

**T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES**



**US POLICY TOWARD IRAN THE IMPACTS OF UNITED STATES
SANCTIONS ON IRAN'S BEHAVIORS IN THE REGION IN DONALD
TRUMP'S TERM**

Master's Thesis

Mahmoud Shaaban Bayoumi ALY

**Political Science And International Relations Master Program
Political Science And International Relations Department**

June, 2021

**T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES**



**US POLICY TOWARD IRAN THE IMPACTS OF UNITED STATES
SANCTIONS ON IRAN'S BEHAVIORS IN THE REGION IN DONALD
TRUMP'S TERM**

Master's Thesis

**Mahmoud Shaaban Bayoumi ALY
Y1812.110022**

**Political Science And International Relations Master Program
Political Science And International Relations Department**

Thesis Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hazar Vural Jane

June, 2021

ONAY FORMU

DECLARATION

I hereby declare with respect that the study “Us Policy Toward Iran-The Impacts Of United States Sanctions On Iran's Behaviors In The Region In Donald Trump's Term”, which I submitted as a Master thesis, is written without any assistance in violation of scientific ethics and traditions in all the processes from the Project phase to the conclusion of the thesis and that the works I have benefited are from those shown in the Bibliography. (.../.../2021)

Mahmoud Shaaban Bayoumi ALY

FOREWORD

I would first like to thank my thesis advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Hazar Vural Jane at Istanbul Aydin University. The door to Prof. Jane office was always open whenever I ran into a trouble spot or had a question. She consistently allowed this paper to be my own work but steered me in the right the direction whenever she thought I needed it. I would like also to thank Istanbul Aydin University and its library for providing me with an access to all the books and articles that I needed to finish this

June, 2021

MAHMOUD SHAABAN BAYOUMI ALY

TABLE OF CONTENT

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	v
TABLE OF CONTENT	vii
ABBREVIATIONS	xi
ABSTRACT	xiii
ÖZET	xv
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. PURPOSE/IMPORTANCE, THEORETICAL METHODOLOGY AND FRAMEWORK	3
2.1 Purpose/Importance, Theoretical Methodology And Framework.....	3
2.2 Purpose/Importance.....	3
2.3 The Hypotheses And The Main Arguments.....	4
2.4 Research Questions:	4
2.5 Field, Data Sources, Location-Time, And Support.....	4
2.6 Method And Technique.....	6
2.7 Theoretical Methodology and Framework.....	6
2.8 Realism:.....	7
2.9 The Term Of Realism:	8
2.10 Stages of development of realism:	10
2.11 The origins and pillars of -realism- theory:.....	11
2.12 European intellectual origins of realism theory:	12
2.13 The American origins of political realism:	14
2.14 Realism and contemporary trend:	16
2.15 Intellectual trends in contemporary realism:	19
2.16 Structure of the Thesis.....	22
3. IRANIAN-US RELATIONS FROM 1950 TILL THE END OF MUHAMAD KHATAMI'S TERM	23
3.1 Introduction	23
3.2 Mohammad Mossadeq And the Political Transformations In Iran	26
3.2.1 The History Of The Oil Industry- Links Between All Of Iran, Soviets, Britain, And USA Between 1950 Till 1953.....	26
3.3 Iran's Oil And USA, Britain Role.....	28
3.4 The Crisis Between Iran And Britain.....	29
3.5 Mohammad Mossadegh Government	32
3.6 The Shah And Mossadegh Authorities.....	34
3.7 Preparing For The Coup.....	36
3.8 New relations between USA and Iran from 1953 till 1979 - Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi's Policy With USA	38
3.9 The Relations Between The Shah And General Zahedi.....	39
3.10 Support For The Shah	40
3.11 The Complete Break Between US And Iran	42
3.12 New Regime Of Khomeini.....	43

3.13 The US Embassy Accident In Tehran	44
3.14 Ali Hashemi Rafsanjani's Regime:.....	46
3.15 The President Mohammed Khatami's Regime:	48
3.16 An overview about the form of the Iranian-US relations from 1950 till 2005:	49
3.17 The Beginning Of The Relations And Their Strength- Their Shape And Features.....	50
3.18 The Complete Estrangement Period-Its Features And Effects.....	50
3.19 The Period Of Negotiations.....	51
3.20 The Period Of Attempts At Rapprochement And Failure	51
4. US-IRANIAN RELATION- THE PERIOD OF MAHMOUD AHMADINEJAD'S TERM FROM 2005 TILL 2013.....	53
4.1 The President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's Political Backgrounds	54
4.2 The Determinants Of The Foreign Policy In The Term Of President Ahmadinejad.....	56
4.3 The Stages Of US-Iranian Relations During The Term Of President Ahmadinejad.....	58
4.4 The First Stage:"De Facto Politics"	59
4.5 The Second Stage: The Stage Of Calling For Dialogue.....	62
4.6 US Reactions	63
4.7 A New Transformation In The US-Iranian Relations- At The End Of The Term Of George W. Bush	65
4.8 Iran In Ahmadinejad's Term As A Basic Player In The Region	66
4.9 The Third Stage In The US-Iranian Relations - In The Term Of The President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad	67
4.10 Iran's Relations With Barak Obama's Administration: The First Term Of Barak Obama's Rule	69
4.11 Features Of Obama's Policies Towards Iran In The Early Days Of His Rule	70
4.12 The Nuclear Program As A Backbone Of The Iranian-US Relations In Obama's term	71
4.13 Diplomacy Of The International Parties.....	72
4.14 Using The Sanctions Method Against Iran	73
4.15 Third Stage In The US-Iranian Relations In Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's Term- The Period Between 2011 Till 2013 From Barak Obama Term:	73
4.16 Important Features In The Relations Between Iran And The United States Of America During The Term Of President Ahmadinejad	74
4.17 External Pressure Of The US Administration On The Iranian Political Regime	75
5. BARACK OBAMA AND THE NUCLEAR AGREEMENT DURING HASSAN ROUHANI TERM.....	77
5.1 Iran-US Relations In The Period Of Donald Trump's Term	78
5.2 Features Of Donald Trump's Foreign Policy During The US Elections In 2016:	80
5.3 Features Of Trump's Political Speech	82
5.4 Factors Of US Foreign Policy Toward Iran In The Period Of Donald Trump.	83
5.5 The Factors Of Iran's Foreign Policy In The Middle East.....	84
5.6 The Environment Of The Islamic Republic's Influence In The Middle East...	85
5.7 The Starting Points Of The US-Iranian Conflict In The Middle East.....	86
5.8 Islamic republic Of Iran And Donald Trump's Foreign Policy	87
5.9 Donald Trump's Administration Sanctions Against Iran	92

5.10 US Sanctions Against Iran In 2018- Maximum Pressure Policy Against Iran	96
5.11 Assessment Of US Sanctions On Iran In 2018	98
5.12 US Sanctions On Iran In 2019.....	99
5.13 The US Sanctions Against Iran In 2020.....	102
5.14 Donald Trump's Policy Effects Against Iran, And The Role Of The European Partners.....	103
6. IRAN'S BEHAVIOR BETWEEN THE US SANCTIONS, AND ITS POLITICAL PROJECT IN THE MIDDLE EAST	107
6.1 increasing Tensions In The Middle East Due To Donald Trump's Policies And Iran's exploitation of US pressure to pass its expansion project	112
6.2 Ensuring The Survival Of European Countries In The Nuclear Agreement:.	112
6.3 Searching For Foreign Investment:	112
6.4 Continuing To Strengthen Its Military Arsenal:	112
6.5 Targeting America's Allies And Washington's Interests:	113
6.6 Proxy Wars In The Region:.....	114
6.7 Iran's Partners In 2015 Nuclear Agreement And Their Failure To Offer Acceptable Solutions To Help Tehran To Face Donald Trump Sanctions	116
6.8 Normalization Agreements In The Middle East:	118
7. CONCLUSION.....	121
REFERENCES	123
RESUME.....	131

ABBREVIATIONS

AJAX	: (officially TP-AJAX) an covert operation by the United States CIA, to overthrow the elected government of Iran and Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadegh.
AIOC	: Anglo-Iranian Oil Company
CIA	: Central Intelligence Agency
EU	: European Union
ISLAMIC REPUBLIC	: Republic Of Iran
TV	: Television
US	: United States
USA	:United States Of America
UN	:Union Nations
World War II	: Second World War

**US POLICY TOWARD IRAN THE IMPACTS OF UNITED STATES
SANCTIONS ON IRAN'S BEHAVIORS IN THE REGION IN DONALD
TRUMP'S TERM**

ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to clarify the indications of the arrival of US President Donald Trump to power in the United States and the impact of his policies on the Middle East region, at the heart of which is Iran, especially the Islamic Republic is one of the important and fundamental issues for the United States of America in the region due to the depth of historical differences between the two countries.

The study also sought to uncover the manifestations and items of the maximum pressure policy adopted by US President Donald Trump against Iran in the Middle East, starting with the US sanctions that included the nuclear program, the economic program, human rights, and weapons programs and ending with targeting Iran's military symbols such as Qassim Soleimani.

On the other hand, the study sought to uncover Iran's reactions to the US sanctions adopted by Donald Trump. Within this framework it will be focussed how to US's attempts to reduce the influence of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the Middle East, especially in Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, and other countries in the region.

Keywords: Iran, *USA Sanctions, Middle East Policy, Maximum Pressure*

ABD'NİN İRAN'A YÖNELİK POLİTİKASI- DONALD TRUMP DÖNEMİNDE ABD YAPTIRIMLARININ İRAN'IN BÖLGEDEKİ DAVRANIŞLARI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİLERİ

ÖZET

Bu tez, ABD Başkanı Donald Trump'ın ABD'de iktidara gelişinin belirtilerini, ve ayrıca ABD Başkanı Donald Trump'ın politikalarının İran'ın merkezde olduğu Ortadoğu bölgesine etkilerini netleştirmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Özellikle İslam Cumhuriyeti, iki ülke arasındaki tarihi farklılıkların derinliği nedeniyle bölgede Amerika Birleşik Devletleri için önemli ve temel konulardan biridir.

Çalışma ayrıca ABD Başkanı Donald Trump'ın İran'a karşı uyguladığı azami baskı politikasının Ortadoğu'daki tezahürlerini de ortaya çıkarmaya çalışmıştır.

Nükleer program, ekonomi, insan hakları ve silah programlarını içeren ABD yaptırımlarıyla başlayarak, İran'ın Kasım Süleymani gibi askeri sembollerini hedef almasıyla devam etmiştir.

Öte yandan çalışmada, Donald Trump'ın uygulamaya koyduğu ABD yaptırımlarına İran'ın tepkilerini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamıştır. Bu çerçevede ABD'nin, İran İslam Cumhuriyeti'nin Ortadoğu'da, özellikle Suriye, Irak, Lübnan ve diğer bölge ülkelerindeki etkisini azaltma girişimleri üzerinde durulacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *İran, ABD Yaptırımları, Ortadoğu Politikası, Maksimum Baskı.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Iranian-US relations include many complex details that are worthy of examination and research to derive results for present and future generations, The Iranian-US relations since 1979 after the Islamic Revolution are in state of escalation of positions, based on divergent actions in many issues raised regionally and internationally. Starting from the Iranian Revolution to the present, Iranian-US relations became more complicated due to the political volitions of the two countries. Iran still plays essential role in the political scene in what belong to the American foreign policy toward the Middle East.

So, it is important to point out an important point in the nature of the relationship between Iran and the United States of America, which is that the policies of the United States of America against Iran since the Islamic Revolution in 1979 have depended on the philosophy of conflict management, as the direct and continuous clash between the two parties throughout these long years, but US policy changed during the era of former US President Barack Obama, as Obama relied in his policies on the philosophy of settlement and not Philosophy of conflict and clash with Tehran. Former US President Barack Obama was able, through the settlement philosophy he adopted in his policies with the Islamic Republic, to achieve great successes, including the signing of the nuclear agreement with Iran in 2015, the agreement that angered the Republican Party in America, and pushed Trump after coming to power in the White House, to the severe attack on Obama and pulling out of the nuclear deal again in 2018.

The beginning of the real clash between the administration of Donald Trump and Iran was the nuclear agreement, especially since the US President believed that Obama's participation in the nuclear agreement was a rescue for the Iranian regime, which was trying to get rid of its major economic problems that it was suffering from, so Trump's policies and statements were all since his candidacy in the 2016 presidential elections is in the direction of absolute clash and

hostility with the Iranian Republic, which has caused a lack of confidence between the two parties and an increase in tension in the Middle East.

Therefore, one of Trump's most important policies against Iran was to manage the crisis of Tehran's nuclear project in a different way from the policies of former President Barack Obama, as he promised in his presidential campaign to withdraw from the agreement and reject Obama's policies that included allowing the transfer of huge amounts of frozen funds to the Islamic Republic, as well as threats Trump said a lot about Iran's influence in the Middle East. Trump's policies against Iran have been crystallized through re-managing the crisis with Iran directly and away from international mediators, a policy adopted by Trump to send messages to Iran that Washington will be mainly and directly present in managing the conflict over Iranian influence in the Middle East and will not leave the region again for the Iranian influence, as happened in the era of Barack Obama.

Finally, Iran became source for creating policy in the region and in the American foreign policy trends, so studying the Iranian role is an important field to those seek to realize the complexities of policy in Middle East.

2. PURPOSE/IMPORTANCE, THEORETICAL METHODOLOGY AND FRAMEWORK

2.1 Purpose/Importance, Theoretical Methodology And Framework

2.2 Purpose/Importance

The thesis will discuss the changes of US policy toward Iran, between Obama's term and Trump's one, and its effects on the Islamic republic in the region.

The thesis tries to emphasize Trump's policy, the trends of the White House policies toward Iran in the period of 2012- 2016 and the circumstances which lead to this policy, and the backbone of Trump's policy towards Iran and its results.

The thesis will examine the economic sanctions of US toward Iran in the period of 2016 till 2020 and reasons of trump's policies toward Iran which differ from Obama's policies, also the U.S. sanctions toward Iran and its effects on the economic field in Iran, Also the effects of Trump's policy on the Iranian Missile Program.

The thesis will monitor the Iranian reactions towards the U.S. sanctions and observe its policies in the region lead by the new American policies in the middle east, also monitor the proxy wars which were controlled by Iran in the regions as a result and reaction for the U S sanctions.

The thesis will try to see what the basic reason of the US sanctions towards Iran was, if it was for changing the Iranian regime completely, or only for forcing it to start new period of negotiations again.

The thesis will be useful on two levels, the first, is the scientific level as it will be addition to the knowledge world, thoughts about the Iranian-US relations.

The second level will be useful on the practical importance as it will add answers for the questions which discussed about the Iranian-US relations in the period of Donald Trump term.

2.3 The Hypotheses And The Main Arguments

This thesis argues that:

H1: US policies toward Iran created problems for the regime so the tension between Iran and USA increased automatically, and lack of trust between the two countries lead to overall enmity between them.

H2: The Iranian behavior in the region, increased the tension because of Trump's policy

H3: The US Policy encouraged and supported proxy wars by Iran in the region.

H4: Iran's partners in 2015 agreement failed to offer acceptable solutions to help Tehran to face US new policy in Donald Trump term.

2.4 Research Questions

1.How do the US policies impacted the Iranian behavior in the region in the period of Donald Trump term?

2.What are the reasons which lead Donald Trump to withdraw from the Iranian nuclear deal?

3.Is the US administration seeking to change the Iranian regime or force it to join negotiations again with US conditions?

4.What is the role of the international system in the 2015 nuclear agreement?

2.5 Field, Data Sources, Location-Time, And Support

This thesis will study the US policy toward Iran starting from Donald Trump term and its impacts on the foreign policy of Iran and its behavior in the region, through monitor and analyzing Donald Trump plans to force Iran to accept new stage of negotiations.

Data Sources :The thesis will depend on resources of some articles and studies, one by Katzman, K., J. McInnis , K., & Thomas , C. published in (2020), it is by the name of " US-Iran Conflict and Implications for U.S. Policy", The article observe the escalation of events between Iran and US Since May 2019, as (US-Iran tensions have heightened significantly, and evolved into conflict after US military forces killed Qasem Soleimani, the commander of the Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps-Quds Force (IRGC-QF) and one of Iran’s most important military commanders, in a US airstrike in Baghdad on January 2, 2020.).

Also (In 2018, Trump Administration withdrew from the 2015 multilateral nuclear agreement with Iran (Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, JCPOA), and since mid-2019 has taken several steps in its campaign of applying “maximum pressure” on Iran.).

