. idealistic or value-laden discourse (1360-68 Iranian calendar 1981-87 AD)

Within idealistic discourse ,foreign policy is based on Islamic teachings and standards and the realization of Islamic ideals and values . In this period, the decision makers and executives of foreign policy had been thoroughly ideological .since, the approach of this policy was based on industrial principles and moral values , it was confronted with difficulties within the international context in which the players' main tenets has been totally relied on realism principles. . According to this policy, the Islamic Republic of Iran attempted to undermine the rules and norms of foreign policy irrespective of the governing system over international relations and supplant their own favorable order ( ibid . , P. 4-13 ).

3. interest-based and pragmatic period (economic reform)
This approach in the second decade of the Islamic Revolution and the presidency of Mr. Hashemi Rafsanjani along with foreign policy was regarded and lasted up to 1997. In this period, the government of Iran approved the realities of the international system and the internal and crisis conditions with the reluctance. To keep the internal situation safe and secure and rebuild the country, implement the economic reform. The major element of this policy are practice based trends in the planning and implementation of foreign policy which lies in compatibility with Islamic values (42, p. 1043).

4. culture-oriented policy discourse (discourse) (1376-84 Iranian calendar/2005 1997 AD) During this period, which includes the Presidency of Seyyed Mohammad Khatami ,it had been shown an attempt to avoid the incessant rumors and persuasive and alluring slogans ,and instead, the main slogan of peace, friendship and co-existence in Iran's foreign relations must be substituted . (74, p. 63 ).

5. value-laden and idealistic discourse.

This policy started from solar year 1384 / 2005 AD, with the presidency of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and continued along with his views on the revival of the Islamic Revolution and Islamic values, and this path continues up to now, over this period, it has been made an attempt to fulfill the goals of the Islamic Republic of Iran for the issuance of the theory of revolution and the unification of the Islamic world against imperialism by better finding out and utilizing regional and international conditions. Although, governing policy over Iran foreign relations during the presidency of Mr Hashemi Rafsanjani between the years of 1989-1997 with the reliance on interest-based discourse across the development of Iran-soviet union is of high value. Acceptance of the Resolution 598 and the end of the Iraq war against Iran, the revision of the constitution and the election of Mr. Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani to the presidency on the one hand, and the collapse of the Soviet Union and its impact on international relations on the other, are the main elements which strongly influence on the policy trend of the system and the thoughts and decisions of the elite section of the society with respect to the major country issues. And destructive effects of war and financial problems arising from the subject of migrants and prisoners of war, destroying the centers of production, loss of national capital, economic limitations and restraints and general economic mayhem and domestic political constraints, altogether, endanger the core and whole existence of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Additionally, following the policy which is intensely oblivious to the international regulations during 8 years of war, failed to meet each of the international review-oriented demands of Iran across. Under the influence of these factors, the government of Iran gradually and with reluctance and pressure accept the realities of international political system and internal and crisis situations and in order to regulate the inner state of the country and reconstructing the country, begin working on the economic reform. The main element of this discourse consisted of practice based over the regulation and handling within foreign policy along with sticking to the Islamic values and canons.(42, page 1043). In deed, the practical and behavioral policy of Iran in the field of foreign policy in the second decade of the revolution can be explore within the national interests and regional arrangements and preventing the others to be obsessed with the other stimulating behaviors in the framework of the policy of the normalization relations. The policy of taking into account the foreign environment and participation in the governing international system had been exercised instead of the policy of dodging the international environment during Iraq–Iran war. On the other hand, the inevitability of regarding economic and security issues and providing national interests in the economic domain has resulted in pursuing credibility and power, pragmatic politics and coexistence with others on behalf of Iran. The need to restore the country's military power which was deteriorated due to the eight years of the war with Iraq, and considering the specific geopolitics of Iran by foreign policy executives was also regarded as another factor in changing the behavior of Iran with the other countries ( 21 , pp. 65-51).overall, the starting point of change in Iran's foreign policy in the period of the presidency of Hashemi Rafsanjani had been coincided with the collapse of the Soviet Union, a superpower which was the dominant power over the east for a 70--year period.

And being against the imperialism policy of the western countries was regarded by this country as a balance within its foreign policy. Thus, it must adopt an approach which decrease the level of threat to its security in every situation and use opportunities to strengthen its relationship with the United States. In this period, it was believed that the Islamic Republic of Iran at first failed to alter the political map of the region, and secondly, it must adapt itself to the new balance of the region, thirdly ,it must gradually stabilize its relations with Saudi Arabia, and due to the limitations and the problems that have been emerged in relations with the West as well as the necessities of economic reconstruction of the country, Iran must promote its cooperation with the countries of India and China . (59 , pages 5-74). On the basis of another aspect ,it can be said the eight-year Iran-Iraq war, decline continuity and the economic crisis contributed to the widespread discontent. The president ( Hashemi Rafsanjani ) promises to rebuild and alter the economic policies of the Islamic opposing parties. The policies which increase the level government control over the economy (131 , p. 54). The predominant ruling system over the country contributed to shifting of the Islamic Republic Iran's foreign policy toward pragmatism. The policy which was replete with an aggressive and ideological form during the first years of presidency . The president ( Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani ) was a pragmatic politician and a type of a real mediator . He introduced his government's policy as "the construction of Islamic Iran ",in addition to emphasizing on the inevitability of the development of the country, the economic prosperity and prosperity of the people, and presenting the developmental model of countries such as Turkey and South Korea as a successful model in the development of Third World countries . (109 , p. 100), he attempted to stabilize relations with the West , adopt a policy of détente, and use the relations of the Islamic Republic with the East, including Russia, in order to facilitate and speed up the implementation process of his economic and political programs. Hashemi Rafsanjani ' Visiting of
Moscow in the summer of 1989 – that is, when he held the position of the candidate for the presidency – and forming a contract of 10 billion dollars with the Russians, definitely demonstrate the attempt of Iran over appropriate using of capacities of northern neighbor to promote the state of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the region and the world and as a the security mechanism against the American threats.

On the other hand, Rafsanjani, at the head of the pragmatic faction of the Iranian political community, whenever he felt that the political situation reached the satisfactory level throughout the country, he would have revived the idea of founding the relationship with the United States (30, p. 57).

In deed, from the other perspective, it can be meant that whatever he had done as the constructive measures form relations with the United States were equivalent to an attempt to lower down the pressure of the United States and keeping away the Islamic Republic from the sphere of the threat of US. However, the traditional right party, which have been known as radicals made this idea impossible due to high level of influence over the country’s various issues, further, they have been always supported by supreme leader of Islamic revolution. In fact, multi-variation across Iranian political society views cause the way as much more complex for Rafsanjani to create a broad coalition to lift the toughest sanctions on Iran’s foreign policy. But let’s not forget that the internal organization of the country, especially in the economic arena and military and defense area and modernization of the equipment had been regarded as at high level of demand to create and develop foreign relations. (Ibid., P. 167). These obstacles signifies the inevitability of Islamic Republic relations with the East, especially Russia, for Iranian statesmen. In other words, Russia and Iran ties regarded as the most striking factor for stability over the region and the most significant debate of these two countries. Of course, Iran’s ties with Russia can be analyzed in the context of the policy of viewing the East; that is, foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran during the presidency of Mr. Hashemi Rafsanjani had been relied on the priority of the East.