Then (President Donald Trump has consistently stated that he wants a revised JCPOA that encompasses not only nuclear issues but also Iran’s ballistic missile program and Iran’s support for regional armed factions. But Members of Congress have received additional information from the Administration about the causes of the US-Iran tensions and Administration responses. They have responded in several ways; some Members have sought to pass legislation requiring congressional approval for any decision by the President to take military action against Iran.).

By examining this literature review, it can mention that Iran refused to face the sanctions alone, so the article shows the Iranian reaction against US and its Allies in the region.

The second article was by Masterson, J., & M. Hickey, S. published in (2020). by the name of US has a backup plan to kill the Iran nuclear deal. It could spark a crisis at the UN.

The essay said, (Indeed, President Donald Trump’s hasty decision to leave the deal appears to have ignored the potential benefits of the dispute resolution mechanism. The former US National Security Council director for Iran, Richard Nephew, has argued the United States ceded vital leverage to impose UN sanctions on Iran through the dispute resolution process and effectively

compromised its own aims. If “maximum pressure” was the goal, then a snapback of UN sanctions would have made this strategy global.)

So, when examining this literature review, will discover that the US withdrew from the Iranian nuclear deal creates new trend in the relations between Tehran and Washington.

2.6 Method And Technique

The Thesis will use some accurate methods to achieve the goals and the results which aimed to.

According to the topic, the thesis will be conduct as following:

The thesis will use:

The Qualitative Research: with using this method the thesis will monitor and analyze the policy of United States toward Iran in the period of Donald Trump term, but in the same time in the second chapter the thesis will emphasize Donald Trump's policies toward Iran.

So, the resources which the thesis will use in the thesis are:

Primary Sources: decisions and sanctions orders will be used in this thesis, The Iranian nuclear deal in 2015, the decision of U.S. withdrew from the Iranian nuclear 2018 – deal, the decision of the Assassination of Qassim Soleimani. data about US Policies, statements of Iran, statements of USA, books, reports, essays TV interviews.

Secondary Sources: Bibliographies, Biographical works, Commentaries, criticisms, Journal articles, Magazine and newspaper articles, Websites, textbooks, and reference books.

2.7 Theoretical Methodology and Framework

The features of the field of international relations began to appear after the end of the First World War, to understand the causes and motives of the war and to search for mechanisms that prevent the recurrence of such wars again, But with the passage of time and the recurrence of World Wars and the occurrence of the Second World War, after the Cold War and then the collapse of the Soviet

Union, (Booth,2011), this prompted the emergence of theories in the field of international relations, where each of these theories represents an extension of a specific historical, philosophical and intellectual legacy.

So, the concept of theory in international relations is considered as a part of the social sciences, so there are many types of theories and each theory is divided into sub-types, where these theories play a large role in explaining historical events, analyzing reality, and anticipating the future. The main Western international relations theories such as realism and liberalism have been based on the principle of human reason in the perception of human characteristics and tendencies. (Booth,2011), Therefore, the master's thesis relies here in its theoretical framework on the interpretation of realist theory as a theoretical framework for studies of Iranian American relations and the interpretation of the impact of US sanctions on the Islamic Republic and then conflict developments between them in the Middle East.

2.8 Realism

For many years, realism was one of the important and considered methods of analyzing state decisions and behaviors towards other countries. Realists regard states as rational actors who are part of an anarchic system and as actors seeking to maximize their interests. Therefore, the thesis will be based on an analysis of Iran's reaction to US sanctions on it and its impact on the behavior of the Iranian republic in the Middle East. (Booth,2011), In addition, the master's thesis will focus on whether Iran has transformed its policies in the Middle East from a reaction to an active role in drawing up policies in the Region.

In addition, the realism theory is one of the theories that specializes in analyzing international policies or the foreign policies of countries, as political realism or realism in international politics is considered a reaction to the current of idealism, on the other hand, the genesis of the realist school in international relations is relatively recent, (Booth,2011) as it dates to the period following the Second World War. At this stage, the interest in studying international relations shifted from its legal framework to its realistic framework with its interlocking dimensions and the contradictory interests it reflects and what it considers from the balance of powers.

Where the theory of realism relied on special concepts to understand the complexities of international politics and explain the external behavior of states, perhaps the most prominent of which are (state, power, interest, rationality, international chaos, reducing the role of international organizations, self-reliance, the priority with security and survival), and these concepts have become keys that have been adopted by all Realistic approaches. (Korab-Karpowicz,2010), While the realism current in international relations went through several developments and witnessed many reviews, several trends crystallized about it, starting with what was known as traditional realism, which was later modified at the end of the seventh decade of the twentieth century because of the changes in the structure of the international environment, and new proposals were added to it within the framework of what was known as structural realism. (Korab-Karpowicz,2010), In the eighties of the twentieth century, realism witnessed another development within the framework of what was known as the new structural realism, which in turn revealed two trends (defensive realism and offensive realism). This period also witnessed another trend that was described as neoclassical realism in the international Relations.

2.9 The Term Of Realism

Realism is a term used in at least two areas; it refers to the observation theory of international relations that must find explanations for things like the end of the Cold War. As for the second area, realism refers to a specific foreign policy, security doctrine, or strategy, and is often linked to containment strategies or military preparedness for war. In the first case, (Korab-Karpowicz,2010), it is an external view of analyzing the world, and it often focuses on explaining the behavior of the actors. In the second case, it corresponds to the development of a general plan of action for the actors.

Realist theory was a reason of the birth of several theories that have shed from traditional realism, so the study of realism in its traditional form was no longer only associated with Hans Morgenthau, and it appeared alongside traditional and new realism, defensive and offensive realism, as well as neoclassical realism, or the so-called contemporary realist thought, which is an extrapolation of traditional and new realism. (Korab-Karpowicz,2010), Stephen Van Evra has

said that realism is not a single theory but rather a set of theories like the paradigm. Likewise, almost all the scholars who have expressed their opinion on the subject during the past quarter of a century agreed that there is a set of basic assumptions that clearly reveal the importance of the theory of realism. These common basic assumptions are the nature of the actors in the international system, The nature of the state's preferences and The precedence of material capabilities.

The nature of the actors: The first assumption of realism relates to the nature of the main social actors, whereby realism assumes the existence of a group of conflict groups as a political actor seeking rationally to achieve distinct goals in a clear range of chaos. (Antunes, Camisão, 2018). In addition, realists also assume that these sovereign conflict groups are rational and choose the most effective means. Available to achieve their ends. Hence, the pragmatic, state-centered approach to the study of international relations is almost puritanical. This is demonstrated in the writings of Kenneth Waltz, Robert Gilpin, Stephen Brooks, and Hans Morgenthau.

State preferences: Another realistic assumption is that state preferences are constant and that opposing state preferences are determined on states of the social world. In short, they remain unaffected by changes in the strategic environment. In contrast, prominent realists such as Carr, Morgenthau, and Waltz have argued that state preferences are fixed as most assume that states seek at least to preserve them and as a maximum, to drive global domination. (Antunes, Camisão, 2018). In short, realists view the world as one degree of constant competition for control of scarce goods. For most realists, the fundamental problem is managing conflict in a world where the interests of the state are fundamentally conflicting.

The priority of power: This axis of realism theory suggests that the results of bargaining between countries reflect the relative cost of threats and inducements, which are directly proportional to the distribution of material resources. It stresses the ability of states to coerce or bribe their counterparts to redistribute resources, and that the means of states in dealing with their counterparts is a policy by threatening punishment or forcing them to make collateral payments. (Antunes, Camisão, 2018). This is what made Morgenthau,

Walls, and Gilpin state that the central premise of realism is the independence of politicians, it also means that material resources are a fundamental fact in exerting external influence on state behavior regardless of what states seek, believe in, or adopt.

2.10 Stages of development of realism

For the great thinker Goldstein, realism developed mainly in response to the liberal term that realists called "idealism". Where idealism emphasizes the principles of international law, ethics, and international organizations, rather than force alone as the main influences on international events. The idealists believed that human nature was good and saw the international system as one based on a community of nations that had the ability to work together to overcome common problems, (Ahrensdorf,1997), The idealists believed that human nature is good and thought that the international system as one based on a community of nations that had the ability to work together to overcome common problems.

In Greece, Thucydides wrote an account of the Peloponnesian War (431-415 BC) focusing on the relative power between the Greek city-states and much later in Renaissance Italy around the year 1500 Niccol Machiavelli advised Italian princes to focus on appropriate measures to remain in power and pay attention to war Before everything.

Many realists attribute their intellectual heritage to political philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), (Ahrensdorf,1997). He believed that humans had a desire for hegemony, a natural, animal-like instinct to gain power as an end. In contrast, in the nineteenth century, the German military strategist Karl von Clausewitz said that war is a continuation of politics by other means, while realists see these historical figures as evidence of the importance of power politics and its timeless and multicultural nature.

Realism became the dominant approach, if not the only one, in the study of international relations after World War II. Scholars such as Hans Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz, AH Carr, Henry Kissinger, etc.,(Ahrensdorf,1997).argued that international politics is governed by universal objective laws based on interest

Patriotism, this interest patriotism is defined as the armed force that is used as a tool for keeping peace, These included diplomacy, international law, war, etc., and despite the fact that since the end of World War II, realism had become the predominant approach to the academic study of international relations, its dominance began to be challenged in the 1960s.

Since the early 1960s, behaviorism has been an alternative to orthodox international relations on both the methodological and conceptual levels. This new scientific school of international relations has sought to move away from the traditionalists' use of Orthodox history and political terms such as "the state" to the use of a new policy that follows "behavior" which means international processes and interactions. Notable scholars in this field include Carl Deutsch, James Rosenau, and Morton Kaplan. Challenges to behavioral realism resulted in the 1960s as a variety of other approaches emerged in the 1970s.(Ahrensdorf,1997).One of these new techniques was "neo-realism." which aim to reaffirm the dominant role of realism in international relations. It sought to re-establish the primacy of states, political and military concerns.

2.11 The origins and pillars of -realism- theory

Clarifying the intellectual origins of the realism theory is important to be able to know the foundations that formed the bases on which the theoretical propositions of Realism theory were based later, It is not possible to talk about real theory in one way or another, except by returning to the intellectual origins of the early theorists who advocated political realism in studying the relationship between states and the logic of the statesman's political thinking. . (Ahrensdorf,1997). These propositions were in the ideas of "Thucydides, Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbs". The same applies to the American intellectual assets that dominated American political culture and which formed the American origins of realism.

2.12 European intellectual origins of realism theory

The European intellectual origins of realism theory include the Greek thinker "Thucydides", the Italian "Machiavelli" and the English thinker "Thomas Hobbs".

- The Thinker: Thucydides

The roots of realistic thought go back to the Greek thinker "Thucydides, who believed that there is no reliable system above the system of independent city-states. He adopts a pessimistic view of human nature, as he believed in the existence of fixed characteristics of human nature in all ages and with different races and doctrines envious of each other. (Brown,2009),Or they hate each other in the same way that allows for wars or peaceful competition. In any case, Thucydides explained the existence of the civil state and that each city interacts with other cities, resulting in relations between these entities that are translated either peacefully through diplomacy or competitively through war.

- Nicolas Machiavelli

In the Renaissance, the theory of realism appeared clearly in the ideas of the Italian thinker Nicolas Machiavelli, who emphasized the principles of Thucydides. And these ideas start from seeing what is being and not what should be, (Brown,2009), so if the ruler wants to preserve his judgment, he must be aware of how not to be attached to virtue and to use his capabilities according to need. He also cleared that there is a sinister nature of individuals and that the ruler must adopt policies that differ from ordinary individuals to achieve the interest of a state in preventing conflict between states because people are driven primarily by their own interests and desires, and that the most pervasive and potentially dangerous desires are the lust for power.

While he saw that the ruler of the state is the true and only guarantor of internal peace; Because he alone has the power to impose that peace, and by this Machiavelli gives the prince the image or qualities that enable him to face human nature and the state of war. The prince must be realistic and think only in the field of reality, based on the victory of the strongest, which is the fundamental phenomenon evident in history. (Brown,2009), Machiavelli's realism appears in the primacy of the state over religion, which is his central

theme and has also focused heavily on the concept of the state. For him, preserving the survival of the state and the rule of the prince is the supreme goal of any policy. The main issue that focused on Machiavelli's studies as well is the role of the state and how to preserve it through the presence of the authority of a strong prince who has special virtues, and a regular army trained without mercenaries.

- Thomas Hobbes

If Thucydides focused on the ethics of realpolitik, while Machiavelli was concerned with the practical side of it, Hobbes showed the philosophical face of political realism, where realism takes a form built in a special way in the works of Hobbs in the seventeenth century, which gives preference to conflicts in international relations, and focuses on The chaos that is characteristic of the international community. (brown,2009),The reality that Hobbes contemplated was a raging civil war that affected his political thinking, which made him search for a way to prevent the recurrence of these unfortunate events that impose the creation of a strong political authority that imposes itself on people through laws that oblige all citizens to respect the rights of others and live with them in peace, This reality influenced Hobbes's thinking to a large degree, as he saw that man always tends to struggle with his fellow human beings in search of benefit or in defense of brotherhood or greed for glory, and this natural state in his mind is linked to the absence of organized authority, since without this organized authority becomes People are in a situation similar to a state of war.

We conclude from the ideas of "Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Thomas Hobbs" that the intellectual propositions presented by these people in their philosophy are rooted in contemporary realist concepts, (brown,2009),by emphasizing the evil nature of man and the state of the chaotic nature of the system, and that everyone searches for a state of power over the other on the basis of from achieving the national interest, and that everyone is in a state of constant struggle in search of power and hegemony, and some realistic concepts such as the concept of "threat" have crystallized.

Also, the proposals of the state confirm that it is the main actor in relations between states. Also, about the separation between ethics and politics, and all

these propositions and concepts, we find that they are basic concepts in contemporary intellectual propositions of realist theory, and its basic pillars in explaining the logic of relations between states, and therefore these thinkers are among the first who contributed to laying the foundations or the first building blocks of political realism. (brown,2009), These foundations were later completed by what was provided by American philosophy and the prevailing cultural environment at the time in supplementing those foundations provided by the early theorists, to be further entrenched in American culture later. The most prominent intellectual origins of American realism were American religion, evolutionary philosophy, and pragmatic philosophy.

2.13 The American origins of political realism

After the development of- realism-theory in European history, this theory also launched in the United States as a new vision, and then as a competing theory, reaching its hegemony over international relations, and it had many origins, including:

- Religious origins:

The religious ideas and beliefs brought by the founding fathers of the United States of America had an important influence in laying the foundations for building a political, socio-religious system compatible with their secular belief that descended from the Protestant religion, (Falode ,2009). as it created from the beginning a religious atmosphere that still exists until now, The alliance of politicians, financiers and clerics in America clarify the intellectual background governing the supreme national interest of the United States of America, which has cast a shadow over its foreign policies and its role in international relations.

And in harmony with the Protestant ethics, the productive power of the public is the basis that reveals the existence of God in the land, and therefore the American message is in the end the message of its national interest, and by achieving this interest the American mission is fulfilled, by values, by force, by trade. That is why religion and politics have formed an interwoven fabric throughout the history of the United States. (Falode ,2009).All of this had a great impact on the emergence of realism in politics, focusing on achieving

direct interest, and glorifying victories regardless of how they were achieved. Among the most prominent of those who called for adopting the theory of realism in politics based on religious foundations was the American priest Reinhold DeBore, whose title was the father of realists, and the title of the founder of the American political realism school and the theory of power in international politics.

- Social basis "theory of evolution"

The theory of evolution and survival of the fittest, is one of the most important and most dangerous theories that formed the intellectual basis of American philosophy, especially pragmatic realist philosophy, which appeared at the hands of Hegel and Lamarck and then reached its climax at the hands of Charles Darwin, and took its social applications at the hands of Herbert Spencer and others, Spencer's philosophy is concerned with two main papers: the first is individualism and the other is evolutionary and its applications to human society. These ideas have influenced even the ideas of many clerics until they have become the epistemological model behind most secular philosophies, and among those philosophies whose influence was evident in them is realistic philosophy or American real theory.

- Pragmatic Origins

Pragmatism is a philosophical direction of thought that focuses on utility as a supreme value, and holds that utility is the normative value of truth, goodness, and justice. This philosophical trend emerged because of the transformations that the American society underwent during its transformation from a traditional agricultural society to a contemporary industrial society, to be after that on the throne of American culture and the American mind, forming what has been termed official thought. (Falode ,2009). Pragmatism is based in the first place on the systematic rejection of all previous judgments, and all ready-made theoretical and complete systems - and pragmatism is an American philosophy par excellence, and with it all the major movements that have been called (The Age of American Philosophy) are related to realism, progressive, naturalism and idealism, which developed over the period. Spanning from the War of Secession to World War II and beyond.

Therefore, the realistic approach is rooted in American political thought through three foundations:

The first: the religious basis that the founding fathers deliberately applied in the new land, with their religious ideas.

The second: the social Darwinian basis, which had a direct and indirect influence on contemporary American political thought, as it worked to establish concepts of conflict and power in American political culture.

The third basis: It is the pragmatic basis on which contemporary American political thought is built. Thus, the realist theory acquired its practical tendency and its maximization of material interest from pragmatic philosophy, (Falode ,2009).and that all these foundations are gathered that formed the foundations and concepts of contemporary American realism in the political, religious, economic and all aspects of life.

2.14 Realism and contemporary trend

It appeared alongside the traditional and new realism theory, defensive and offensive realism, as well as the neoclassical realism theory, or the so-called contemporary realist thought, which represented an extrapolation of traditional and new realism.

- Traditional realism and neo-realism

Hans Morgenthau is the first person responsible for introducing the traditional realism theory into the study of international relations, through his famous work "Politics Among Nations" 1948, which revolutionized the academic study of international politics.

- First, the traditional realism

Realism theory appeared in the beginning through its traditional form with the contributions of Hans Morgenthau (1904-1980 AD), and other early realist thinkers who tried to adapt to the events of the twentieth century that were accompanied by many manifestations of turmoil and insecurity and the exacerbation of the borders of conflicts and wars, (Falode ,2009). While this perspective dominated the field of international relations and American political

thought during the Cold War phase, it also appeared after the World War after the failure of the ideal school, Analyzing the world as it is and not as it should be, and international relations should study what it is and not what it should be.

This theory also appeared to clarify the various failures that befell the idealism, such as the establishment of the League of Nations and the various attempts to achieve peace, and it is about past readings by Machiavelli, who proposes a modern reading of international relations, even if he only cares about the image of the prince, (Falode ,2009).as he rejects the saying Idealism is the existence of a symmetry of interests between different nations. Considers that states have conflicts of interests to the point that leads them to war, and that the state's capabilities play an important role in determining the outcome of the international conflict and the state's ability to influence the behavior of others. Because states, like humans, have an innate desire to control others, which leads to clashes and wars.

Chaos is also the main feature of the structure in which states interact with each other according to the traditional realism theory. Therefore, decision-makers are called upon to consider the higher interest of the state before anything else. (Falode ,2009). For this also, it is said that classical realism carries a pessimistic view, and this view prevails to a large extent. This is because states see their own gains and compare them with those of others, mutual suspicion, fear of fraud and deviation, and concern for the private interests of states considering chaos.

- the role of the nation-state

The traditionalist realism arises from the assumption that states, as homogeneous and independent units, are the main actor in international relations. Although realists acknowledge the occurrence of important developments and the emergence of new actors, they adhere to the fact that nation states are the main influencing actor in international politics. The nation-state means they have a unit that is independent on the one hand and homogeneous, on the other hand. That is, it cannot be accessed by external influences, and it is not subjected to internal pressures. (Avgustin,2017), Therefore, international political and non-political relations are determined by

reference to national borders. Therefore, their analysis assumes of separation between domestic and foreign policy, and hence governments, decision-makers, or The government official, at the highest diplomatic and military levels, are the main actors and not any other internal groups or any other international non-state actor.

The basic principles of classical realism defined by Morgenthau in his famous writing "Politics Among Nations" can be identified in basic principles, namely:

1. Political relations are governed by objective laws rooted in the depths of human nature and the construction of public policy must be based on an understanding of these objective rules.

2. The idea of the national interest is the main evidence of political realism, whereby a political leader thinks and acts in accordance with the national interest defined in the framework of the authority.

3. Interest is like authority, as it is a legitimate goal in general, although its meaning varies with time and circumstances. The national interest is survival, but countries - to ensure their survival - pursue other goals.

4. Some moral aspirations cannot be reconciled with the moral laws that govern the universe.

- Second: New Realism

After the current realism failed slightly in the sixties, realism returned, starting in the late seventies under the influence of the new Cold War, without a doubt to occupy the fore position in thinking about international relations, under the slogan of the new realist current, and this was especially with the emergence of the works of "Kenneth Waltz" And John Girard, Robert Gillian. Also, New Realist theorists have also diverged a little from Morgenthau's theories to join Raymond Aaron, in their insistence on the chaotic nature of the international order, and in their more cautious resort to other concepts, such as national interest and power. (Avgustin,2017), Neo-realism criticized its traditional predecessor because of its behavioral methodology, which centered on the state's behavior in international politics, and failed to understand the real reality as a system of structure or its distinct entity and overestimated its interpretation of interest and the concept of power and overlooked the behavior of

international institutions and frameworks for their dependency relations in their economic aspects.

Among the most prominent representatives of neo-realism can be mentioned "Robert Glenn, Kenneth Waltz, Stephen Crazes, Robert Tucker, and George Modelsky." (Avgustin,2017), Where the goal of the pioneers of this school was to try to take realism out of the classic and intuitive analytical concept to a level of analysis, more scientific to bring it to a scientific theory, which is a systemic vision of international policies.

The most important principles of new realism can be summarized in the following five points:

1. Political systems take two basic forms, chaotic or chaotic, and the international system always takes the last form.
2. In an anarchic system, all states have similar functions. They are distinct in terms of capabilities, not functions.
3. All states are characterized by the characteristic of selfishness and seek at least to ensure their survival.
4. In any self-help system, survival requires responding to relative strength and the actions of others.
5. The state of chaos in the international system always pushes towards creating a system of balance of power.

2.15 Intellectual trends in contemporary realism

Realism has known since its emergence an evolutionary path that has led to the emergence of many trends within the realist perspective. The actual beginning of the emergence of realism was with the contributions of Morgenthau, where he described realism as traditionalism, then traditional realism was later modified because of transformations in the structure of the international environment, and new theoretical pieces were added to it that it developed in the form of new realism with "Kenneth Waltz". (Avgustin,2017), One of the important contributions within the realist perspective was the emergence of two

"offensive-defensive" approaches represented in the defensive realism theory and offensive realism.

- Defensive realism

Defensive Realism, as described by Robert Jervis, George Quester, Stephen Walt, Stephen, Van Avira, and Jack Snyder, is an important addition to realism. They argue that the likelihood of war was higher when states could overcome each other, but the easier the defense, the greater the security, the fewer incentives for expansion, and the higher the potential for cooperation.

Defensive realism predicts that causing chaos in the international environment makes security at the forefront of states' preoccupations and the focus of their attention, (Avgustin,2017), and that these results of the "security dilemma" arise from a country increasing its level of security, given that security is a zero-sum game, which leads to confusion. Stability, which pushes the opposing countries to respond, which they consider a reduction in the level of security.

- Offensive Realism

Offensive realism emerged as a response to defensive realism, as it criticized it for its primary premise that the framework of international chaos is only looking for its own security. As it sees the opposite, that chaos is constantly imposing on states to maximize and increase power, so they believe that the potential for war between states increases, the more some have the ability to easily invade another country, (Avgustin,2017), and then the state of absolute chaos continues, but what distinguishes this conflict from Waltz's realism is the lack of recognition that the interpretation of the foreign policies and international outputs of various countries is based on the idea of chaos, and this is what offensive realism rejects as one factor.

Offensive realism is also called "aggressive realism" - as states seek to achieve the maximum level of security due to the establishment of an authority that has the task of imposing security and order, and when attacking states are considered rational actors who do not engage in conflicts except when they feel threatened, but they soon adopt this Politics and that is imposed by the requirements of the international structure to be more powerful than other countries. Offensive realists see the increased possibilities of war between states

the more some can easily invade another country. (Avgustin,2017), But when defensive capabilities are more explanatory than offensive capabilities, security prevails and the incentives for expansionism disappear, and when defensive tendency prevails, states will be able to distinguish between defensive weapons and offensive weapons. At that time, states can possess the means to defend themselves without threatening others, thereby reducing the effects of the chaotic nature of the international arena.

- Neoclassical Realism

Neoclassical realism first appeared in 1998 in the writings of Gideon Rose called "Realism and New Foreign Policy Theories," which presented a new approach to explaining foreign policy behavior. Randall, Fareed Zakaria, Thomas Christens, and William are the same. Falode, A. J. (Falode ,2009). One of the pioneers of the emerging neoclassical school in foreign policy theories that integrate the international system and the internal political structure to explain countries' foreign policy behavior. As it specifies that states should pay attention to interest and identity and prefer it as a variable that interferes between the international system and the behavior of foreign policy, and it also brings the state back to relying on the proposals of classical realism, and it aims to modernize the traditional and new approach by integrating the local and individual level with systemic factors for foreign policy analysis.

Neoclassical realists argue that the foreign policies of states are what drives the capabilities of relative power in the international system, however it is an indirect and complex process and how it is translated into foreign policies or security strategies may depend on various interference factors within the state itself. Neoclassical realism is an important and new attempt to reduce the severity of the separation between the internal and external environments, after the complete negation between them by previous realists with their different theories, Falode, A. J. (Falode ,2009). So that neoclassical realism presented positions described as moderate, thus constituting a positive initiative to reconsider the levels of analysis adopted in the interpretation of external behavior. And give importance to the internal determinants as well as the systemic determinants. (Avgustin,2017), These positions with respect to neoclassical realism constituted a profound shift in the realist school regarding

the boundaries between what is internal and what is external, to open the way for the necessity of reconsidering the impact of internal determinants in directing foreign policy and removing that rigid separation between them.

2.16 Structure of the Thesis

Prior to the analysis of the impacts of the American sanction on the Iranian behavior in the region, the following chapter will focus on Iranian-US Relations From 1950 Till the End of Muhammad Khatami's Term, as this chapter will follow the historical background of the Iranian-US relations and the essential changes in the middle east depending on the role of Iran in the region.

The third chapter deals with the period of US-Iranian relations - during the term of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad from 2005 to 2013 and sheds light on the policies of Iranian President Ahmadinejad in his dealings with the US administration as well as negotiations on the Iranian nuclear project in addition to the role of the European Union in supporting an acceptable agreement regarding The Iranian nuclear project.

As for the fourth chapter, it deals with the period of Barack Obama's rule and the nuclear agreement under Hassan Rouhani and highlights the measures that accompanied the signing of the nuclear agreement with the participation of Washington and the situation in the Middle East during this period as well as US-Iranian relations during the period of Donald Trump and the impact of US sanctions on Iran's behavior in the East Middle.

The fifth chapter deals with monitoring the impact of US sanctions and the results of US pressure on Iran and its impact on the proxy wars in the Middle East

3. IRANIAN-US RELATIONS FROM 1950 TILL THE END OF MUHAMAD KHATAMI'S TERM

3.1 Introduction

Iran and the US had made their efforts in the previous years to affect the policy in the Middle East and in the decision-making circles in wherever their interests overlap and collide. This principle of foreign policy of the two countries which based on the complete pragmatism had been the cause of major clashes between them over the past years. So, The Complete Fluctuations, were, the backbone of the relations between Iran and US since 1950 till right now. Their relations ranged between strong links and connections, and full enmity, (Amirahmadi, 1992).

In The period of the 40th of the last century, the US tutelage and control , were clear over the Iranian relations and even the decision-making in the country, so one of the reasons which lead for the Islamic revolution in Iran was the rejection of the complete American hegemony over the policy and administration in Iran, so Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi , allowed US to support his regime, against the Iranian citizens who considered him as the "US Shah", so there were clear steps in this aspect, Washington did not stand idly with its pro-American man in Iran but worked hard to aid him, (Ramazani, 1975), like the steps of the American Administration to establish military bases in the north of Iran to spy on the Soviets in this time. (Marr,1993), also through sending American military advisers to monitor and preserving US interests in Iran and controlling The Iranian parliament (Keddie,1990).

US role in the Iranian scene was complicated, it wanted to draw new policy with new characters, new allies and new political interference that allows for it to be in the future the only one which control Iran the great country in the region especially with the emergence of oil and Iran geographical value in the middle east, so the American role did not stop at this limit, but it and the British

government helped Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi to strength his rule, (Keddie,1990). through arranging coup against Mohammad Mossadeq, the Iranian prime minister in this period, who was democratically elected and secular leader, in 1953. (Marr,1993).

The emergence of the oil in the middle east was the key word in the radical transformation in the Iranian-US relations. Washington took new radical action Toward the government of Mohammad Mossadeq after strong decisions made by this government during this period. The American Administration supported the coup against Mohammad Mossadeq and brought Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi back to the rule in Iran, (Ramazani, 1975). especially after Mohammad Mossadeq decisions of nationalizing the Iranian oil sector and the refuse of Washington for this step.

The relations continued strongly between US and Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi after the coup in 1953, through supporting him through a cooperation nuclear agreement between the two countries in 1957, (Ramazani, 1975). Then the united states provided Iran with nuclear reactor for peaceful use in 1967. In the security field, the United States also helped Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi to establish the Iranian ministry of intelligence and national security "SAVAK", which helped to control the security in Iran from 1957 till 1979 the time of Islamic revolution after many years of injustice and absence of freedom. (Sick ,1986)

Under the dictatorial regimes, the security tool was the solution to confront all voices that oppose policies and decisions. Especially with the rise of many voices rejecting economic policies and the Iranian American rapprochement during this period. So This Iranian ministry of intelligence and national security was the tool by which Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi could suppress and arrest thousands of people who refuse his rule, also could keep eyes on the opponents in and out of Iran. (Ramazani, 1975).

Despite the tight security grip by the Iranian authorities against the citizens, especially the political opponents. However, there were clear signs of rejections for the new trend of relations between Iran and USA. This shape of relations between Iran and United States of America in this time create a state of rejection inside the Iranian society to the American role. this rejection led to

new period of relations between Iran and USA, especially in the period of 1978. (Rahnema ,2015).so in 1979 and because of Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi policy, Iran was on a date with substantial changes in the country through the Islamic revolution. (Sick ,1986)

There were rapid developments in the Iranian scene, as the Iranian revolution broke out. Millions of citizens participated in the demonstrations, rejecting the continuation of the current political regime in running the country. So Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi, the strongly pro-American man in Iran forced to leave Iran after the Islamic revolution in January 1979, in the same time USA refuse supporting him because of the demonstrations which refused his policies, then two weeks later the Islamic leader Ruhollah Khomeini returned to the country from France. (McMurdo, 2012)

A new history was written by the Iranian citizens and the Iranian revolution, alike. In the entire region a new regime came to light after great popular Islamic revolution in the country that became a major regime in the entire middle east region. So, In February 1979 Ruhollah Khomeini was appointed the head of state, to start with these details a new period of the enmity between the two countries. (Gasiorowski,2004), Iran adopted after the Islamic revolution a new philosophy against USA its content is the "Death to America", announcing full enmity with Washington especially after USA agreement to Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi's treatment. (Gasiorowski,2004)

The new Iranian regime, that came after the Islamic revolution wanted to make a complete break with the United States policies in the region. Especially it had a historical legacy of brutal US interventions inside Iran and in controlling its foreign policies as well. This led the Iranians to attack the American embassy in Tehran on 4 November 1979 and detained 52 employees of the embassy. these events in Iran, which refuse completely the American role in the political scene, forced USA to cut its ties with Iran in April 1980, then Iran had released the 52 employees in the American embassy in the beginning of the president Ronald Reagan term in 1981 (Bakhash,1985).

Iran had not changed its intellectual and political convictions towards the United States of America, rather it insisted on its stance of categorically rejecting any American role in the middle east region, and it sought to promote

that Washington seek to control the region completely, this Iran's anti-American policy in the Middle East lead US president George HW Bush to announce that in 2002 that Iran is labeled in the “axis of evil”, this step caused the Islamic Republic to be anger. Even in the term of Muhammad Khatami from 1997 till 2005, some, were counting on his policy to make change in Iran's policy toward USA, after his call for dialogue with Washington, but nothing new happened. (Üzmez, 2010).

The region faced a new shape of struggle between the two countries depending on the historical legacy between Iran and USA. the two countries' relations created a new shape of struggle, which changed the region completely, so the tensions had escalated in the relations between Iran and USA, from 1979. (Üzmez, 2010). Even after the end of Khomeini's term and new period started by the rule of the leader Ali Khamenei, Iran applied the same policy against USA, in all fields start from the nuclear program, Iraq, Syria, and in all fields where any struggle between the two countries. (Afrasiabi, 1994).