This policy was taken into consideration just for creating a balancing medium as opposed to the western societies and developing the cooperation with the Eastern part of the world. In other words, cooperation with the East as a counterweight to the West has always been within the strategic idea in Iran. In the policy of viewing the east, there have always been two approaches: geographic and ideological factors. In this regard, the Islamic Republic of Iran feels more proximity to based on its geographical and cultural, political and social ties, the eastern countries more than the western world. The most crucial point here is that in policy of viewing East by Iran at the time of presidency of Hashemi, they were not fully aware of the progresses and abilities of West, roughly, relations between Iran and Western countries had been based upon the traditional relations and viewed as holistic one, which its abrupt change could result in the tremendous losses inside of Iran. And this why the Islamic Republic of Iran due to its policy toward East is exclusively emphasized on the special state of the Russian Federation? Based on the aforementioned issues, it should be stated that the country’s neighborhood with the Islamic Republic and the conditions that emerged in its cultural and political affairs with the newly independent republics played an key role in relations between Iran and Russia. The fall of the Soviet Union resulted in accepting of Islam by a significant part of the former Soviet population. On the other hand, the roots and historical-cultural interests of the present-day southern region of Russia have traditionally been in touch with the Persian-speaking world and have an incessant tendency.(40 , p. 106 ). Under the presidency of Hashemi Rafsanjani, in addition to Iran’s foreign policy, Russian foreign policy must be explored and each of these policies must be studied comparatively. The Russian Federation after the collapse of the Soviet Union, alongside the foreign policy of Mikhail Gorbachev developed relations with the countries in accordance with the framework of political-economic expediencies. In deed, the Russian Federation had encountered two basic attitudes towards itself and its position in the world after the fall of the Soviet Union i.e. the Atlantic and Eurasian conservative wing. While the proponents of Atlantic tenets (At-la -tisch -ism : a policy of military cooperation between European powers and the united states) emphasized over the need for exhaustive cooperation with the West and the United States, the proponents of Eurasian tenets focused on Russia’s geopolitical requirements. In the first vision, a democratic Russia, a market with multi-ethnic, pluralistic and non-religious features with global has been taken into account which aims to follow the constructive and active foreign policy toward the West. The prominent figures in the Yeltsin government have been in favor of this attitude. The second vision is a Russia with great power with a unique nationality, which sets forth the idea of the revival of the Eurasian Empire. This group has been very close to the old Russian proportions and the idea of the revival of Russian power. The idea of this group had influenced Russia’s foreign policy since the mid-1990s, and then reached the highest level during the Putin period.

Between 1991-93, although the attitude which governs the foreign policy of new Russia is the continuation of the new idea of Gorbachev’s foreign policy and a part of his perestroika(the policy of economic and governmental reform instituted by Mikhail Gorbachev in the soviet union during the mid -1980s). However, it was apparent that due to giving up the communism ideology completely and the ending of the global role of the Soviet Union, Moscow’s foreign policy fundamental experienced a basic change. hence, this policy was termed as an attempt to integrate with the West. During this period, a set of collaborations over strategic issues had been formed which the Second Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty between Moscow and Washington, support for the implementation and destruction plan of long-range missile systems and additional nuclear warheads located on Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan within Lisbon protocol on May 1992 deemed important ones. (96, p. 123).

Along with this period, Russia’s strong need to US help within its economic reconstruction has made Russia’s relations with the Islamic Republic unfavorable. In such a way, the Russian Foreign Ministry one year after the collapse, within its West-oriented policies framework, regarded the Islamic Republic of Iran as a source of ”Islamic
threat”, at this time, adhering to the principles and canons of Islam perceived as a serious threat to Russia's security, which is quite in harmony with the Western interpretations. Within this interpretation, Iran, China, Japan and Turkey have been regarded as the threat sources upon Russia. (32, p. 51). since 1993, Russia's foreign policy instead of cooperation and being in accompany with United States much focused on keeping the national interests. Due to the failure of Russian West-oriented policy, and even moderators (moderate parties) in Russia challenge the policy of integration into the West. However, step by step the proponents of the Atlantic attitude was questioned in Russia, and Moscow attempted to satisfy the domestic public opinion and reveal its sovereignty in international affairs through developing ties with states such as Iran.

The first Chechen crisis (1994-96), was regarded as the worsen conditions of relations and then as a factor to enhance relations must be taken into account. Since 1995, along with the increasing rate of nationalist movements against the United States after a two-year period of Western-oriented policy, the necessity of adoption of a moderate or anti-Western policy in that country strongly felt. Thus, within the 1993 election, the extremest nationalists (the Liberal Democrats) and the Communists reached high votes. The alteration in the status of the past, the anti-American public opinion, the mutual interests of the two countries in the adjacent areas and the need for the advantages resulted from bilateral economic and technical and military relations led to enhanced ties.

In 1998, Iran's foreign minister stated that Tehran-Moscow relations has been at the highest level in contemporary era. (25, p 29). Due to the civil war in Tajikistan, the future legal regime of the Caspian Sea and the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh, Gradually, made the Russians aware of the significance of friendly relations with Iran. Another eye-catching issue which had an effect on the change in Russia's approach was the concern about the West's secret aims of expanding NATO towards the east. In Russia, it could be easily seen that, despite the unilateral liquidation of the Warsaw treaty, Western countries did not annul the NATO alliance, which regarded as one of the vivid signs of the Cold War, but it was extended to the east, and they chose some Eastern European countries such as Hungary, Poland and Czech as candidates to be permanent members of this organization. Based upon this point, Andrei Kozyrev, the Russian Foreign Minister, who was well-known for intense tendency to the ideas of the West, made his first official visit to Tehran on April 9, 1993, in order to develop bilateral ties. Besides, meeting with his counterpart, he also visited the other officials of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The developments of late 1994 can be viewed as a turning point over the realm of enhancing bilateral relations. During this year, Russia's Atomic Energy Minister Mikhailov visited Tehran and, meanwhile going to Bushehr, announced Russia's agreement to complete the Bushehr power plant (85, p. 312-3). As the ties between two countries enhanced, over this period, we have seen the meetings along with participating of scholars, researchers of both countries the first round of debate panels was held on March 14th and 15th at the Foreign Ministry's Studies department. This meeting provided an opportunity for advocates of bilateral relations freely express their views on the abilities and obstacles over expanding ties. The remarks made by Andranik Megranian, member of the Islamic advisory Council of the Presidency of Russia, have clearly express Russia's approach to this debate panel. He also declare that Russia after the fall of the Soviet Union was trying to be in compliance with the global order. (111, pp.163-67) the next panel of these type of meetings undoubtedly will be effective on the making two countries' views close to each other over some key issues of the region.