3.2 Mohammad Mossadeq And the Political Transformations In Iran

3.2.1 The History Of The Oil Industry- Links Between All Of Iran, Soviets, Britain, And USA Between 1950 Till 1953

With the geopolitical transformations in the region in the 40th of the last century, the expansion of the role of the Soviets in the middle east and in Iran, in addition to the emergence of a clear role for USA in the region. All these reasons prompted the Americans to issue a political document that defines the features of the region in a different way. This document was called by the "Truman Doctrine" which was in March 1947, clearly showed the responsibility of USA toward Iran, Turkey, and Greece. This doctrine includes the ways by which USA will help Iran and the other two countries to get their independence and as Washington will be the guarantor for these steps (Hale, 1997).

There were other fundamental reasons that led America to issue this document. The political situation in the region was prepared for this in light to the grinding differences between Iran and the Soviets at this time. So various clashes between Iran and Soviets in the period of 1945 and 1946 forced USA to change

its policy toward the Middle East, especially toward Iran, so it resort to the Truman Doctrine to put an end to the Soviets politics in the regions. (Theodosius, 2001). It is important to refer to essential issue in this point. The US moving toward Iran, was a beginning to the great existence of US in the Middle East after that, although, Soviets were whom got the high percentage of existence in the region during these times. (Theodosius, 2001).

During this period, the United States sought to have a strong presence in the Middle East region especially as it was period in which the region was preparing to get rid if the colonialism that lasted for decades, so then new states, borders and international alternatives were formed in this time. In other wording, Iran was the great gate for the US existence in the middle east, actually there were other essential factors, but Iran (the greatest enemy for the American administration) was the bait, which attracted US to the region with no exit, (Amirahmadi, 1992).

There were many internal factors in Iran facilitated the ability of the United States of America to control Tehran and to have strong presence in the region. So, what supported US existing in the region was the Iranian regime in this time, who tried to get all strength factors to make the citizens under control. So, its lonely way was through the US support. USA steps with Iran started from the point of the crisis by Soviets and Britain when they occupied Iran in 1941, they tried to prevent any Iranian-German pacts in this time, because of the oil (Kyle,2010).

According to the terms of the treaty in 1946 they refuse to leave Iran, in this moment Britain supported Iran to complain at the security council in the year of 1946 to force the Soviets to withdraw from the country and stop supporting the Separatist movements in the provinces of Kurdistan and Azerbaijan, (Kyle,2010). In the same time USA played essential role to support Iran against the Soviets in this period, as it believed that it is danger to let Iran alone face to face with the soviets who were in this time a Great power expanded in the region. (the National Archives Online Portal,1947). Washington supported Iran through the Truman Doctrine to force Soviets for leaving. These steps created new situation to USA in the region, being the other side who will face the

Soviets and its interests in the Middle East, (the National Archives Online Portal, 1947).

This conflict continued between Iran and the Soviets directly, and with the United States indirectly. As Washington seek to replace the Soviets role in the region with full force in the coming years. so, it pushed hard for a major clash between Tehran and the Soviets at that time. But this struggle ended with the Soviets withdrawal in 1947, because of that, there was an agreement between USA and Iran in 1950 which was linked with the mutual defense between the two countries, plus that agreement, the Shah of Iran had desires for close connections and relations with USA. all these situations create the great alliance between USA and Iran (Hale,1997).

New birth was done for the relations between Iran and US which affect in all the Middle East affairs for several decades. From this point, a new era was created between Iran and US, depended on the full and complete partnership, in politics, security, economy, even in the strategic plans. New world order shaped, one of its sides is US and its new allies in the middle east. Iran according to the new agreements with US, became as a cop who protect the US interests and as a tool used by the American administration against the gulf countries. (Bill, 1988).

3.3 Iran's Oil And USA, Britain Role

Oil was able to move the Middle East region, from the post-colonial world to the world of production and export for the most important industry known in the modern history, which was the oil industry, as it moved the region out of poverty to get billions of dollars in oil revenues. The oil was responsible for a social and economic revolution in the region, after the World War II, the oil became the most important industry in the Middle East as it provided the countries with the hard currency, also helped in advancing the countries. (Abdelrehim,2010). Iran's location and oil resources helped the country to be one of the most powerful participants in the world economy. (Abdelrehim,2010), It was clear that Iran's oil industry accounted high percentage of the industry in the region and in the middle east. Especially after it became on of the basic suppliers for the west especially Britain, also for USA,

after oil exploration in 1908 and after the exploration in 1909 by the AIOC(Abdelrehim,2010).

The oil industry took off in the region, and great international efforts were made to explore oil and its derivatives in the middle east and there were many international parties searched for oil. So, The AIOC established in the year of 1909 aimed to make benefits from the oil in the Middle East especially the oil in the Arab gulf. So, The AIOC had a great refinery which was a reason for expanding the oil production in the region and in other places. In these times, Iran, depending on the AIOC and in partnership with Britain became the backbone for the oil exporting for many countries. (Engdahl ,2011).

Therefore, the AIOC sought to provide the appropriate infrastructure for the search of oil in Iran and to prepare all available components for that to overcome the difficulties and remove all obstacles it faced. So, Over the years especially in 1950 and the year of 1951 the AIOC drilled 400 wells for the production, also constructed more than thousands of miles of roads and hospitals and other services for the laborers, (Farndon,2006). After the British-Iranian partnership in the oil industry, the British government gained direct control over the Iranian oil through a 60-year agreement in 1933. so After the oil production became one of the important industries allover world, Iran did its bests to develop the oil sector with the internship of the AIOC, so these steps helped Tehran to be the 4th oil producer allover world, (Abrahamian, 2008).

3.4 The Crisis Between Iran And Britain

Among the paradoxes included in the agreement signed in 1933 between Britain and Iran. it was one of the provisions that revealed the price of a ton of crude oil, the agreement between the two parties included that Britain had to pay Iran 4 pounds for each ton of crude oil, which was very unfair for the Iranian side. So Although Iran became in the front of the countries which produce and expert oil allover world, its oil revenue was not suitable, as Britain believed that there no right for the Iranians in the oil which AIOC explored it, (Abrahamian, 2008). Britain developed the oil industry in Iran to gain the great mount of its revenue and leave little mount to Tehran, (Abdelrehim,2010). This unfair clause in the agreement between the two parties was one of the motives that pushed the

Iranian side to search for solutions to save its newly discovered wealth from theft by the British side. So, this clause caused worry for Iran, logically the situation of Tehran was right, the oil is belonging to Iran and it is necessary that the great amount of revenue must be for Iran not for Britain. Or at least must be there a fair agreement between the two countries, (Touraj, 2012).

In a rapid transformation, and after a full partnership between Britain and Iran, based on the oil industry. This industry was also the main reason for Britain's position to turn into the opposite. So, one of the reasons which lead Britain for supporting completely political change in Iran, through supporting coup in Iran, was the oil industry in Iran and the future role of Britain in this issue. With the insistence of Iran to be the only controller in the oil industry inside its territory , Britain and US moved for new changing in Iran which was after that by organizing coup against elected government in 1953, (Chehabi,1990). Britain did not leave any options for the Iranian side, especially because it well aware that he oil industry will completely change the world, therefore , the borders of each party must be clarified from beginning, which is what Britain sought at this time through the agreement with Iran, especially after the new world order which created after the world war II, there were a new industrial era created, Iran became one of its creators , in the Middle East , so there were a desire at Britain to be the controller in this scene completely, (Abdelrehim,2010).

Here, the first steps began the first steps began by the Iranian authorities, which wanted to re-discuss the terms of the unfair agreement between them, which was signed years ago. There were negotiations between Britain and Iran about the controversial topics, like the percentage of revenue, training the Iranians laborers, (Abdelrehim,2010). Also, Iran's government demanded 50% of the AIOC total profits, but the company refused this suggestion, and Britain refused to pay any more revenue to Tehran. But early in 1951 the USA advised the British company to give the Iranians 50% of the profits (Engdahl, 2011). Iran wished to put an end for the AIOC inside Iran and start exploring the oil by its national companies and no chances for the foreigners in their country (Parra, 2009).

And just as oil was the first tool in the great economic transformation that affected the middle east region, it was also the main tool just as oil was the first

tool in the political transformation inside and outside Iran as well , until it became the only bet that all internal and external political sides use in their accelerating conflicts. So, the real political transformation in the Iranian scene depended on the oil movements and its industry. the regime in Iran especially after the democratic elections which held in 1950 sought to prove his constitutional legitimacy through ask Britain to leave (Parra,2009).

Therefore, the Iranian authority at that time played on the affection of the citizens, also used terms as the national liberation, getting out of the colonial dependency, which were credible slogans at that time, through which the authority was able to gain a lot of internal support. So, Tehran announced that the agreement of the year 1933 between Tehran and Britain including the exploring of oil is cancelled. Also announced that the era of granting concessions for the foreigners is ended, (Ebrahimi, 2016). Then, decided to allow its national companies to start investing in the field of exploring oil and to be the alternative of the foreigner companies, (Parra,2009).

In this period Iran looked for the independence and to start new era without any foreign authority so decide to finish the business of the AIOC inside the country, in the same time Britain and the AIOC believed that Tehran will not be able to face the new steps alone. Also were worried that the Iran's government will fail to start new production in the field of oil without British help, (Abdelrehim, 2010).

In these moments, the AIOC refused completely the Iranian demands, and told the Iranians that there would not be any change. The response of Britain and the AIOC lead the Iranian government to start a series of negotiation with the British government and the AIOC, these negotiations aimed to achieve the most limit of advantages for Iran. or to be the beginning for the end of British authority on the Iranian oil (Gasirowski, 2004). Iran affected by the calls of liberations in the 50th of the last century, and the liberation movements, which moved to put an end for the occupation regimes in the region, but Tehran was not ready for the new culture of liberation, especially, Britain was controlling all the oil industry in Iran, (McMurdo, 2012).

But with the situation of Iran, after discussing the issue in the Iranian parliament, the members of the parliament voted for nationalizing the oil

company. So, in 1951 on the month of January, nationalizing oil industry was proposed in the parliament, after hard discussion, they approved in March 1953 nationalizing of the Iranian oil industry. (McMurdo, 2012). In this moment, Britain refused completely the Iranian parliament decision, so it made some decisions against the Iranian government, like economic boycott, Britain prevented Iran from selling its oil, so the Iranian economy faced great crisis, (Üzmez, 2010).

3.5 Mohammad Mossadegh Government

The Iranians are still affected by the history of the prime minister Mohammad Mossadegh, this person whom they considered one of the political symbols that had a great role in confronting the American influence in the region and in Iran each alike. They draw from his biography the concepts of struggle against the current American policy in the region that besieges their country in the entire region. So, Mohammad Mossadegh, was born in 1882, his family was rich, studied law in Paris. He got his PHD certificate in 1914 after that he joined the Tehran school of law to be a professor of law in 1915, (Gasiorowski, 2004).

Mohammad Mossadegh was able to gain many experiences in the administration, through his work in the government positions alongside his academic work. These experiences made him a political symbol with great experiences that helped him to hold important position in Iran, through which he made great transformation in the country. So he became a deputy of minister of finance, then the minister of finance 1921 then became minister of foreign affairs in 1923, (Gasiorowski,2004) then he was Imprisoned in 1940 till 1941 after that he was elected in the Iranian parliament, (Bayandor,2010). An essential event happened in the year 1941, Reza Shah Pahlavi was ordered to abdicate by the British government and his son Mohamad Reza Pahlavi became his alternative in rule Iran. In these moments Mohammad Mossadegh was elected as a member in the parliament on behalf of the national front party of Iran, which was an organization founded by him and 19 others, its aims were put an end for the British authority in Iran and nationalizing the oil production (Crist, 2012)

With these elements and in this period, Muhammad Mossadegh was able to gain acceptance among the Iranian citizens who believed that he could achieve radical change in the country. So, because of the popularity of Mohammad Mossadegh, the Shah appointed him as prime minister in April 1951, it was a chance for Mossadegh and his party to apply his policies and achieve his goals. So, the demonstrations spread in Tehran call for nationalizing the AIOC and put an end for the British authority in the Iranian government (Farndon ,2006).

The government which adopted a socialist approach at this time, sought to gain the support of the lower social classes in Iran, in the light of the difficult economic reality that the country was going through during this period. So, the new government improve some of the worst social laws, it introduced social reforms in the country, it helped the farmers and injured workers. But the most important decision, Mohammad Mossadegh made was nationalization AIOC, he cancelled its concessions and took its assets to be belong to the national government. He made this decision believing that the AIOC is belong to Iran not to Britain and all revenues of oil belong to Iran no other countries, (Ebrahimi, 2016).

Britain found itself in a complex position, as its influence in Iran is on its way to threat, and its economic power in the oil-rich country is facing a real existential threat, so the stick of sanctions was its solution to face the Iranian government's decision. So the Iranian steps created a great confrontation between Britain and Iran, by the decision of Mohammad Mossadegh which included preventing the British company from any investments in Iran, (Ebrahimi, 2016), Britain decided to make some punishment decisions against Iran. The British government through the AIOC stopped its busines in Iran and brought the technicians back to Britain, stopped working in the oil installations. Finally, Britain complain Iran at the security council, (Ebrahimi, 2016).

Hence, the British sanctions tick against Iran had a serve Impact on the economy and the future of the oil industry. So, British punishment against Iran was costly, Tehran did not have any abilities in these periods to face like these punishments, (Chehabi,1990), have no experiences, have no labors, have no plans to start the oil industry without others helping. but, although the strong links between US and Britain, Iran had no choice except ally with united states

to create alternative shape of relations support its situation in the new movement, (Afkhami, 2009).

Iran found itself in a difficult economic condition after the British sanctions, especially the British side sought to paralyze the Iranian economy with these sanctions in the oil industry. So, These British steps created a complicated result in the Iranian economy and the political scene in Iran. To face the British decisions, and the role of the Iranian armed forces in the political scene, (Chehabi, 1990), Mohammad Mossadegh could persuade the parliament and got the power of applying the emergency law, to control the military situation in the country , also was granted authorities to control any financial crisis caused by lack of revenue of oil and apply his political program in Iran and to could nationalizing the AIOC forever, (Abrahamian , 2008).

But, on the other hand, Muhammad Mossadegh, with the new authorities, he began a new era of struggle between him, the opponents, and the Shah. But with Muhammad Mossadegh's desire to obtain new more powers, in order to face the British policies, so a great clash happened between his and the Shad at that time, so a new dispute occurred in 1952 when Mossadegh insisted on obtaining the authority for appointment the minister of War and the chief staff, (Abrahamian, 2008).

3.6 The Shah And Mossadegh Authorities

On the external side, Muhammad Mossadegh, did not realize at that time, that his ambition for the economic independence of his country and its liberation from the dependence on Britain would bring him troubles, and he could not understand that London would impede all his moves in this direction. So, Although Mossadegh, moved politically depending on his democratic situations and authorities, but he could not predict with the results of his desires, no one left him move to build new country without any foreign authorities. (Gasirowski,2004) he could not treat the situation, in pragmatic way, but he was moving in a clash policy with sides like Britain and USA. (Bayandor, 2010) In light of the ongoing state of clash between all internal and external parties and Muhammad Mossadegh, who insisted on implementing his political

program inside Iran and his desire to stop the foreign interference in his country affairs, the results were a major crisis threatening Muhammad Mossadegh's survival in power. In these moments, the Shah refused Muhammad Mossadegh's demands, considering this demand to strength Mossadegh power in the country. the Shah situation led Mossadegh to resignation. a new era of struggle started, as Mossadegh had enemies inside and outside the country. Britain, The Shah, and the opponents became in one side against Mossadegh (Jesionowski, 2004).

But the changes that occurred after the resignation of Mossadegh, were in his favor, as he departed from office due to internal and external policies, but the man who became new prime minister caused major political crisis in the country. After Mossadegh's resignation, the Shah appointed Ahmad Qavam as prime minister of Iran, the new prime minister started negotiations with Britain about the future of AIOC in Iran, this step was a crisis, it was against the program of Mossadegh, who aimed to nationalizing the company.(Avery, 2008).

It was a great opportunity for the party to which Mossadegh belongs and other parties which reject the British hegemony over the Iranian oil, they took advantage of the new prime minister policy, who sought to negotiate with Britain to discuss the continuing of economic partnership in the oil industry , so they demonstrated against this new approach by the government, so The "National front of Iran", the party of Mossadegh and some other parties refused this step, responded by demonstrations in all the country against the new prime minister and the Shah. There were hundreds of citizens, killed by the police and army forces, military forces left the capital Tehran for the demonstrators, the Shah brought Mossadegh back as a prime minister of Iran again and dismissed Ahmad Qavam, (Rahnema, 2015).

Mossadegh returned with wide powers, and desire to implement his program without considering any internal rejection or any foreign policies that rejected it, especially he was in a strong position after his return to his tenure, after large popular demonstrations that demanded his return. So, some procedures were taken by Mossadegh after brought back as prime minster caused great refuse to him inside the country and at the Shah also. He limited the Shah personal

budget, preventing him from meeting the diplomates, also he failed to find any solutions with the British company, so people started suffering from the British boycott and its effects on the economy, (Üzmez, 2010). Because of this complicated scene, Mossadegh and his situation toward Britain, there was a trend of some people called for support the British situation toward the AIOC, as they cannot get any gains from the AIOC after nationalization. (Touraj, 2012).

Mossadegh's policies towards the British government and its policies in Iran, especially in the oil sector, did not stop, he insisted on his policies and sought to completely cut off all forms of cooperation between his country and Britain. So, According to the British situation, it lost the Iranian oil because of the nationalization, failed after several attempts to achieve good agreement to it, Mossadegh continued his sharp decisions toward London, so he cut all diplomatic relations with Britain after announcing that London became an enemy. (Avery, 2008).

For its part, Britain did not receive the Iranian decisions in silence, but it sought to confirm its situation towards Mossadegh's policies, and it would not hesitate to protect its economic interests inside Iran. So, Though Britain is in critical situation, it faced the new Iranian decisions, with rough reactions, but at the same time, London did not desire to lose its authorities inside the Islamic country, but there were no options except the clash with Iran (Abdelrehim, 2010).

3.7 Preparing For The Coup

During this period, allegations against Mossadegh's party and the Iranian government increased, claiming that they had relations with the soviets, and were adopting socialist ideas that soviets believe in, also claiming that Mossadegh would be one of the tools of the soviets in the region and Iran. These allegations that were circulated during this period were among the important political transformations that helped Britain to restore its consideration in front of itself and USA after Mossadegh's decisions of oil industry. So, these Essential transformations, helped Britain to move for the

ousted of Mossadegh and his government. There were fears at Britain and USA, of the political thought of Mossadegh and his party (Abrahamian, 2008).

Despite many differences between them, Britain and America agreed in the end on one situation towards Mossadegh's government in Iran at that period, especially they had a common enemy which was the soviets. After Dwight D. Eisenhower elected as USA president, in November 1952 there were discussions between CIA and British intelligence officials who suggested that Mossadegh must be ousted. so fears of Soviets were one of the factors which lead USA and Britain to prepare scenario for the end of Mossadegh (Avery, 2008). In the beginning of 1953 USA and Britain decided to start planning for remove Mossadegh from the rule, the two countries started campaign against Mossadegh's government announcing that its policy is harmful for Iran. After that, the minister of foreign affairs directly discussed with the CIA how to apply perfect plan against Mossadegh. (Bayandor, 2010).

The efforts of Britain and America in the first period of their plan, were to ignite the internal political situation in Iran and incite all parties against Mossadegh's government, so, The first step of the plan which was by the name of AJAX, concentrated on lead the Shah to dismiss Mossadegh from his office, but the Shah was terrified from the results of this decision. But after many attempts of USA and complicated events, the Shah decided to Mossadegh remove from his office, but the prime minister refused these orders (Avery, 2008).

It was clear for Britain and America from the beginning that the goal was forcing Mosaddegh to leave power and prepare the country to new policies which serve the American and British interests. So, CIA supported demonstrations against Mossadegh, in all cities, there were victims, buildings destroyed, the military were in the streets, then the demonstrations went to Mossadegh's home , finally Mossadegh was arrested, and the Shah returned again to Iran after he escaped to Rome because of the demonstrations against Mossadegh (Engdahl, 2011).

There was no doubt that, some foreign countries played major role in ousting Mossadegh's government from power. Rather, these countries that sought to do so from the beginning, but Mossadegh himself cannot be overlooked, who was

also a cause of this crisis, so, there were internal factors, and external ones helped in succeeding the coup against Mossadegh, the former Iranian prime minister failed to create a political harmony, this political harmony could help him to face the outside enemy, Britain, and its policy, but he made enemies inside and outside the country (Crist, 2012).

Iran was going through great difficulties during this period. Indeed, the political scene during this period was very complex, and the former Iranian prime minister should have to deal with it professionally with high precision, but this did not happen at all. The political scene in these times, internal problems, and external crisis, helped to remove Mossadegh from his office, and change completely the Iranian scene to be a part of the west camp policy (Crist, 2012). After the coup against Mossadegh in 1953 there was new government formed and led by Fadlallah Zahedi, the new government helped the Shah to recontrol the country in dictatorial way, supported by the USA and its men in Iran. (Kalinovsky,2014). This was a fundamental and historic moment for the united states of America, as all conditions were prepared for solid relations with Iran, despite, Britain was being the major controller in the economic and political situation in Iran. So, New period of close relations started between Iran and the united states of America after removing Mossadegh from his office, as after the coup successful, Mossadegh sentenced to three years in military prison, after that he still under house arrest till 1967, when he died (Gardner, 2009).

Thus, Iran transformed from having strong relations with Britain, to form solid relations with the United States of America since 1953 which is an important year in the history of the two countries, so, It is important to refer that the USA overthrow of Mossadegh considered an important event in the history of the two countries, till now Mossadegh considered in Iran the famous national leader in the history of the Islamic Republic (Avery, 2008).

3.8 New relations between USA and Iran from 1953 till 1979 - Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi's Policy With USA

Despite, the new period that Iran entered in its relations with the united states of America after the coup in 1953, and despite what was known that the coup removed many obstacles that prevent establishing large political partnership

between the two countries in the past, but there were other political parties inside Iran did not agree with this new era. So, although the full help that Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi had got from USA especially during and after the removal of Mohammad Mossadegh of his office, the Iranians especially the national parties, started new period of the hatred to USA, because its role in the coup against Mohammad Mossadegh. (Chehabi,1990).

The Shah who ruled Iran in this period, faced a real dilemma, as he had agreed to overthrow Mossadegh from power with US and Britain assistance, therefore, he would not be able to continue in power except with clear western support. And at the same time Iranians viewed him as one of the strongest reasons of bringing in US interventions in the country, therefore Iranians did not respect his policy. So, The Shah faced a great political crisis, which belong to his popularity inside the Iranian society, he lost much of his popularity and his people respect and lost much of his legal legitimacy (Chehabi,1990). He faced a political crisis as he accepted the USA protection and help. although his people refusing for the American role inside Iran, so he was known as the man of America in Iran. (Afkhami, 2009).

All his rule, the Shah was known with the dependency to USA, so he discovered his disability of ruling his country without the help of USA (Afkhami, 2009). At the same time United States made several decisions and procedures to force Iran applying the western policies in the country. these steps led USA to lost part of the Iranian appreciation for its political role in the region (Goode, 1997).

3.9 The Relations Between The Shah And General Zahedi

It is important to refer to the shape of the relation between the Shah and General Fadlallah Zahedi who came as a prime minster after Muhammad Mossadegh in 1953, he played an essential role in the coup of 1953 and was Iranian statesman who was a source of worry for the Shah (Blake,2009). His long history of experiences led him to play a basic role in the Iranian political life, as he was arrested by the British government after the removal of Reza Shah in 1941, then sent to Palestine (Goode,1997) After the coup against Muhammad Mossadegh in 1953, General Fadlallah Zahedi come back from Palestine in the year 1954, in the period of Muhammad Reza Shah, then worked as a inspector in the military

forces in south of Iran, then the head of national police in Iran in 1949 (Blake,2009).

General Fadlallah Zahedi was a source of danger for the Shah, at the same time, Zahedi was considered by the others as the "strong man" in the country, so the Shah did all his bests in order to neutralize the prime of minister, especially because USA considered the Shah weak and unable to control the country, so the Shah was terrified from any new coups might to be by the general Zahedi. (Blake,2009). It is logically to say, the Shah wanted to change the impression about him, which describe his rule by the weak and dependency to America. So, he wanted to be a popular leader like the former prime minister Muhammad Mossadegh. He removed general zahedi from his office and appointed Hossein Alaa as a new prime minister. (Gasiorowski, 1991), Also asked advice from the politicians who had links with the national front. Asking them how to make reforms in Iran (Hale, 1997).

But the Shah sought to change the Iranian people's perception of him, he tried to be closer to his citizens and present himself with a new policy in running the country. The Shah presented himself for the Iranian society in new form, as if he were a wise ruler, seeking for advancing country, support the women right, seeking for the liberty and the individual's rights. These new policies of the Shah led American administration to believe in supporting him and his government. (Gasiorowski, 1991).

3.10 Support For The Shah

There were some remnants of the Iranians 'relations with the soviets, which did not end quickly, but these remnants were bothering the united states of America. So, there were some fears, US faced in its relations with Iran, included the soviet's role in Iran after Muhammad Mossadegh removal. US believed that, Its interests would be in danger if Soviets still had authority inside Iran. (Hale,1997), but after 1953 coup , US made a great relations with Tehran, in order to end any presence of all Soviets union inside Iran, so there were strength initiatives between US and Iran in this period, like, the visit of Vice President Richard Nixon to Iran to support the Shah government in 1953. (Hale,1997).

Also there were great mounts of military and economic supplies, and new oil agreement between US and Iran was done, this agreement helped US companies to be the basic partner to the Iranian companies in the field of oil industry. (Hale,1997). In addition to these political and economic steps to support Iran, there were security agreements between CIA and Iran, these security agreements lead to new agreement it was by the name of "Baghdad Pact", which was by the support of US, Iran became in alliance with some countries which are US's allies. (Hale,1997). It is important to clear that, the Iranian step of join Baghdad Pact, showed the new policy of the Shah, Iran by this step chose to be in the side of the west and depended on its protection against inside and outside enemies, (Hale, 1997), also the new pact, showed that the new policy of Iran toward soviets, after several decades of strength relations between Tehran and Soviets.

The shah sought to implement economic reforms in the country, introduced amendments to the laws, tried to highlight his ability as a ruler ruling the country independently. away from any foreign interference, to convince the Iranian public of its political independence away from the American tutelage, but this did not success. The Shah policies especially which belong to the economic improvements, caused refuse from several sectors in the Iranian society, this refuse, lead to beginning of opponent's movement and signs of rejections of The Shah rule. (Abrahamian,2008). According to the new policies of The Shah, there was the new political birth Ayatollah Khomeini. Who became a political leader especially after being arrested in 1963 because of his speech about the corruption in the country? (Abrahamian,2008).

The country was on the verge of new transformations in light to the increasing of opponents who refuse the policy of the shah which did not achieve anything fort the Iranians at that time. So, the major mistake, the Shah committed is exiling Ayatollah Khomeini, in 1965, as Ayatollah Khomeini became the leader for the opponents who refuse The Shah rule, this refuse led to the revolution. (Wright,1989).

After a while the regime became in isolation from the citizens, as the refuse of the Shah increased with the refuse of the US role inside Iran, so the regime failed to face the opponents who depended on refusing the American

interference in the Iranian affairs as backbone in their struggle with the Shah (Wright, 1989).

3.11 The Complete Break Between US And Iran

Despite the beginning of the end of the colonial era in the middle east in the 1960th of last century, the culture of suppressing dissent still exists in the region, it was the culture that the Shah restored to in order to confront his opponents in the country. so, For the Shah economic policies in Iran beginning from 1963, he aimed through using what he called "white revolution" to implementing land, social reforms. but he failed to find political solutions for the opposition parties and movements which reject his reforms. (Chehabi,1990). So, till one year before the Islamic revolution in Iran, he had only one solution to stop any political opposition against his regime, through using security forces to arrest people and farmers who reject his failed reforms. Finally, the Shah authoritarian regime led to the revolution. (Abrahamian,2008).

With the increase of repression that the Shah practiced against the Iranian people to preserve his rule, there were other precursors to a revolution in the country. In this period, in 1979 the demonstrations increased and were in all Iranian cities, these political events lead Ayatollah Khomeini to come back to his country Iran after many years exiled abroad. (Chehabi,1990). Ayatollah Khomeini, the religious and political leader, gained the results of his rejection for the Shah and his regime. he depended on the demonstrations which refuse the Shah regime, (Chehabi,1990), he " Ayatollah Khomeini" and the demonstrators considered the Shah as a police protect the western interests in the Arab gulf, and allowing for US and Britain to control the Iranian policies towards the west and the middle east. (Gasiorowski, 1991).

Consequently, Iran prepared for a revolution based on rejecting the rule of the Shah and raised the Islamic slogans as a solution for the country problems, also sought to win the sentiments of the masses who reject the violations that occurred in the country and rejected US's interference in the Islamic country. So All these points allowed for Ayatollah Khomeini to back to Iran and put an end for the Shah regime, forced the Shah to leave the country and live in exile with

his family, to start new republic in the Islamic country, its title is the shariá "Islam rules" and the "death for USA".(Afkhami, 2009).

3.12 New Regime Of Khomeini

The new regime in Iran, ruled by Ayatollah Khomeini relied on national and religious slogans which became the title of his struggle forever with the united states. (Afkhami, 2009). the regime realized that: First: the role of CIA and Britain against Muhammad Mossadegh removal of the office , Second: The role of the USA in the political scene of Iran, Third: The Shah " who was supported by USA" policies towards the citizens and its bad effects on the economic sides, (Gasiorowski, 1991), Fourth: The oil industry in Iran and the role of Washington in this issue, Fifth: The crisis of Iran in the middle east due to following the west policies , Sixth: The great abilities of Iran as a petroleum country, but USA control this oil without any benefits for the citizens. (Gasiorowski, 1991).

At the same time, there was a successful revolution. So, all success factors were in the hands of the new leader of Iran Ayatollah Khomeini to start his path of struggle against the role of the united states of America in his country. (Panah,2007). Although there was a president to Iran in the period of 1980, who was Abolhasan Bani Sadr , then the president Mohammed Aly Ragaayy till 1981 but the real ruler of Iran was the leader Ayatollah Khomeini who started early his struggle against the united states by the year of 1979. . (Panah,2007), In this year after the Islamic revolution, the demonstrators took 52 American hostages from the US embassy in Tehran, they asked to exchange the hostages with the Shah who was escaped to unites states after the revolution, (Bashiriyeh,1984).

A new political doctrine that Iran adopted against the united states of America, Iran did not forget all the interventions of US inside the country in the years before the revolution, and thus the new Iranian leadership was keen to highlight the value of its existence as an ideological revolution by focusing on its continues struggle against the one enemy, USA. so, Here, it is important to refer to the deeply interaction between the domestic politics and the foreign affairs in Iran. The Iranian leader Ayatollah Khomeini succeeded in united the people for

the major target for Iran, which was the struggle with the only one enemy for Iran, the United States. (Wright, 1989).

3.13 The US Embassy Accident In Tehran

The Iranian leader, Khomeini was setting out in his new political orientation in the country through integrating domestic politics with his country's foreign doctrine towards the United States of America, to ensure for many years, the full support of his citizens to counter America's influence in the region. The revolution itself was a translation for this interaction the domestic politics and the foreign affairs and policy, demonstrations were organized to put an end for the authority of the USA role in Iran in the term of the Shah regime. (Wright, 1989).

An important point must be pointed out, which is that the Iranian revolution, although some had supported and sympathized with it, considering it a popular movement that was fully with implemented by the Iranian people without any external interference, aimed to get rid of a dictatorial political rule. However, during its complex rivalry with the United States of America, it had committed illegal acts. The US embassy accident in Tehran was the real beginning of the major and complete break between USA and Iran, the Islamic revolution became as a responsible of illegal actions, not just fair movement of people seek for freedom in their country. (Afrasiabi, 1994). This action led the American Administration and the president Jimmy Carter to break the official relations with Iran and imposed several kinds of sanctions against Iran, as a first step of sanctions against the Islamic revolution. (Afrasiabi, 1994).

The step of storming the US embassy in Iran was one of the steps that caused many criticisms to the Iranian side. especially it is known in the international laws that it is not permissible to offend, arrest, imprison or detain any of the members or the employees of the foreign embassies because they have immunity, but Iran did not take into accounts the legal framework also did not take into account the expected international reactions to the storming of the US embassy. Another step made the crisis more complicated, is the desire of the president Jimmy Carter to rescue the hostages, he sent military forces in a mission to save them from the embassy, but bad results happened. (Afrasiabi,

1994), On 1980 the American rescue force went to the Iranian territory, but before reaching the embassy, the plane of the American landed in some places in the desert in Iran to refuel, and finally failed to take back the hostages. This fail reflected badly on the presidency path of jimmy carter, as he failed in the first diplomatic clash with the Islamic republic and its new leaders, these details reflected badly inside the American society. (Chehabi,1990).