Domestic war inside Tajikistan and concern of Moscow over spreading of this turmoil to the central Asia resulted in the formation of negotiations of the authorities of Iran and Russia during 1994-1999. During the visit of Kozyrev the foreign minister of Russia that on April 8, 1993, the issue of forming a quadripartite debate panel among the opposing sides of Tajikistan State, the state of the country. Russia and Iran was taken into account and approved overall, 9 round of negotiation for resolving the civil war in Tajikistan, held upon which, the first negotiations on 1996 in Tehran and the last one with the final signing of the peace treaty on 24 June 1997 in Moscow held.

The constructive role of Iran within these negotiation and political ties between Iran and Russia In 1995, a board of the representatives of the union of industry and employers came to Tehran to discuss with their Iranian counterparts in accordance with the development of the ties within each other. Arkady Volsky, the chairman of this board, emphasized on the commonality of Iran and Russia interests over the exhaustive development Of the industrial and technical relations due to the needs of Iran and Russia abilities. Based upon the agreement of Iran and Russia for boosting the economic and technical cooperation, a striking promoting occurs within the transactions of those two countries. On January 5 to December 8, 1995 Volg Davydov, Deputy prime minister’ deputy and the economic relations minister of Russia visited Tehran due to the formal invitation of Mohammad Khan, Iranian finance and economic affairs minister. And then, at the middle of the month of that year (mid-March), the justice minister of Russia signed judicial treaty with Iranian counterpart during his visit to Tehran. Within the framework of that deed, both countries agree upon the returning of the criminals (extradition), judicial experiences transaction and in terms of education. A new era upon the relations between Iran and Russia began as Primakov, the Orientalist and the most experienced expert over middle east issues as foreign minister of Russia. Appointing Primakov as foreign minister of Russia, connote that Eurasian proponents overpower the west-oriented proponents within Russia political arena. After this time, Islamic republic of Iran reached the more favorite stance over Russian foreign policy and relations of two countries promoted tremendously, Primakov, in addition to criticizing the Russia passive policies against America and adhering to US policy over the world, much more emphasized on the special geopolitical interests of Russia. Primakov has a great tendency toward the increasing of the influence of Russia federation over the Islamic world as one of the
most crucial aims, the developing of the relations within Islamic countries especially, central Asia and the Caucasus mostly grasped his attention.

The visit of Natgh Nouri, the head of the Islamic Consultative Assembly in April 1997 to Moscow, and the signing of several documents with respect to the purchase of the topolove airplanes, 204 aircraft, the construction of satellite and commercial cooperation, was the other development in relations between the two countries, which was more closely in accordance with the positions on issues Regional and global issues. Natgh Nouri, who at those times had the first chance to be elected as the next president of Iran, was warmly accepted by Boris Yeltsin. The Russian State Duma, which was in the hands of the Communist Party, had a positive attitude of expanding relations with Iran and favorably received the Iranian parliamentary board.

After the seventh presidential election on May 23, 1997 and presenting the new programs of the new president (Seyyed Mohammad Khatami), Iran's foreign relations continued within the framework of the relative realism approach, although a variation on the way of speech and ways of dealing with others had changed, and the policy of economic balancing and focusing on the state industrial development is replaced with political development and within foreign ties, acceptance of the global pluralism which connot the denial of the one-sided world and acceptance of the equality of the cultures, resulted in the major axis of foreign policy.(42, page 1044).

In the other words, during the presidency of Mr. Khatami, a change took place in the political discourse of Iran and keeping away from creating hostility and the plot of violent and stimulating slogans had emerged. Thus, Khatami state foreign policy has named Cultural-oriented political -based discourse.

In fact, Khatami’s new foreign policy aimed at achieving global dignity which formerly deteriorated. Following this policy within the first four years of Presidency of Khatami, the government had taken significant steps towards overseas countries and removed the tensions alongside the countries of the regions and the whole world, further, had increased its regional and international cooperation. One of the most eye-catching developments in Iran during the Khatami era can be viewed in the field of national security. Khatami, in line with the policy of peaceful coexistence and the confirmation of global pluralism, could separate the two issues of national security and foreign policy which had not previously been differentiated. In the first round of his presidency, he corrected the violent face of the Islamic Republic across the international relations and moved the Crisis Dialogue successfully European countries into constructive discourse and changed the attitude of the world toward Iran in a positive way. He was influential in improving relations with the West and the Western countries, especially the Gulf region. Iran's positive relations with the Federation of Russia and the Commonwealth countries continued. Since, the supporters of the Khatami government saw economic and political relations with Western countries and the Middle East as pernicious to Iran (131 , p. 65), The policy that Khatami’s government adopted in respect to Russia and the interests of the northern neighbor, led to Iran's relations with Russia also boosted.

Khatami’s foreign policy was largely based on two principles: 1. The policy of lifting of tensions, creating the trust in Relations with Other Countries. 2. The theory of discourse of civilizations. The existence of a negative attitude in the outside world towards the Islamic Republic on the one hand, and the theory of being against the West and the United States, antagonism inside the political circles inside Iran, resulted in the formation of a series of conditions under which President Khatami, as President, presented the lifting of the tensions. Based on the views of Khatami, removing the tensions did not mean neglect and oblivion to the threats, however, it was understanding of the enemy's borders and efforts to strengthen friendships and aspects of commonality against the threats. He believed that the policy of removing the tensions decreases the cost of governing the country. As a meeting with Iranian ambassadors in the Persian Gulf region, Khatami stated that: The current era is the era of the stabilization of the system and the principle of removing the tension in the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic is in accordance with the stabilization stage ... We must strive to learn from the past; our look is to the future. Therefore, we can begin a new stage of mutual understanding and mutual respect .(67), Khatami government, apparently, approved three key elements of dignity, rationality and expediency; and annihilating the tension within the framework of these three principles meant that Iran's foreign policy strives to overcome misunderstandings from the past and effort to end any type of conflict and international conflict and highly regards the international reality so as to provide its security. Moreover, the policy of removing the tensions is based on the tenet that Iran, which has had a very sensitive historical and geopolitical situation with a history of several thousand years of civilization, must gain its authentic historic status as its regional and global player. (77).

Crisis conditions within the country And many troubles in Iran's foreign relations forced Mr. Khatami to basically reconsider the foreign policy and precarious relations of Iran with the great powers of the world and the countries of the region. On the one hand, the threatening publication of Samuel Huntington, the American well-known-theorictian upon the approaching of civilizations, which had a global reflection, had inevitably resulted in the accountability of the executives of non-western civilizations. Another major point was that on the threshold of the third millennium, public opinion had been influenced by the new superpower of the international system, and almost the governments of the world hate to be regarded as a kind of authoritarian and fascist states.