But political understandings were the key to resolving this deep crisis between Iran and the United States Of America, also was the beginning of the inauguration of a new phase between the two countries based on the culture of negotiations that achieve positive results for the two countries. Many factors helped to finish this crisis, some of them, the death of the Shah, Iraqi Iranian war, and Ronald Reagan presidency in 1981. The hostages back to their country. In the same time Iran obtained 8 billion dollars from the Iranian assets which were frozen by jimmy carter. (Chehabi,1990). In the period between 1984 till the period 1988, the relations between USA and Iran was complicated, in this period there were scandal called "Iran Contra", the administration of Ronald Reagan sent weapons for the Islamic republic in order to use it in its war with Iraq, but USA demanded the help of Iran to take back American citizens were kidnapped in Lebanon by some Shiite groups supported by Iran .(Ganji,2006)

The Iranian neighborhood was part of the relationship between the United States of America and the Islamic Republic. It was natural for Iran's neighbors to seek to benefit from Washington's politics against Iran, which is what happened. No doubt that, the Iranian-Iraqi war between 1980 and 1988 was a part of the case which shape the relation between Iran and united states. The Iraqi president Saddam Hussein tried to make benefits from the US policy toward Iran and the Iranian isolation. (Ganji,2006), Iraqi army invaded the Iranian territory, with encouraging and supporting from USA in this time, even the united states army was a part of this support for Iraq. The USA warships destroyed 2 floating oil owned by Iran in 1987 when Tehran attacked the oil tankers of the gulf countries, also the USA destroyed 3 Iranian frigates. (Panah,2007).

With the continuous state of clash that the Iranian revolution lived from 1979 until death of the religious leader Khomeini and then Ali Khamenei came to run the country as a supreme leader of the Iranian revolution, Tehran found itself In

a state of constant exhaustion, internally and externally. The country, which is trying to recover from the effects of the Shah's authoritarian rule in order to build a new political system and a positive economic situation that serves the citizens, found itself in conflicts with its neighbors such as Iraq and with the United States of America, which made there a desire to search for another mechanism to deal with issues of concern to Iran in Region. These events led to new change in the Iranian policy especially after the death of Ayatollah Khomeini in 1989, and became there two leaders in Iran, or what we can call "dual leadership", (Panah,2007), The leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and the president of Iran in this time Ali Hashemi Rafsanjani who led Iran to put an end to the international isolation, but slowly. (Freedman, 1990).

3.14 Ali Hashemi Rafsanjani's Regime

In the term of Ali Hashemi Rafsanjani, there were trials to stop estrangement with the west, and started more stable especially after the Kuwaiti war with Iraq, supported by the oil industry and improving links with UN and other international institutions. (Ganji , 2012). Also, what supported the new Iranian policy which aimed to stop estrangements with the west, was the election of the new US president George H. W. Bush, in 1988, 1989. January Who seek to get some benefits from Iran especially through help to obtain the freedom of remaining hostages who were captured by Hezbollah in Lebanon. (Tazmini, 2013).

These steps created new political atmosphere which referred to the ability of being a new policy of USA toward Iran depend on dialogue not estrangements, so USA in these periods offered the possibility of taking Tehran off terrorist list, improve the economic situation through cancelling some of the sanctions. But nothing happened. (Ehteshami,2015) Although, of the good intentions of George H. W. Bush, in 1988, 1989 toward Iran, but in the term of President BILL Clinton, in 1995 there were several sanctions against Tehran. . (Sohrabi ,2009).

Ali Hashemi Rafsanjani was one of the powerful figures in the Iranian politics, one of the most prominent symbols of the Iranian revolution and one of the poles of decision-making in the Iranian republic. He played major role at the

period of the war with Iraq between 1980 till 1988 , so he conducted indirect contact with USA in order to obtain weapons, he remained a difficult figure in the power equation in Iran, he is the only one among the men of the Iranian revolution who opened dialogue with USA during secret contacts in the era of US president Ronald Reagan , Rafsanjani also believed that the boycott with the West would not achieve any results for Iran , especially in light of ongoing conflict for years ,so, he also determined to dialogue with US to restore the relations between the two counties. . (Sohrabi ,2009).

After Rafsanjani was elected to the presidency of Iran, he sought to rid his country of economic dependence to be able to integrate into the international community. Especially the Iranian economy faced major problems in that time. So, after he elected to presidency, he worked to rid Iran of its economic problems by opening up to the world and relying on the principles of the free market, and allowed for the foreign investments. Rafsanjani sought through these steps , to pursue different politics and to reveal to the world that Tehran had become different from those that had committed illegal acts since the Iranian revolution , such as storming the US embassy and other actions that caused major break with his country. (Sohrabi ,2009).

One of the characteristics that Rafsanjani sought in running his country was to avoid direct entry into regional conflicts, especially after his country's bitter experiences with Iraq, but he tried to avoid repeating this experience with the Gulf war broke out in 1991. Therefore, he avoided intervening directly in the gulf conflict in 1991 in order to be able to play a mediating roles , whether in the political context or in the oil industry , as his country would be the appropriate alternative to the oil industry and its global export at this time when oil was facing a crisis in the gulf due to the ongoing was at that time.(Niakooee, 2015).

In addition, Rafsanjani took advantages of his pragmatic policy and made strong relations with Arab leaders, these relations influenced condemning Iran the Iraqi occupation to Kuwait, and Rafsanjani gave direct orders to the Iranian embassy in Kuwait to help Kuwaitis seek refuge in Iran and to secure special protection for all those from the ruling family of kuwite political figures who want to asylum in Iran. . (Sohrabi ,2009).

After Rafsanjani was re-elected in 1993 for second term, during which he began to discuss the relations with the united states of America and the consolidation of relations with the west , but because of Germany accuses , the relation with west were in a bad case , and this led to the suspension of efforts to restore the relations with the united states. Despite, there were a reliance on Rafsanjani's efforts to achieve real and substantial results in the understanding with the united states of America, there were negative efforts in return on the part of some European countries that prevented the Iranian American rapprochement, which ultimately led Rafsanjani's failure to adopt a new policy of constructive and debate with the united states of America, (Nikole, 2015).

3.15 The President Mohammed Khatami's Regime

At a time when the United States of America accused the Iranian republic with oppression, tyranny, and faced it with great criticism around the world, Iran was presenting an experiment in the presidential elections, closer to the democratic version of political practice, this political practice was an eloquent response to Washington's criticism. Therefore, the image of the Iranian- American relations was differ after 1997, when Mohammed Khatami was elected for the presidential elections, and won a majority of 70% in free elections. This large percentage in winning the elections embarrassed the United States, whose official rhetoric continued to use vocabulary accusing Iran of all evil and even dealing with it with high degree of underestimation (Ehteshami,2015)

After Mohammed Khatami was elected, Iran's relations with western countries improved during his two terms of rule, after witnessing a remarkable opening in his visit to number of European countries like Italy, France, and Germany. he also achieved satisfactory economic results internally and his country signed economic agreement with several countries. In these periods Khatami tried to take advantage of the apparent improvement in his country's relations with some western countries, and to try to improve his relations with United states of America, therefore, her adopted for the dialogue of civilizations and he support the peace between Israel and Palestine. (Tazmini, 2013). Also, The Iranian president calls of dialogue created a positive atmosphere between the two countries, so little conditions improved for the benefits of Iran. In 2000 there

were some informal talks held by members in the American congress and some Iranian leaders. (Ehteshami,2015)

But there was a fundamental dramatic changing after the event of September 11,2001, this action led Iran to be genuinely alarmed by the American statements that were spoken by the president BUSH, who promised that Iran would be one of the countries targeted by the American administration, therefore, Iran refused the attacks on the united states of America and reject the terrorism in all its forms. The strange scene in this crisis is that despite the hostile position on Iran, but in the United states' war Of Afghanistan on 2001 , Washington needed Iran's help , in the early stages of the war , so Tehran agreed to this help. But this rapprochement quickly ended after Bush designated Iran, Iraq, North Korea in 2002 to be members in the axis of evil that threatened peace all over world. (Ehteshami,2015).

Therefore, tension and poor diplomatic relations remained the master of the situation between the two countries, and the reason for this is due to the stereotypical image that was formed in each side about the other, and with the Muhammad Khatami's adoption of the reformist trend and the pursuit of American Iranian rapprochement, the US administration in Clinton era did indeed try to normalize the relations with Iran, but nothing was positive till the end of Khatami term, (Keddie,1990).

3.16 An overview about the form of the Iranian-US relations from 1950 till 2005:

Those who follow the history of the long relations between the united states and Iran from 1950 till 2005, will discover a set of profound determinants and changes that these relations had witnessed considering the radical changes that had happened in the middle east and indeed in the whole world in these years. On the other hand, the US-Iranian relations during these periods were not a single pace, but witnessed fluctuations at one time, and convergence at other time, and attempted at rapprochement at another time. (Sick ,1986), the distances remained far apart between the two countries in general in front of observers, while there were secret negotiations between the two countries over

these years. Therefore, it is possible to refer to a four essential stages in the history of the Iranian-US relations from 1950 till 2005:

3.17 The Beginning Of The Relations And Their Strength- Their Shape And Features

This period began from the Allied occupation of Iran in the world war II and continues in the 1950s, 1960s and in 1970s of the last century until Khomeini's return to his country and the victory of the Iranian revolution in 1979. In these long years, the relations between America and Iran were in a great harmony and in a state of complementarity between the two countries. For America in this period, Iran was like a strong ally that has no alternative In the middle east, especially with the growth of the oil in the region and America's desire for Iran to be its arm facing by the gulf countries, (Keddie,1990).

The feature of this period was complete Iranian subservience to the American decision, and the Shah was like an obedient disciple of the white house, a situation that caused an increase in the opposition against the Iranian rule during this period. As a result, Iran was one of the countries that USA relied on to extend its influences in the middle east since the 1950s till right now, and thus this period was a treasure for the American side. On the other hand, Iranians was in a great agreement with the American administration which helped it to achieve some economic renaissance in addition to the conclusion of agreements belong to peaceful nuclear program and economic developments. (Sick ,1986)

3.18 The Complete Estrangement Period-Its Features And Effects

There is no doubt that the period that witnessed the estrangement between the two countries was linked to the huge political transformations in the middle east country after the Islamic revolution. The Iranian revolution, led to qualitative change In the relations with USA, as it was accompanied by independence and hostile tendencies to the US influence, and many issues played an important role in bringing relations between them to the stage of estrangement.(parsi,2017)

After 1979, revolution, Carter's administration tried to build a relationship with the new regime, but it failed. So that is why the Iranian-US relations were

described by as hostile, as they were based at that stage on accusing each other by several accuses. Finally, USA succeeded to put Iran under the economic sanctions since the Islamic revolution and as a result. New era of struggle started between the united states of America and the Iranian republic. (parsi,2017)

3.19 The Period Of Negotiations

As a result of the clash that occurred between the two countries after the Islamic revolution, there were stations of direct conflict between the USA and Iran, foremost of which was the storming of the US embassy in Tehran and the arrest of employees and diplomats from inside it. This important incident in the history of iranian foreign policy was one of the major motives that pushed the united states to enter secret negotiations with Iran, to reach a solution for the release of its diplomats in Iran. This incident was the first stage that witnessed secret negotiations between the two countries after the revolution. (Youssief,2008)

There was another incident, which was the taking of American hostages in Lebanon, in a response to America and France's arming Iraq with weapons in the Iraqi-iranian war 1980 till 1988, the American hostages were arrested in Lebanon by groups supported by Iran, so Tehran with the negotiations between the two countries in 1985 they succeeded to solve what was known by the name of "the Iran- contra" scandal , and reached a deal in which Iran would buy American weapons in exchange for the release of the hostages in Lebanon.(parsi,2017)

3.20 The Period Of Attempts At Rapprochement And Failure

During the period of attempts at rapprochement with the united states of America, Iran did not seek to create a state of twining, political harmony, or even a partnership with the united states of America in the middle east region, but it was evading the international pressures that it suffers from, and escaping from the isolation it had faced since the Islamic revolution in 1979 by seeking

to reach out to Washington, for understanding about some common issues between the two countries. (Ali, 2019)

Hence, the complex history between the two countries did not allow at all to create a political partnership between them considering the permanent enmity, but as a result of the difficult political situation that Iran had suffered from and is still suffering from at the present time, it was trying to tell world public opinion that it did not object to negotiate or understand with its first enemy in the world, which is the united states of America. (BBC, 2020)

So, Rafsanjani's rule witnessed many attempts for this rapprochement, as well as in the late period of Muhammad Khatami, it also witnessed attempts to reach an understanding with the united states of America in some fields, but all these attempts failed because of the prior image of the two countries between them, an impression that would destroy any attempts to bring views between the two countries, as it was so already. (BBC, 2020).

4. US-IRANIAN RELATION- THE PERIOD OF MAHMOUD AHMADINEJAD'S TERM FROM 2005 TILL 2013

It is important to refer to the years before the term of the president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, and its policies towards the united states of America, and how the Iranian side in the period of the president Muhammad Khatami, tried to achieve some aims in his foreign policies, like his try to create good ties between the external policy and the internal policy goals, to create typical atmosphere about the Islamic revolution all over world, another aim was his try to improve the Islamic state relations with the united states of America, and other western countries, (Durmuş, 2005), So, in the period of the president Muhammad Khatami, he succeeded in improving the impression towards Iran, this successful step, was positive point in the foreign policy of Iran, as it affected positively in the relations with some other countries, beside this, there were other steps like the Iranian president initiative of the dialogue among civilizations. So, in the case of monitoring Khatami's term, he tried to use the authority allowed for him to create fair relations with the other countries like the European countries, especially that Tehran was suffering of the international isolation, (Ehtisham ,2008).

But the reformists lost the presidential elections in Iran in 2005, so the struggle between the reformists and the conservatives in Iran led to Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's victory in the presidential elections, the reformists defeat have had many reasons some of them were internal and others were external, like the deterioration of the economic situation and the public's indignation over the corruption that raged in the term of Rafsanjani and Khatami. Some of these reasons were external, such as the complaints of the Iranian citizens about the failed attempts or reformists to rapprochement with the united states of America during the term of Khatami and before him in the term of Rafsanjani w, which was met with more economic blockades and the escalation of hostility from the American republic, (Clawson, Eisenstadt, Kanovsky, Menashri, D, 1998)

Despite, the attempts of the president Ahmadinejad's predecessors to make more efforts to meet in common points with the American administration, the first years of the president Ahmadinejad's presidency were contradictory and complex. The new Iranian president Ahmadinejad brought about a clear change in the Iranian foreign policy after a great period of international isolation, so he returned many of his country's ambassadors to western countries in order to gain their good relation and ensure their support for him in the face of the United States of America, but in the same time Ahmadinejad was unable in the first years of his presidency to maintain the same policies of Khatami or Rafsanjani which sought to improve the relations with America, rather, there was a clear collision between the two sides, (DURMUŞ, 2005).

4.1 The President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's Political Backgrounds

Hence, the history and biography of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad are full of complicated details which created Iranian leader who left a big footprint in the political arena in the country, he was able to engage politically with all parties internally and externally, whether with the supreme leader of Iranian revolution Ali Khamenei, or with external parties such as US or Israel. Mahmoud Ahmadinejad participated strongly in the student's activities and movements after the revolution especially he was a student in Iran university of science, his participation helped him after that to be one of the students who are responsible for organizing the demonstrations after the revolution, (Şenyurt, 2013).

This rich history of early political activities for the President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, led him to be a member of the Iranian revolutionary guard, as he served in many units after joining to the "BASIJ", to serve in the Iranian-Iraqi war from 1980 till 1988. Ahmadinejad witnessed through his political history, the transformations in the US-Iranian relations from the Islamic Revolution, so he tried to gain administrative and political experiences in his country to serve his state interests, (Şenyurt, 2013), So he was appointed as a provincial governor after joining in activities belong to organizations, ruled by the Iranian revolutions, but due to political changes and after the elections of Mohamed Khatami elections, he was dismissed from his job, but in 2003 he was appointed

as a mayor of Tehran, starting his path for the elections of presidency. Ahmadinejad was one of the strongest opponents of united states policies in the middle east, he tried to create alternative ties with other countries in the region in order to face the unites states policies, so he strengthened in his term the ties with Russia and Syria and other countries, (Katz, 2016).