Within this outlining, it can be said that the reviewing of Iran's foreign policy during this period, not only was effected by domestic requirements and factors but also was influenced by the conditions and imposition of the international system. This type of connection of Mr. Khatami to tackle the problems within Iran's relations with the abroad has resulted in a policy which focuses on the removing of the tensions and also in order to present a realistic picture of the Islamic Republic system and keeping away Iran from international isolation, set forth the discourse of
civilizations as a method to reaching the goals of foreign policy. The idea of the discourse of civilizations was based on these tenets which as follows, in general, human problems were caused by lack of mutual understanding among nations, and present human being which has been on the verge of entering the third millennium, by learning a n experience from the former events, can concentrate on the dialogue and understanding, and prevents the forming of the war and a repetition of the bitter sorrows and mayhems within the country's relations. In the fifty-third UN General Assembly, Khatami expounded the doctrine of civilizational discourse, and deemed Islam a religion of peace, friendship, and kindness.(67).

In another speech at the University of Florence, Italy, also provided a better and clear definition over the discourse of civilizations more clearly. He said: "In order to achieving the real discourse between civilizations, East needs to be turned into a conversation and conversation partner rather than an issue for knowledge. This is a very striking step that Europe and the United States must take into account to pave the way for the plan over the discourse between civilizations. (The same source). Overall, the discourse of civilizations can be regarded as a realistic in as it calls for cooperation and coexistence of countries as a reality and so as to prevent disorder and wrath in the world, in other words, if the discourse of civilizations has been at a macro level and put it in contrast to the theory of confrontation of Huntington civilizations, it takes the form of a framework of an idealist approach, and reciprocal relations or ties became multilateralism and secret diplomacy became intellectual communications and national interests became the mutual benefit of human beings. Looking at Mr. Khatami's words and his description of the theory of dialogue between civilizations, due to the ideas of Khatami it became feasible to implement it through the policy of removing the tension.

Russia's foreign policy has altered since the mid-1990s, with the election of Yevgeny Primakov to the country's foreign ministry on global and regional issues and the Middle East countries. And as mentioned in the aforementioned parts, the policy of co-optation with the West turned into the tendency to Eurasia, and later on the agenda of the Russian president, Vladimir Putin, at the beginning of the third millennium, was intensely confirmed. Primakov's nomination as Russia's foreign minister, contrary to the satisfaction of public opinion within Russia, contributed to the concerns of Western countries. He was a Middle Eastern expert and a close friend of Saddam Hussein. Whatever is famous in the literature of international relations as Primakov's doctrine is the set of perspectives that emerged since 1996. In January 1997, Prime Minister declared that Russia would play a role and its policy towards the world will be formed on this basis, and its ties with the hostiles of the Cold War should be a fair and a mutually beneficial partnership. His emphasis on "multilateralism" in the international arena, in deed, connotes the role of Russia as a "global power" by communicating with the other states to resist the dominancy of the United States.

The new foreign policy of Russia during Primakov period was intended to stand enduringly with three negative trends in the world: 1. The claim that Russia has lost the Cold War and is a defeated country, and is viewed as a non-European country. 2. The creation of a monopolar world and the affiliation of the interests of all countries to the interests of a superpower. 3. The openness of the Russian economy should not render Russia the role of supplying raw materials to the world economic system (96. p. 136). During the Primakov era, Russia was an true supporter of peace in the Middle East, and any war between Arabs and Israel, based on his views is due to the interfering of America. He called for American intervention. Conditions that would have prevented Moscow's capacity to be resilient, operate and interfere. Primakov expressed explicitly that Russia does not intend, to follow the policy of cooperation with Washington but wants equal partnership with the United States (94).

The climax change in Russian foreign policy between 2000 and 1999 occurred and caused many observers and international relations analysts to render the beginning of the new Cold War on Russia's relations with the West, especially the United States (31. p. 146). Russia's policies that have been exerting pressure and violence since the summer of 1999 upon several southern regions of Russia, such as Chechnya and Dagestan, were heavily rebuked by Western countries, and even Yeltsin, who made a visit to Istanbul to attend the OSCE summit, left the city indignantly.(96, p. 141). But how did the states of this period impact Russia's relations with Iran? In Russia, the idea of threatening upon Iran on the first -10 year-period after the collapse of the Soviet Union i.e. when supporters had thought that close to the West is favorite for Russia, was prevalent. However, when Putin came to the power, the idea of the threatening Iran changed and turned as an opportunity for Russia's foreign relations.

Vladimir Putin became the president of the Russia as participated in the 2000 election, and finally won. He centralized Russia's foreign policy and lowered the mayhem of Yeltsin's time. Roughly speaking, it was at this time that Russia approved Iran as one of the key powers of the Persian Gulf region and Central Asia. over the presidency period of this man, a new expounding of relations with the West was taken into account, and widespread changes in the Russian foreign policy took place. The term, multi-polar geopolitics of Primakov during the era of Putin much more emphasized, although, the modified structure of the world after the events of 11 September, imposed new norms on the elites of Russia. According to these conditions, Putin, in contrast to his intense tendency towards a strategic Eurasian security approach, interpretation of Russia's Western foreign minister, Andrei Kozyrev, who believed that Russia must take into account the tangible interests and evades the ideological tenacity, implemented in Russia's foreign policy doctrine.(52)

Putin who regarded the collapse of Russia as a calamity for Russian nation, planned a middle--eastern policy on the framework for playing an active global role and because of this point, he continued the large part of the policy of Primakov, in such a way as a symbolic act, in the last month of 2000, the Russian Duma passed a new national anthem.
One of the significant points within Russia's foreign policy dimension was that foreign policy is a manifestation of domestic policy. Putin put it in another way, and that foreign policy is both an indicator and an influential element in the external and internal relations of one Government is considered. He insisted on this point that foreign policy is not only effective at promoting regional and international states in Russia, but also can have an impact on the optimal management of the country's internal affairs.

Putin, in his particular foreign policy, attempted to strengthen the concept of multilateralism rather than polarization in the international strategic literature. To achieving this goal, the new definition of cooperation with the Western alliance and the transatlantic mechanisms of the US neoconservatives for the Russian strategic security agencies has been construed and reviewed. This approach, along with Putin and Bush's visit in June 2001, and the formation of a joint NATO-Russia Council on May 28, 2002, altogether cause the reciprocal treat discourse to take the form of a divergence in relations between the two countries.

When the documents with respect to national security measure, management of foreign policy and military doctrine at the beginning of 2000 was published, and this occurred when Putin was in charge on behalf of the President Boris Yeltsin. The provisions of these documents clearly manifests a fundamental change in the Russian policy towards the West.

Throughout the diplomacy agenda dominating over Russia's foreign policy, imminent new challenges and threats to Russia's national interests, the increasing demand to establishing a global monopolar structure in which the United States will be a superpower - and focusing on the Western institutions and councils to degrade the role of the United Nations Security Council have been highlighted.

On the basis of the agenda, Russia expressed its interest in a system of stable international relations based on the principles of equity and mutual respect. In such a system, the UN should remain the major center for regulating international relations in the 21st century, and Russia is opposed to measures to lower the role of the United Nations and the Security Council on Global Affairs.

That is, Russia has a tendency in a system of stable international ties on the basis of the respect for justice and reciprocal esteem. Russia has also prioritized its regional priorities in the Foreign Policy diplomacy framework: to make sure that bilateral or multilateral cooperation for convergence of independent CIS countries has been fully in compatibility with Russia's national security forming relations with European governments. Russia is much more inclined to boost relations with the United States and resolving the obstacles faced by them and finally an emphasis on the significance of Asian countries in the Middle East, Africa and Latin America (26, pp. 20-18). Further, within this document that Russia is helpfully involved with NATO to provide international stability, however, slight variation due to the inclination of NATO toward the east prevals.

regarding the whole contents of the doctrine of the country foreign policy, it can be found out that Russia in its foreign diplomacy convention, demonstrated itself as a great pragmatic country which exploits the opportunity. Overall, However, Putin has been in line with the phrase of the security discourse of the tendency toward the Eurasia by Palmerston which believes that Russia has no everlasting friends and enemies, but permanent interests. Overall, Putin's period is a period of renewal of identity and new orientations after the fall of the Soviet Union and the Cold War, and this reconstruction has always been under the effect of two crucial developments: 1. 11 sept Terrorist event 2. Iran's nuclear crisis.

over the first three years of Putin presidency, between 2000 2003, the government became very strong Russia, and the Russian economy escalated. After this time, Russia changes the manner of speech with the West, and like former times, has not been any longer under the pressure of the West to make an decision or plan on the basis of their command. In practice, a set of measures was carried out in the field of Russian foreign policy, which manifested Russia's serious measures in competing with the United States. Putin's visiting of China, India, North Korea and Cuba, or the unilateral annulling of the agreement between Washington and Moscow in 1995 which had been signed among Gorvcherno mervdin to curb the military cooperation with Iran and beyond this an emphasis on cooperation with Iran, and also military contracts with India, China and Syria have all been done in this regard.

Alongside the presidency of Putin, whatever made the relations between Iran and Russia as strong and powerful is the aegis of two countries upon each other at global arena. Before Putin came into power, they deem Iran a threat to Russia, after that, this view was corrected along with a positive attitude toward Iran. Thus, they began creating favorite bilateral relations which encompass military projects as well as co-operation such as the construction of the Bushehr nuclear power plant. On the other hand, Russia became one of the countries without any strict and persistent ideology after the fall of the Soviet Union. specifically, at the time of the presidency of Putin, national interests were mostly regarded, and Russia's viewpoints during the Putin presidency was concentrated on the financial and economic resources over a multi-faceted world, a policy which continues up to this time. Maybe this is why some believe that the relationship between Iran and Russia is considered a unilateral one which is totally in favor of Moscow. Since, Russia's cooperation with Iran has at least been of major significance to Russia: the first one is related to the economic benefits that rooted from gaining the financial resources which is essential to support Russia's nuclear power plants and, secondly, Iran's geopolitical characteristics that make it a bridge to East and West and Has become a global energy route. If this has been confirmed, then how can Russian contribution to Iran across the international domains, especially, the United Nations, and the reaching the nuclear technology, be analyzed? In response to this question this point must be emphasized: however, within the realm of each of these points, Iran get profits over the help of Russia, these assistance fail to surmount the difficulties emerged from the lack of Iran's relations with the West, especially the
United States, in the long run. That's why Russia is not willing to lose the opportunity to play with Iran internationally at any cost. Due to the statements of a senior national security official in Russia, in response to the question "Is there a more dangerous phenomenon beyond Iranian nuclear weapon for Russia," it was equivocally asserted that: "Yes, Iran become a friend of the United States. Thus, never for ever, this delicate point has never been taken away by the authorities of Russia. One of the main reasons contributing to the proximity of Iran-Russia relations was the mutual policy of the both sides to restrict the United States in the region.

On the one hand, Russia regarded Iran as a country through which it could creates ties with the Islamic world and the Persian Gulf and maximize its impacts in the region; on the other hand, there are many capacities in the area of commerce with Iran which must be diligently kept. All of these elements produced the conditions for the two countries of Iran and Russia to come closer to each other at a large scale. Hence, Iran played a key role as a geopolitical Turkey rival for the Russians, that's why Iran is regarded as the Armenian-Russian alliance in contrary to the alliance between Turkey and the United States (39, pp. 8-297).

On the basis of Iran's viewpoint, relations between the country and Russia provide the possibility of balancing international and regional issues. Issues such as coping with the West's influence in the Middle East and the high level of demand on the influence over the countries in the region, by Turkey and Pakistan. Based on the views of Russia, ties with Iran contributed to the boosting of Russia's influence over the international community, particularly the Middle East and the Persian Gulf.

Undoubtedly, one of the most crucial developments over political relations between Iran and Russia took place at the time of Khatami's visit to Moscow on March 12 to 15 March 2001. This is the first formal visit of the president of the Islamic Republic of Iran to Moscow. However, prior to this event, the visit of the senior officials of the two-nation in New York in 2000 carried out which contributed to emerging of a new situation and boosting of Russian-Iranian relations in a stable and lawful state.

During the visit of Mr. Khatami to Moscow, several contracts on political, economic and technical cooperation were signed by the authorities of two states. The treaty has been totally relied on the interrelationship and regulations of cooperation between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Russian Federation over this deed, the two sides have committed themselves to refrain from using the violent action or exhortations and threats in their relations and not permitted their territory to be abused for the aggression and acts of sabotage and separatism against the both sides. The third article of the document also asserted that if one of the parties is raided by another country, the other party is required to avoid any military support or other assistance to the aggressors who pave the way for the continuation of the aggression and to attempts to resolve the disputes through the United Nations rules and regulations as well as the procedures and principles of international law.

Article 12 which refers to the Caspian Sea, clearly asserted that both sides, regard the 1921 and 1940 conventions and their annexed letters as the legal ground for operations in the Caspian Sea, and the legal regime of the Caspian Sea must be regulated in compliance within the unanimity of the five seashore countries, further, the parties do not recognize any boundaries in this sea except the whole legal regime of the Caspian Sea fully obeyed and exercised.

The protocol was approved and took official and legal form between the two countries along with the visit of the foreign minister Sayed Kamal Kharazi to Moscow in April 2002 after being approved by the Islamic Consultative Assembly of Iran and the Russian Duma.

Moscow University and Moscow International Relations University granted two honorary doctorates and an everlasting professor position to Iranian president, furthermore, Seyyed Mohammad Khatami visited the cities of St. Petersburg and Kazan and several Russian industrial centers, such as the Mir space station (85, pp. 20-319-20).

But the most crucial change in the relations between Iran and Russia emerged as Russia felt a serious threat from the West due to a cooperation work period with Iran (2001-2003). When US attacked Iraq and occupied the country, it expanded NATO to the Russian borders and then provoked a wave of color revolutions in the adjacent regions of Russia, especially after the American attempts to deploy missile defense systems in Poland, and the Czech president, the Russian president, described the United States as a Predator wolf and Third Reich, and mentioned the possibility of repetition on the Cuban missile crisis and, thus, unlike the past periods, focused more and more on the ties with Iran. In short, it is apparent that Iran's focus on Russia over the past two decades deemed a strategic vision and much more insisted on the relations with Russia (97, p. 100).