The president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad appeared more populist than Islamist, and was more like the presidents of Latin America, and his rhetoric appeared tremendously violent. On the domestic level, he supported the Wilayat-al-Faqih and the return to the values of the revolution and the need to strive towards the social justice and the fight against corruption, and his first priority was getting rid of the oil mafia. at the international level, Ahmadinejad adhered to the iranian right to the nuclear project and the enrichment of uranium for peaceful purpose, and in this regard , he did not express any intention to negotiate , he also spoke about his ambition to eliminate Israel and his clear support for the Palestinian resistance forces and Hezbollah in southern Lebanon and the word of the great Satan was repeated in his speeches on America and Israel, (ŞENYURT, 2013).

In continuation of the strict state of Ahmadinejad in his relationship with America in the first years of his rule , and as a result of his policies , America took important decisions especially after Ahmadinejad refused to comply with the security council's requests to halt uranium enrichment, so the security council adopted the imposition of a series of economic sanctions to deter Iran and push it to comply with the council's decisions, and the iranian economy during the era of Ahmadinejad suffered painful blows, where the united states imposed harsh sanctions on iranian banks and banned dealing with them by any foreign side and under any name. The American administration also claimed that the iranian revolutionary guard is working to spread weapons of mass destruction, and it prohibited dealing with the iranian oil companies as is known, the iranian economy is based on the export of crude oil. With the increase in punishments against foreign companies accused of dealing with banned iranian companies, the screws imposed in the iranian economy narrowed and the iranian people lived lean years with the president Ahmadinejad, (UZU, 2011).

Other aspects formed the doctrine of Ahmadinejad's policy towards the united states of America, these aspects destroyed the efforts of Khatami and Rafsanjani to open a direct negotiation with the united states of America, Ahmadinejad affected by the USA's policies towards his country beginning from the explosions of 11 September against USA, Then the speech of George W. Bush in 2002 as he announced Iran listed In the Axis of Evil. After that the Iraqi occupation in 2003, all these events, played essential role and helped Ahmadinejad to be a president in 2005, (Ehtisham ,2008).

These policies led Ahmadinejad to adopt the isolation with the west. He believed that Iran would never be under control the western decision, this policy was differing from the Khatami policy, as he tried to make strength relations with the west. But with the American policy of George W. Bush against Iran, there were internal support for the policy and speech of Ahmadinejad, the voters who had chosen him in the elections. They chose his policy to be the constitution against US policy in the region. Also, With the propaganda of the elections in Iran in 2005, Ahmadinejad presented himself as one of the greatest opponent of US policy in the region, he showed his opposition for any relations between Iran and USA in the future, (Alfaki, 2015).

4.2 The Determinants Of The Foreign Policy In The Term Of President Ahmadinejad

There is no doubt that, the only person who control the establishment of the policies of the iranian republic is the supreme leader and his assistants from the revolutionary guards and some other institutions inside the country far from the position of the president, and therefore the movements of any iranian president in his interaction with the policies of other countries against his country is in accordance with the predetermined policies of the supreme leader of the Islamic revolution. However, despite the recognition of the role of the supreme leader of the iranian revolution in shaping the country's foreign policies , there is also one of the important ingredients that may have a role in these policies, which are the president's personal fundamentals , his past experiences and his ability to maneuver with the supreme leader in order to gain even a simple space to adopt some of his country's foreign policies, and this was clearly evident in the case of

the president Ahmadinejad. So, Ahmadinejad was a rational and pragmatic figure who wanted to reach his goals from shortest roads and directly, in addition to not eluding any of the parties he deals with, (SIDIQ, 2018).

There is a third factor affecting the president Ahmadinejad's orientations and foreign policies , which is the internal situation in the country , the extent of Ahmadinejad's relations with him, his experiences in dealing with the government side and decision-makers in the country, as well as his political backgrounds and his career and political experiences, as he had a great history of political activity where he was involved in military activity , as well as management and planning experiences likewise, the situation in the case of the president Ahmadinejad, it might be called the direct diplomacy , which relied on his foreign policies on communication with others through the Iranian lobby in America and in other countries, which caused a decline in the dynamism and activity of the Iranian foreign ministry , as it relied on very traditional mechanisms in her moves, (GÜRSEL, June).

However, despite the traditional methods adopted by the regime of Ahmadinejad in managing its foreign policies to confront American influence in the middle east, it had remarkable activity in unconventional directions to confront America, including its efforts to create a multi-polar international system with the participation of Iran during this period. So, One of the most factors which were included in Ahmadinejad's policy is his trials to create new multipolar international order, to face the USA control of world, so there was a strong tie between Iran and Venezuela in the term of the president Ahmadinejad. There were links between the two countries started in the term of Former President Khatami, then after the president Ahmadinejad in 2005 the relations between the two countries were strongly changed, The two countries had a clear situation against the American role in the region and allover world, seeking at the same time to make a multipolar world order, (Cmdr, 2009).

Also, Ahmadinejad strengthened the relations with Russia, starting from 2005, by this way, Iran wanted to get the Russian support in the Iranian nuclear program, after that there were positive steps from Russia towards Iran especially in the uranium enrichment program. On the other hand, Ahmadinejad wanted to make a strength links with the regional countries especially after years of

tension between Iran and the countries in the middle east because fears of the Islamic revolution, he strove to reconciliation with the Arab countries through encouraging the economic activities, adding to that, he support his country relations with Syria, (Katz, 2016).

4.3 The Stages Of US-Iranian Relations During The Term Of President Ahmadinejad

US-Iranian relations during the era of the president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad witnessed great fluctuations , especially as it came after two former presidents, Khatami and Rafsanjani , who tried to open channels of communication with the US administration in order to get out of the international isolation that the country was suffering from after the Islamic revolution, therefore , the relations between the two countries was dominated by the policy of exploring the other", at the beginning of the term of the iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who , after coming to power in the country , tried to be more extreme in his political convictions towards the united states of America, seeking to establish the impression on Washington that he would not neglect Iran's rights are all , which allowed him some room for maneuver with the American side, (Brown, 2015).

The iranian president was trying to present himself as the faithful guardian of the goals of the iranian revolution, in attempts to gain the support of the iranian citizens , who elected his as a spite in the reformist movement represented by Khatami and Rafsanjani and who tried to negotiate directly with America to end the isolation. So, the president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad tried to ensure the iranian citizens supporting him so that he could win a second presidential term, in addition to his overt and violent adherence to the principles of the revolution, which would allow him to move freely with the western countries and even America, in order to negotiate the future of his country and the future of his country's nuclear project, because in this case he would be in the eyes of the iranian people are the honest man who seeks successes for their country, and therefore is no fear or concern about this foreign endeavor, (Brown, 2015).

The president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was aiming to express his hard-liner position on the principles of the iranian revolution, the iranian interior, and he

was trying to link the future of the Iranian people with the foreign policy which are based on opposing American influence in the region as well as America's stances rejecting the Iranian nuclear project. Thus, there was no disagreement or conflict between Iran's foreign policy and the internal political project that the president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was trying to implement in the country. Either, through parliament or through the economic side, especially, since the economic aspect inside Iran is closely related to the extent of his ability to complete an agreement on the nuclear project for his country. What allows him to pump western investments in the oil sector, gas manufacturing and other fields, which will contribute to improving the economic situation in Iran, which supports the economic situation of the citizens and pushes them to elect the president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad again, (HAJÍ YOUSEFÍ, 2010).

Therefore, the president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's foreign speech was all the time at attracting the support of other and large segments inside Iran, and as a result of the hardening of the Iranian interior in its views towards the American administration at that time, slogans such as "Death to America" was among the slogans that the president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is keen to promote in international conferences and forums to ensure a supportive crowd inside Iran. Therefore, the period of the Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad passed through many stages in his country's relations with the United States of America, (HAJÍ YOUSEFÍ, 2010).

4.4 The First Stage: "De Facto Politics"

The first stage of the presidency of the Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, can be named by the name of "de facto politics", which is the policy that Ahmadinejad implemented in the face of the Europeans and the Americans policies against his country, these Iranian policies were characterized by the direct escalation of statements towards America, the rejection of any American attempts of the annihilation of the Iranian nuclear project, as well as well as the confrontation of Europe's attempts to jump over Iran's nuclear aspiration, therefore, this stage witnessed an escalation in statements by Ahmadinejad against America and European union, (Tyler, 2010).

The policy adopted by Ahmadinejad in his political conflict with the united states of America and Europe was, of course, in contrast to the policies adopted by both Khatami and Rafsanjani, through which they tried to open ways of communications with the American administration, but Ahmadinejad , due to his escalation , turned against the policies of the Iranian predecessors in a new isolation by the Europe and the international community. Therefore, during the first year of Ahmadinejad 's presidency, the conflict between Washington and Tehran reached the highest level of estrangement as all relations between the two countries froze until 2007, (Şenyurt, 2013).

The Palestinian issue was also one of the issues that Ahmadinejad exploited for the political escalation against the united states of America, which forced him to enter into a political conflict with many sides, while the united states linked its support for the establishment of the Palestinian state with the recognition of Israel's right to exist, Ahmadinejad had another opinion. The American position on the Palestinian caused Ahmadinejad to launch a severe attack in his statements on the Israelis, as he called on Europe to receive Israel and to establish a state for Israel in Europe away from Palestine, these statements caused a major crisis between Iran and America, (Hassan,2008).

But it should be noted that there were no new policies in dealing with the Iranian nuclear program in the term of the president Ahmadinejad, except for some measures that were tantamount to putting America and Europe in the front of a fait accompli through Ahmadinejad announcing the continuation of his country in its nuclear program, as a step that provoked Europe and America all both although the Iranian decision was surprising to Europe and America, at the beginning there were no confrontational reactions on the side of the west against Iran, which prompted Ahmadinejad to escalate more politically to affirm his country's right to possess a nuclear program , so he criticized in his speech before that , the united states of America in the year 2005 the countries which try to monopolize nuclear power. He affirmed his country's right to possess nuclear power, this escalatory step on the side of Ahmadinejad was the beginning that prompted Europe to submit a bill to the international atomic energy agency to refer Iran's nuclear program to the security council in 2005, (Bayar, 2015).

So, the Iranian nuclear program was one of the most important issues in the period from 2003 till 2015. As in the year 2003 the supreme leader Khamenei and the president Khatami decided to stop and suspended the enrichment program for 2 years, allowed also for the UN inspections to give the Europeans and US chance not to fear about its nuclear program. Although the Iranian steps about its nuclear program, but the American administration, which was ruled in this period by the president George. W. Bush ignored the Iranian situations and there was not any positive reaction towards Iran, But The American situation led Ahmadinejad when he came to the office as a president in 2005, he realized that the west never agrees to allow for Iran to continue its nuclear program, so he continued uranium enrichment, (Öncel, 2019), in these times, the foreign policy of the president Ahmadinejad was Rough policy towards the west, so the policy of Ahmadinejad in this time, like the policy of the supreme leader of the Iranian revolution, Ali Khamenei. So, From 2005 till 2006 there were some decisions taken against the Iranian nuclear program as a result for the president Ahmadinejad policy like: In 2005, there was a nuclear fuel supply agreement between Iran and Russia, this agreement allowed for Iran to get fuel from Russia. Also, in the same year 2005 there was a new step that Iran started producing uranium hexafluoride in ISFAHAN facility, this step led UK and other European countries to stop negotiations with Iran, (Öncel, 2019).

After that there was a decision in 2006 by the IAEA referred Iran to the Security Council, because of this decision, Iran told the IAEA its decision which included stop the non-legal binding inspection procedures. The Iranian steps did not stop, it announced the enrichment of uranium in 2006 for the first once, so Germany and other countries including USA offered agreement to Iran including stop the Iranian enrichment program, but with the rejection of Iran for this suggestion, there were sanctions on Iran. According to the Iranian president Ahmadinejad reaction towards the sanctions, he replied by ensuring that Iran will never stop or back down the uranium enrichment, demanding all countries to consider his country as if it is nuclear state, (Turan, 2018).

4.5 The Second Stage: The Stage Of Calling For Dialogue

The second stage of US-iranian relations during the term of the president Ahmadinejad could be called the stage of calling for dialogue from Iran to the united states of America. in the second year of the term of the president Ahmadinejad, he sent a personal message to the US president George. W. Bush, suggesting in his letter , the work to find new and non-traditional means to end the nuclear dispute between the two countries, but the American response of course was negative , and the American administration saw that the message was just a ploy from the iranian side to create a new state of negotiation and gain more time to Iran in order to achieve gains in the ongoing negotiations on the nuclear program, (HAJÍ YOUSEFÍ, 2010).

Contradictory policy took placed in the Iranian foreign policy towards USA. Although the sanctions imposed on Iran from USA and other countries, and the Ahmadinejad policy towards the white house, the Iranian president Ahmadinejad sent a letter to the former American president George W. Bush. He tried to appear as if he is calling for the civilized dialogue with the American administration, but this step achieved negative reactions. The Iranian politicians considered this letter as it is was a try to push the country towards USA more than it must be. The letter was to search about new ways for put an end for the Iranian nuclear program dispute, through the dialogue between USA and Iran, (Montagne, Kelemen, 2006).

This letter showed that the president Ahmadinejad as if he had two situations against the American administration, one of them is the clash situation, and the other one is the desire of opening negotiations with USA. It showed also how is the president Ahmadinejad in a struggle between his desire for opening negotiations with the USA and his fears of the internal political scene in Iran. The letter sent by President Ahmadinejad to George W. Bush included some topics like the war in Iraq, Ahmadinejad wrote about the miserable results happened in Iraq due to the USA occupation, and the victims who paid their souls as a cost of this war. Also, he wrote about the Holocaust and the role of Israel in using it as weapon against the Islamic countries, then he wrote about the leaders' role in achieving the peace all over the world, (Stokes, 2010).

The most important points in the letter were about the Iranian nuclear program, President Ahmadinejad, he wrote about the role of the international institutions which try to forbid Iran from being a nuclear state. The rejection of the American side to the Iranian president Ahmadinejad's letter was logically, the American administration did not care with the call of the president Ahmadinejad. As they believed that Ahmadinejad tried to escape from the internal conflicts with the supreme leader in this time Ali Khamenei, through seeking to achieve national success by starting negotiations with the US administration, (Amir, 2012).

Also, Ahmadinejad faced corruption criticism, because of his policies A failure in the economic field that caused capital to flee abroad, in addition to the US sanctions imposed by the white house against Iran which caused economic problem in addition to the students demonstrations in 2006, which were due the sanction and the increase of US pressure on the Iranian government, which prompted students to demonstrate, rejecting the crisis facing the country that Ahmadinejad caused, (Amir, 2012), All these reasons prompted Ahmadinejad to search for another way to achieve any success in the issue that concern his country in order to reintroduce himself to the Iranian society as a successful president who was able to open ways of direct contacts with the American side, which would help him overcome the internal crises he was facing at the beginning of his role. The Iranian president Ahmadinejad's attempts to address the American side to search for a mechanism to start a direct dialogue between the two countries to discuss the future of the Iranian nuclear program have not succeeded. That was in the assembly held in 2006, but as usual, the US administration's position was clear, which is the complete rejection of all attempts by Ahmadinejad to communicate with them, (HAJÍ YOUSEFÍ, 2010).

4.6 US Reactions

There is no doubt that the American administration understood that Ahmadinejad was trying to escape from his internal problems in Iran by taking a big step forward, trying to achieve any progress in the Iranian nuclear crisis in his country to present this success to his people to obtain their support in the face of the supreme leader and the reformist movement. However, the call for

dialogue called by the Iranian president Ahmadinejad did not stop considering the intransigence of the American administration, which was persistent in directing a very negative reaction to all the calls of the Iranian president, (Warnaar, 2013). Although The Iranian president Ahmadinejad's negative situation towards the US policies in the Middle East, but the efforts of him to start negotiations, depended on many convictions like:

The support by the voters who had chosen him, so there was a great amount of trust between the president and the Iranian citizens, he is ensuring that they will agree with all his steps especially if these steps were serving the Iranian interests.

with the clashes between the supreme leader in this time Ali Khamenei and the president Ahmadinejad, especially in the internal policies and economics, Ahmadinejad's desire in this period to achieve a great success support his political situation against the supreme leader.

Ahmadinejad desired to present a new Iran with new relations with the international community, through showing that Tehran accept the dialogue and welcome with all steps which serve the world peace. Of course, this achievement will be added to his history and successfulness.