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in 2005 was elected as the president of Iran. His government has quite in contrary to the policies of 16 former years. The policies that were the output of the activities of Hashemi Rafsanjani and Mohammad Khatami which are as follows: the eliminating the tensions, lowering the level of the Islamic Republic's resistance to the West, the development of political and economic relations with the outside world, the presentation of a plan for discourse within civilizations, and so forth. It is quite manifest that the foreign policy of any country which has been in line with the continuity of a policy with regard to the inner affairs of the country and has also been as par with the foreign policy of the other states and environmental factors have been analyzed. Since, the domestic policies of Ahmadinejad's government in line with the foreign policy of the country changed, hence, the all of these developments has had a undeniable impact on Iran's relations with the West, Israel, Russia and, in other words, the international system. The supporters of Ahmadinejad's state think that the policy of the ninth government is in deed the outset of a new epoch over the policy and diplomacy of the Islamic Republic of Iran, which seeks to get rid of the tensions and to reach the domineering spiritual, political, economic and military technology. In other words, the ninth government approach to worldwide relations, regarded as a shift from the position of the convict to the claimant.
and a shift from defense position to the assertive and ready to fight stance. The major difference between foreign policy of the ninth government and foreign policy of Islamic Republic of other states lies in utilizing the state of the art tools and mediums and also making use of the technology. (125, p. 229). Within this type of the foreign policy, neighboring countries, the Middle East, the Islamic world, developing countries and ultimately regarding the east have consecutively had priority (116). The stance of the ninth and tenth government of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad against Israel has been definitely stated. (84). He has termed this country as illegitimate and illegal and has always focused on the rights of the people of Palestine. (84).

The Islamic Republic's negotiations with three European countries England, France, Germany which began with the period of the presidency of Mohammad Khatami on the issue of Iranian nuclear activities and later on through the attempts of 5+1 countries continued, at first years of the presidency of Ahmadinejad, the favorite results did not achieved. This issue resulted in an reverse over the foreign policy of Iran over the reviewing of the ties with the western countries and creating a more close relations with the east including superpowers China and Russia. Some of the authorities declared that new policy gives an opportunity to Islamic republic of Iran, to be situated at the position of claimant over the international realm.

Such excuses and pleas caused Ahmadinejad government to focuses more on the eastern countries and Russia after the crisis in Iran's nuclear activities and challenge with the West. Along with this issue, the situation and the capacities of Iran especially in the field of energy, energy security and transportation produces opportunities for cooperation with eastern countries. However, it should be noted that Ahmadinejad's government will utilize its anti-US stances as the most crucial political card against Russia to challenge the West in its decision-making process against the Islamic Republic.

It must be noted that however, this policy has been to some extent influential in alleviating Western raids upon Iran, it has not been capable to fulfill Iran's long-term interests in the most crucial situations. The distinct typical of this claim is Russia's equivocal stance on Iran's nuclear activities. Mr. Ahmadinejad which also has been supported by supreme leader of the Islamic revolution, has been quite aware of this point that Russia's interests regarding the United States and Europe, cannot be replaced with those of Iran at all. Thus, Ahmadinejad government made use of Moscow over the sanctions imposed in 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2010 at the United Nations, in such a way that could lower the effects of sanctions. The other approaches of Ahmadinejad over the policy of viewing the east, lies in boosting the regional cooperation, which is rooteded from a type of new inclination to the region after the cold war (125,p. 211-3). The foreign policy of Iran and Russia have been mostly based over these bedrocks upon which the most crucial cases, are the communication of both countries for the developing the new legal regime of Caspian sea, preventing from the influence of the western powers especially US into the region, cooperation of Iran a with Russia to put into effect the policies of Moscow across the central Asia and Caucasus region, grasp the cooperation trend of Iran in forming the highway of north-south which is well-known as north-track that provides the access of the Russia to Persian Gulf and also to the subcontinent of India, supporting Iran to access to the technology of peaceful nuclear energy, the making use of Iran as a medium for relations with the west.

Without any doubt, Russia's nuclear cooperation with Iran, as well as lots of economic interests, has given Russia an crucial position within the international arena.

Moreover, the other political relationship Iran and Russia blossomed by Travelling of Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki to Moscow. He entered Russia along with a group of senior political, economic officials, on 22 September 2006 with the aim of negotiating with Russian authorities. Manouchehr Mottaki in a direct TV live interview with IRIB in Moscow airport declared that: chairs of mutual economic commission of Iran and Russia agreed to arrange sessions to evaluate the progress of decisions and seeking the new solutions in the capitals of the two countries. He emphasized that: the amounts of commercial and economic transactions of Tehran – Moscow have not in harmony with the current capacities, and also two sides have proper capacities for the development of cooperation in all areas. Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran said: With respect to the visit that Mr. Putin, Russian president, planned to perform, some parts of talks of President of the Russian Republic concentrated on the bilateral debates and due to the roundtable which the presidents of both countries will have new opportunities for certain cooperation will be produced.

The session which Mahmoud Ahmadinejad took part in the three stages during the Shanghai Summit, and then the Russian President's visit for the first time after almost four decades, was the most striking event within the relations between both countries. At the ministerial level, Russian officials had frequently visited Iran, nonetheless, the Russian president or prime minister had never made a visit on Iran. Analysts have always pointed out that the visit wasn't of high significance, and some assumed that it was less feasible for Putin to travel to Tehran owing to Russia's relations with the United States. But on 24 October, 2007, the Russian president came to Tehran to attend the summit of Caspian Sea countries and met with the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Revolution and the President of Iran. Vladimir Putin as the most high ranking authority of Kremlin is the first senior political leader of Russia in the last year of his presidency who entered Tehran after the formal visit of Tehran by Leonid Brezhnev in 1975, and this deemed much more rare across two countries ties. During the meeting, the presidents of both countries called for extending of cooperation in the oil and gas sector, nuclear energy, refining, airplanes, banking and transportation. Both sides emphasized on the coordinating of their transactional policies in the oil and gas sector and Russia's involvement in the operation of the supply of South Pars. Besides, both sides had agreed on the fully complement of Bushehr Power Plant in compatibility with the determined timetable based on the framework of NPT. Development of the North-South
Corridor, consular cooperation, tackling the problems of the Caspian Sea, the establishment of military forces Kasfourt cooperation in Central Asia and the Caucasus and the development of helpful cooperation within the framework of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. Another agreement was the other agreements within Putin travel to Tehran. Putin and Ahmadinejad articulated their reluctance to the use of force and threat to tackle the problems and called for the respect for the independence and territorial integrity of the countries.

Iran and Russia condemned terrorism in all its forms, and asserted that they have been in contrast to regard it as a notion equivalent to a particular nation, culture or religion. Both countries called for the consolidation of the role of the United Nations in the battle against terrorism and the other threats and challenges. And at last, they promised that they will have close co-operation in implementing the UN's anti-terrorist strategy. Moscow and Tehran have been backed an agreement between the different Lebanese movements without outside interference and calling for the keeping of the unity, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Iraq and the ending of the presence of foreign troops as per the relevant timetable.

Both Presidents hold that they immediately tackle the trouble with regard to the Iranian nuclear program through political procedures and diplomacy and based on the framework of the negotiations, and hope that a long-term and exhaustive solution sought. Ahmadinejad deemed Russia and Iran natural allies, and stated that: "the Islamic Republic of Iran does not apply any requirement for the development of relations with Russia and seeks a non-temporary, rigid and maximal relationships with that country. Putin, in response to Iranian reporters, declared that: I have a unique tendency in the Middle East... Our history has very deep roots in the history of Iran, and we have vast cultural cooperation and we have a high degree of knowledge upon each other (97, p. 174). Truly speaking, Russia, along with China, had the feasibility of vetoing Iran's sanctions on the Security Council, in December 2006 and April 2007, respectively, in resolutions 1737 and 1747 Security Council theirs votes have been positive. In short, Moscow's relations can be outlined within Putin's 8-year presidency in this way, Tehran used Moscow power as a counterweight to neutralize the burden of sanctions, which in recent years, had been imposed on Iran due to Tehran's nuclear activities, and in contrast, Moscow made use of Thran as a stronghold against the impact of the West in its under influence traditional area, namely the Caucasian and Central Asia, and, indeed, benefit from Tehran in diverse international equations. One of the most significant features of Putin's pragmatic approach to foreign policy, which was regarded as his privilege, was his logical and realistic view upon the economic and military capacity of Russia and its political situation across the international realm. But the fact is that the non-stop change in Iran's foreign policy and the continuous changes in the country's foreign policy has caused Russia, especially after Khatami's government, to inferred that Iran has no definite program over its foreign policy. The Russians believed that Iran have to decide which role it would prefer to play in the world mainstream, and based on this point, Russia is able to decide on how to handle its relations with the Islamic Republic.

Russians believe that when a country has not yet been aware of its role in this world, the other countries cannot form a relation at large scale with that country. Russian analysts believe that the Russian policy of viewing the East have been basically at odds with Iran. Since, in Russian foreign policy East-West balance has been prevailed to fulfill Russia's national interests, but the government of Ahmadinejad has no tendency with the west owing to the major conflicts with the West. Valentin Sarbulov, a Russian government representative who had traveled from the Kremlin to Tehran on the 5th of May, two days before Putin left, brought the message of Putin to Mr. Ahmadinejad, demonstrating that Moscow's policies in support of Tehran would not alter. It was nothing other than which has been hard foretold in advance. As Dmitry Medodov, who has been the current president of Russia is quite obedient to Putin and holding the power by him, does not mean making a meaningful change over domestic and foreign policies.

The role of the Caspian, Caucasus, Central Asian and Middle Eastern regions within between Iran and Russia relations:

The Caspian Sea, which had been in the interests of Iran and Russia over the past 250 years, after the fall of the Soviet Union became the so-called territories of 5 countries of Iran, Russia, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan. Young Soviet successors articulate their rights in the realm of the Caspian sources; the new political situation, enhanced the state of Caspian sea in comparison the past. To clarify the situation at first, one has to take into account historical-legal backdrop. Issue of the Caspian Sea's legal regime first appeared during the battle of Peter, the Great on Iran 1722 - 1723. And its roots must be explored in the Treaty of St. Petersburg (1723), the Treaty of Rasht (1729), the Gulistan Treaty (1813), and the Turkmenchay treaty.

Overall, these treaties inherently regarded the Caspian Sea under Russian governing system. In other words, at those times, the Caspian Sea had not been taken into account as the sea or international lake, rather, it regarded as inside sea (bounded by so called lands). The Soviet Union gave up its exclusive rights over the Caspian Sea, and in the treaties which had been formed between Iran and the Soviet Union in 1921, 1935 and 1940, the equal rights of two countries Iran and the Soviet Union for maritime activities in this The sea was filed. Moreover, 1940 contract was also a commercial and maritime pact that provided Iran and the Soviet Union with a distance of 16 Km from the seashore in the fishing specifically-determined area. The remaining parts must be equally shared by both countries.

In the other words, the Caspian Sea region during the Cold War era 1947-1989, belonged to the total security areas of the Soviet Union. And even the Soviet Union did not heed the Soviet Union's 1920s and 1941 reciprocal contract, its interference and superintendence extended to the borders of the Iranian sea, which include Astara-
Husseinqi straight route. The Soviet armies traversed between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea, without the control and intervention of any country. The exploitation of the Caspian Sea oil was under Soviet administration and has been controlled by them.

In spite of the long borders of Iran and the Soviet Union across this sea, the maritime business activities between the two countries decreased, and extensively in the form of commodity exchanges in the port of Anzali, those activities done, and few passengers crossed it. Despite the religious and cultural similitude between the Iranian people and the republics of the borders of Caspian sea and Dagestan, no momentous communication between the people inhibiting over the borders of the sea had ever been took place.

However, since 1981, two years after the Islamic Revolution, the Islamic Republic of Iran abolished Articles 5 and 6 of 1921 Iran and the Soviet Union Treaty unilaterally, and even by the end of the Iran-Iraq War, and even the fall of the Soviet Union, a challenging argument between the two countries on the interests of the legal regime of the Caspian Sea had not been emerged, and after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the legal regime of this sea faced a new phase. After the fall of the Soviet Union, the Caspian had been invariably more significant for Russia. Indeed, Russia has been attempted to keep and promote its economic and military presence over the region, hope that guarantee its state across global markets and neutralize the capacities of its political and economic rivals through escalating the level of supervision over the mainstream of extracting oil and gas reservoirs from the sea and on the ways of energy transferring. These long-term profits must be taken into account as per the following points:

1. Military and Political Security: Russia regards militarism of the other Caspian states and political military intervention of the overseas powers as a threat.
2. Ecological security: Russia needs ecological security its seashore zone, since, ecological safety plays an vital role in reproducing Russian resources.
3. Energy transferring Lines: These lines have been designed to transfer energy from the Caspian to Europe, Central Asia and China, and have been much more significant for Moscow (63, pp. 325-7). I currently , 1921 and 1940 treaties which have been formed between Iran and the Soviet Union, regulates the legal status of the Caspian Sea, and they have authenticity and exercised except a new contract set and created on the regime of this sea after this time. As per 1921 contract, the 8th paragraph of the Turkmenchay pact was annulled and Iran and the Soviet Union agreed on equal rights in the Caspian Sea.

in 1992, the idea of founding and establishing an organization for cooperation and coordination among littoral governments of the Caspian Sea by Iranian President Hashemi Rafsanjani was suggested and approved by other countries. The idea when the number of Caspian littoral states from the previous two countries was turned into five new countries: Russia, Iran, Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan, generated. As each of these countries tend to much more exploit the Caspian sea, they design divergent policies. (120). This divergent policy caused the Islamic Republic of Iran in 1992, to excavate 20 Oil well in the Caspian Sea, although there is no information on the advantage of excavating these wells. Other countries of the Caspian Sea have already retained their oil resources in their territory for the next two decades in advance and through creation of multifold international consortia, have pave the way for the participating of oil firms within the Caspian sea. Meanwhile, the Russian Federation, in terms of global and international obligations has been regarded as a heir to the Soviet Union. This country has advantages in the Caspian region due to two factors: 1 - as a coastal country 2 - as a regional superpower.

In the 1990s The Russian Empire in the Caspian Sea attempted to hold its geopolitical impact and state in the region. Even if there are economic drawbacks for this aim, Russia's goals in the region encompasses: ensuring stability and tranquility in the region, enhancing ties with the Caspian Sea neighbors, following a strategy of backing active Russian firms within the Caspian zone, transporting oil and gas to the overseas markets, establishing a corridor and North-south international transport, specifying the legal regime of the Caspian Sea, producing an international legal framework for environmental difficulties, exploitation of the resources and the protection and management of biological reservoirs. ( 71 , p.240-1) Russia, over past 20 years, has always attempted to safeguard the interests of Russian energy firms. This Russian measure caused a trouble for Iran if Iran fails to take its portion under the sea, and in spite of the advantages of being equally common usage of the sea for all sides, it may back the entire division of the sea.( 51)

The function of Russia over this issue caused the countries which had more close borders with Iran to be fairly active on interfering over oil reservoirs regions near the coastlines of Iran and eventually compelled Iran to adopt the military threat approach to some degree to demonstrate its strong willpower on the defense of its national interests in 1998.

And through flying of its military airplanes over the boats intended to explore the oil and gas in a controversial area, warn that the Islamic Republic of Iran will not hesitate to defend its national interests. Consequently, this action was accomplished by the peaceful measures of Iran and in practice, banned any exploration and extraction activities of neighboring countries in a region which reportedly encompasses 20 percent of Iran's claim under the southern Caspian Sea. Unfortunately, the opposing interests of each Caspian sea seashore countries within the division of the resources of this sea has been the major reason upon the lack of mutual understanding among them in the region. The contradictory approaches of Russia have been one of the recurrent impediments to worsen the legal state of the Caspian Sea. Russia, primarily, in order to prevent the leading oil companies of US and European countries to invest, emphasized on the ambiguity and vagueness of the so called equal shared parts of the sea along with its former division. Although after active participating of American and European Hayes firm, reversed its stance in this regard.
due to taking the other privileges in return. For the first time in 1998, Yeltsin and Noor sultan Nazarbayov, Russian and Kazakh presidents, agreed upon the division of the Caspian Sea basin on the northern part between two countries. In January 2001, Putin and Ilham Aliyov President of Azerbaijan signed an contract specifying the sea boundaries of the two countries. Ultimately, the three countries of Russia, Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan in 2003, signed a tripartite agreement with respect to division of the central and northern parts of the Caspian sea as well as exploiting the oil reservoirs located on the seabed. (64, p. 52).

Turkmens in spite of the relative cooperation with Iran, due to traditional following the policies of Russia, left Iran alone. As per this tripartite contract, 19 percent of the portion of the sea allocated to Russia, 29 percent to Kazakhstan, and 18 percent to Azerbaijan and then the remaining parts belong to Iran and Turkmenistan.

n deed, after these agreements, Iran expressed its disagreement to this contract, and once again affirmed that 1921 and 194 contracts will be authentic if all five seashore states failed to be unanimous over the legal state of this sea. However, it must be noted that the countries of the borders of this sea, particularly, on the northern border, achieved significant agreements on how to make use of common reservoirs and refuse to heed Iran's protests. Furthermore, Russia, Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan divided the northern sections of Caspian sea among themselves through signing bilateral or tripartite contracts. And they may not essentially feel that they must validate the convention owing to the legal basis in that area (113, p. 67). Another point was that in May 2000 the Security Council of the Russian Federation announced that the Sea Caspian regarded as traditional region of Russia's national interests, besides, the president sanctioned an specific representative post to regulate the Caspian sea affairs (69, p. 111-109). Victor Kalouzhnny, has been permanently in charge of this post from the outset to September 2004, and was incessantly made visits across the capitals of the Caspian region to coordinate various viewpoints on the issues such as legal status, pipeline construction, security and other subject matters of the Caspian Sea. In September 2004, Igor Yusuf appointed for this post. On 25 July 2000, the oil companies of Russia, Lukoil, and Gazprom UKAS, generate the Caspian Oil Company so as to develop the new oil wells in the region. Consequently, Russia simply overlooked the interests of Iran due to a very desired and guaranteed relationship with the West. This fundamental dilemma has resulted in diminishing of the power of Iran across the region.

Conclusion. Through an analysis on the relations between Iran and Russia after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, two critical results achieved. 1. If we aim to analyze the strategic aim of the Islamic Republic during 30 past years in terms of maintaining the sovereignty and security of the Islamic system, we conclude that lots of unutilized opportunities have caused much more advantages for the Islamic Republic. Thus, it keeps the Islamic military entity and the other dimension of the system as more secure and safe despite all inside and outside raids and hostilities. From this perspective, safeguarding the national interests and the rights of Iranian society have not been regarded as prime aim and even not feasible. Consequently, Iranian society has been dramatically experienced very high costs in this regard. Based on these viewpoints, Iran-Russia ties became justifiable as well. Note withstanding, this point should not be overlooked, along with the outset of Islamic Revolution of 1979 to the current time, fight the opposition has been one of the most crucial challenges that the Iranian authorities deal with. 2. Another point of view concerned with the analysis of Iran-Russia relations in terms of protecting the national interests and the rights of the Iranian society. In this vision, the interests of the Iranian people have been regarded as more significant than the interests of the Islamic nation. However, it seems that the interests of the Iranian people been more in harmony with the foreign policy during the presidency of Khatami, based on a thorough analysis it is quite clear that foreign policy adopted by Hashemi Rafsanjani, Khatami and Ahmadinejad states along with their shortcomings and capacities roughly had been in accordance with a balance over the interests of the nation of Islam and the global human rights of the people and the national interests of Iran. Hence, Relations between Iran and Russia in terms of Iran's national interests has imposed costs for the country. In other words, the idealistic, realistic, being prone to resolve any tension and counter-productive policies of each of states of the last 30 years of the Islamic Republic have, to a somewhat, been able to provoke more striking performance within the international and regional arena. The geopolitical, geopolitical and geo-strategic stance of Iran in the region of Middle East and Central Asia, alongside enriched energy resources (oil and gas), may given rise to a tremendous progress in diverse sections of the Iranian society just by adopting a pragmatic policy in accordance with national interests.

Nonetheless, Political, social and economic aspects of Iranian society as well as challenges facing the government, reveal that the Islamic republic of Iran fail to make the best use of the available opportunities to some extent. Thus, it is apparent that in order to generate a conditions that can form the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran in terms of pragmatism in a particular sense, so as to safeguard the national interests and the interests of the impoverished, it is more essential to provide the participation of diverse groups of society within the political and governmental realm. Undoubtedly, the awareness of the whole society upon the process of the planning with respect to mid-term and long-term policy -making can promote the national authority so as to develop the strategic depth of the system across the region and the world.