The Iranian president desired through this step to present the Iranian Regime as the only one in the middle east who can form a new frame of the international relations with the American administration through the sharing interests. not as if Iran is a country affiliated with the US decision. as during in the Shah era in the 1950's. (Warnaar, 2013).

So, Although the negative reaction of the American administration towards the Iranian President Ahmadinejad. He insisted on make debate with the US former president George W. Bush. The Iranian president asked for a debate in the UN in 2006, but with the rejection of American administration, he wrote a letter for the American citizens in November 2006 talking with them in the letter about the bad effects of the US policies in the middle east and upon his country, (Warnaar, 2013)

4.7 A New Transformation In The US-Iranian Relations- At The End Of The Term Of George W. Bush

In the second phase of the pattern of Iranian American relations during the era of the former president Ahmadinejad, which was during the late period of the former US president George W. Bush, the US administration was not satisfied with the rejecting the Iranian request, the content of which the call to start direct negotiations with the white house, but there were punitive measures, against this demand and began a series of US sanctions on Iran. new decision in March 2007 was made by major countries including USA and presented to the security council adding additional sanctions on the Islamic republic as a part of punishments, due to the Iranian decision of continuing the uranium enrichment program, (Cordesman, Gold, Coughlin, 2014), The new list of sanctions included institutions and persons like:

The metal Industries Group, which was owned by the defense industries organization, The Isfahan center for research, Nuclear research center which was a branch of the Iranian Atomic Energy Organization, Group of transit missile industries. Some international banks. Islamic revolutionary guard, Al-Quds air industries group, and Persons involved in the nuclear activities and leaders in the Islamic revolutionary guard, (Cordesman, Gold, Coughlin, 2014).

These new sanctions were in few months before the UN general assembly in September 2007, it was as exam for the Iranian president Ahmadinejad and his reaction towards the new international policy to his country nuclear program. Ahmadinejad ought to have replied for some essential reasons:

Ahmadinejad had internal challenges, economics and politics ones, and in the case of not reply on the new sanctions, he might lose more and more from the supporters who chose him in the elections, this might weakened his political situation in the Iranian state.

The external challenges which he faced, and his efforts to create new ties with other countries to decrease the effect of the American policy on his country future. These points were enough to lead Ahmadinejad to a public reply, rejecting the new sanctions on his country, (Cordesman, Gold, Coughlin, 2014)

4.8 Iran In Ahmadinejad's Term As A Basic Player In The Region

The US position of the Iranian nuclear program, which involved rejection for the Iranian steps in this field and desire for put an end for it, all these points arranged Iran to be a basic player in the region, especially in Iraq, Lebanon, and other countries where US have interests. The only solution with the Iranian nuclear program was the dialogue sharing with the major countries, even if the Iranian regime behavior was illogical and unacceptable. In these times, the US administration had two options, the first one is changing the Iranian regime, the second option is preventing Iran of possession the nuclear program. The US insisting on the first option, had not solve the nuclear program crisis, US should had focus on the second option not the first one, as there were not any factors help to change the regime, (Warnaar, 2013).

US should had to craft policy with the Europeans, Russia, and China, to manage the negotiations with the Iranians politically, this policy would have neem the alternative of changing the regime, but it will change the Iranian situation positively, but nothing happened. While the US administration continued waving with the military solution against the Iranian regime, this US policy led to destroying any common situations between the two countries to reach a political solution to the Iranian nuclear program but created much complicated details in the treatment of the crisis. In the other hand, Iran realized from beginning that US and the European countries could not be able to force the Islamic Republic to halt its nuclear program, so Tehran did not accept any blackmail that US administration tried to push it into, (Warnaar, 2013), There were great opportunities for the US administration to find common situations with Iranian administration, like the common interests in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the terrorism in the middle east. But for the US and security council insistence on pre-limiting enrichment activities in Iran under the international control, the Iranian government refused the offers which presented to treat its nuclear program, the US should have to send clear message to Tehran that it would face long-term regional isolation if there were not any acceptable solutions for the nuclear program, (Warnaar, 2013).

It is important to refer to the shape of the relations between US and Iran especially after the 11 September explosions. The first stage started from 2001

till 2004, the Iranian government tended to reduce the political tension and refusing the escalation. Also, during US war in Afghanistan, there were optimism expectation in improving the US-Iranian relations, and this atmosphere continued till 2004. The second stage began from 2004 when there was a crises in the relation between the two countries because of the Iranian position towards the nuclear program, (Durmuş, 2005), also the atmosphere of tension continued in the term of Ahmadinejad, but there were are other factors shaped the basic role of Iran in the region in Ahmadinejad term like , as The new stage of the Iranian nuclear program, which support the Iranian situation in the negotiations with the major countries including US administration. The failure of US policies in the middle east especially in Iraq, this failure strengthened the Iranian position in its struggle with the American administration. The achievements of Iran's Allies in Lebanon, like Hezbollah, and Hamas in Gaza, which led Tehran to play the most essential and basic role in the Middle East against US policies.

Also, after the international reactions which happened due to Ahmadinejad's speech at the UN general Assembly meeting in 2007, there were some developments in the US situation towards the Iranian nuclear program, in December 2007, US said in a report about the issue, that Iran able to produce nuclear weapon in the period from 2010 till 2015. After that there was the decision No 1803 by the Security Council, increasing the sanctions against Iran, (Durmuş, 2005).

4.9 The Third Stage In The US-Iranian Relations - In The Term Of The President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad

It should be noted that the former US president George W. Bush pursued a two-stage policy in managing the nuclear program and his country's foreign policies with the Islamic republic. The first phase was the stage of hard-line diplomacy, through which the US administration sought to change the regime in Iran and replace it with another regime that works on serving the interests of the united states of America in Iran and in the region as what happened in the overthrow of the government od Muhammad Mossadegh in 1953. This stage of the US policy towards the Iranians , in which Washington focused on attempts to isolate the

iranian regime from its people , from the countries of the region and even from western countries by pushing the public opinion in Iran to demonstrate against the iranian regime under the pretext of its economic failure in addition to finding western support to confront the iranian nuclear project, in addition, the united states of America initially adopted the option of rejecting negotiations with the iranian republic to pressure it to agree to the terms of the negotiations of the nuclear program, (Elsharkawi, 2007).

However, with the passage of time, Washington found that this policy had not succeeded at all in pushing the iranian regime to submit to and agree to the American terms for dialogue of the nuclear program, which prompted Washington at the end of President George. W, Bush's term to change the policies towards Iran from rejecting the dialogue, to start finding a medium for negotiations. One of the reasons that led America to change its policies with Iran, was its failure in overthrowing the iranian regime due to major obstacles , whether inside Iran or in the region where the countries neighboring Iran, on the other hand Washington failed to fins an international agreement about its struggle with Iran especially , the European countries were supporting signing a fair agreement with Iran and not adopting the American situation on the conflict with the Islamic republic, (Elsharkawi, 2007).

In addition, the current crisis in Iraq had pushed Washington to find a way to direct dialogue with Iran regarding the war in Iraq and to work together to achieve political and military stability in the countries neighboring Iran and then the crisis in Iraq was the key to starting direct dialogue between America and Iran regarding the nuclear program and other essential issues. As a result of the administration's failure to bring down the iranian regime, Washington played to reduce the influence of the iranian policies in the region, by supporting the Gulf countries militarily to counter Iran's influence. On the other hand, there were fundamental reasons that America's efforts to manage and limit the iranian nuclear program or at least stop it for a certain period faced failure, like: there was no agreement between the American administration and the western countries about the iranian nuclear program, and thus Iran was able to take advantages of the fluctuation and difference of opinions to win the western supporters of its nuclear program. In addition to the lack of direct dialogue with

Iran and thus caused the failure of America's attempts to open to Iran, (Davis, Martini, Nader, Kaye, Quinlivan, Steinberg, 2011).

Although the case of struggle between US and Iran in these periods of 2008, US former president George. W. Bush agreed to participate in direct negotiations with the Iranian government to discuss the future of the Iranian nuclear program, the American administration sent William Joseph Burns, one of the most prominent US negotiators with the Islamic republic , who was the negotiator who succeeded in achieving the nuclear agreement with Iran after few years, So, in the third phase of the relations between USA and Iranian republic during the era of the two former presidents Barak Obama and Ahmadinejad, this period may be divided into two parts: the first part, which is the first period of Barak Obama's rule , the second part will be the second period of Barak Obama's rule, (Davis, Martini, Nader, Kaye, Quinlivan, Steinberg, 2011).

4.10 Iran's Relations With Barak Obama's Administration: The First Term Of Barak Obama's Rule

After president Barak Obama came to power in America, there were indications referred to a clear change in the US policy towards the Iranian republic, although Obama's administration followed the same approach adopted by the administration of former president George.W. bush, Obama's administration tried to change the policy and start a constructive dialogue with Iran. One of the features of that, and what confirms the change in American policies towards Iran, was the invitation of US secretary of State Hillary Clinton at that time to a dialogue with Iran in more than one official statement, then president Barak Obama, and his deputy announced the launch of an initiative for a dialogue with Iran, in his speech in front of the annual security conference in Munich in 2009 , Obama's vice president , Joe Biden , called for direct dialogue with the Islamic republic, (Jahanbegloo,2009).

One of the features that was indicative of Obama's desire to conduct a direct dialogue with Iran and that there was a change in the US foreign policy towards the Islamic republic, was the appointment of Dennis Ross by Barak Obama's administration to assume the responsibility for following the developments of

the scene in Iran, where he had a great experience in this field. In addition, Washington invited Iran to attend the international conference on the future of Afghanistan in March 2009, which revealed America's pragmatism in its dealing with Iran, especially as it knew about the depth of Iranian- Afghanistan relations, which paves the way for a political settlement in Afghanistan after the war, (Jahanbegloo,2009).

4.11 Features Of Obama's Policies Towards Iran In The Early Days Of His Rule

During the first period of US former president Barak Obama, he tried to adjust his country's policies towards the Iranian republic, especially those policies that were adopted by his predecessor George. W. Bush. Although, the changes made by US former president Barak Obama were not changes of great value, there were positive changes that revealed the Obama administration's intentions to start a new phase of dialogue and direct negotiations with Iran, but the administration of US former president Barak Obama moved from the stage of directing accusations against the Iranian republic, as did George. W. Bush administration, when it classifies Iran as one of the axis of evil, to a new positive policy towards Iran. On the other hand, Tehran received the White House message regarding the desire to initiate direct negotiations based on mutual respect, in a positive manner, but the Iranian president at that time Ahmadinejad, was afraid that Obama's call for direct dialogue would be a mere tactic by the White House as a cover to pass more US and international sanctions on the Iranian government, (Alkaçar, 2018).

Obama administration's calls for the direct dialogue with Iran had not stopped, rather, it had made decisions in this context to activate its initiative calling for containing Iran and not clashing with it, so it agreed to participate in the international talks regarding Iran's nuclear program, the other matter, in a fundamental shift in the US administration's situation on the crisis with Iran, US former president Barak Obama spoke positively about Iran which his speech about the middle east in his famous speech at Cairo university in 2009. Obama said in his speech in Egypt, that he support the right of Iran to obtain the peaceful nuclear energy, pledging to everyone in his speech to participate in direct negotiations with the Iranians based on mutual respect between the two

countries. In addition to that, the US administration referred to its permission for participating the representatives of the Iranian government in the official American ceremonies in the US embassies all over world, (Akbarzadeh, 2011)

Regarding to Obama's speech at Cairo university in 2009, some international opinion polls reported that a large percentage of Iranians supported the US administration's approach to their country, despite all the criticisms that exist and are adopted by President Ahmadinejad and the supreme leader of the Iranian republic against the US administration. But there was a paradox in this matter, despite the support of a large percentage of the Iranians for the US administration and they desire to restore political relations between the two countries, but there was no confidence in the US administration, Iranians believed that Obama was unable to achieve any achievement related to rapprochement between the two countries although in 2009 demonstrations which were against the president Ahmadinejad. Chanted in support of Obama and his policies, (Akbarzadeh, 2011).

4.12 The Nuclear Program As A Backbone Of The Iranian-US Relations In Obama's term

While the administration of the US former president Barak Obama sought to create a chance for a direct dialogue with Iran, Washington also sought to ensure the international support for its position against the Islamic republic, especially Obama administration understood that Tehran would not achieve what is wanted as long as it was far from the various kinds of sanctions mechanisms. As a result of the policies of the US former president Barak Obama, through which he sought to find mechanisms to start a direct dialogue with the Islamic republic, Tehran's nuclear program has become the basis of relations between the two countries, as Washington sought to discuss the program with full transparency in front of the international community to put an end to the ongoing negotiations to no avail. and to sign an agreement that guarantees every country monitoring of Iran's nuclear program, as it was a source of threat to international peace and security, (Jahanbegloo, 2009).

It was clear that the administration of US former president Barak Obama had come to work on the previous political legacy left by the administration of

George. W. Bush, in addition to long periods of hostility in the relations of the two countries, and despite previous attempts, Washington and Tehran were unable to overcome this decades-long conflict, but rather relationships were getting complicated. Considering Obama's desire to work on negotiating with the Iranian side, the escalation of the political events and elections in Iran, which caused Ahmadinejad to rise to power again, and then the exit of the 2009 demonstrations rejecting him. All of this impeded all efforts to agree with the Iranians. After the Iranian elections in 2009, which were the elections that witnessed great controversy inside Iran due to talk of fraud that occurred therein, demonstrations spread in the country for several weeks rejecting Ahmadinejad's continued power, which prompted the US administration to talk about the demonstrations and demanded that the demonstrators not be arrested and that they not be suppressed protests, which caused an exacerbation of the relationship with the Iranian republic, (Jahanbegloo,2009).

Despite the escalation in the media statements against Ahmadinejad regime due to the demonstrations, but in the mid-2009 America sought to cooperate with the international atomic energy agency to support Iran in its nuclear project in order to demonstrate the good intention that might prompt the beginning of a serious dialogue between the three parties. But Washington's attempts to coordinate with the IAEA failed, due to the Iranian oppositions' criticism of President Ahmadinejad, rejecting support Ahmadinejad in his negotiations with USA and the international atomic energy agency, (Brown, 2015)

4.13 Diplomacy Of The International Parties

On the other hand, Obama's administration did not stop at this step, and the failure that occurred because of the demonstrations inside Iran, but it adopted a double policy in dealing with the Iranian position, as it moved in two directions, the first is the direction of pressure to conduct serious and direct negotiations with the Iranian side. And the second track is the threat to impose new sanctions to force Tehran to submit to the negotiation's requests. But at the same time, there appeared international efforts trying to find a solution to the escalating crisis between Iran and America at that time. The position of both Turkey and Brazil, who sought to receive the diplomatic track in the negotiations between

America and Iran, also were able to sign an agreement with the Iranian president in 2010, but no results were achieved, especially since America's efforts to threaten Tehran and the Islamic republic's disrespect of the agreements concluded in 2009 and 2010 prompted Washington to adopt the sanctions option as a basic solution to force Tehran to return to the negotiations, (Nader, Larrabee ,2013).

4.14 Using The Sanctions Method Against Iran

All of the united nations, USA and the European union resorted to the sanction's method to face Tehran to back down and accept a solution to the negotiations , so it worked with Britain, France and Germany to arrange a set of sanctions, as Obama administration wanted to grant Iran privileges and incentives in the event of cooperation with the international community and suspended uranium enrichment completely, but after difficult negotiations, the security council passed a historic resolution in June 2010, (Cordesman, Gold, Coughlin,2014).This resolution included work to prevent the transfer of nuclear weapons technology, prevent Iran from producing nuclear materials, and imposed travel restriction on iranian officials associated with the nuclear program. This was followed by decision by the US congress to adopt sanctions that include tightening US sanctions on companies that invest in the iranian energy sector and withdrawing US investments from various sectors in Iran. Then the European union approved sanctions that include measures in the areas of trade, financial services, energy, and transportation, as well as additional appointment for visa bans and asset freezes, (Nader, Larrabee ,2013).

4.15 Third Stage In The US-Iranian Relations In Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's Term-The Period Between 2011 Till 2013 From Barak Obama Term:

In the period following the election of US former president Barak Obama to the presidency of the united states of America, he tried in every way to force Iran to sit at the negotiation table, but the period from 2011 till 2013 , the end of the president Ahmadinejad's rule , it witnessed what could be called a freeze in the US-iranian rapprochement attempts because of the great developments in the sector of western and American sanctions against Iran included many steps that

prompted the Iranian side to retreat from proceeding with efforts to bridge the gap between Tehran and Washington like:

A decision by the EU included preventing countries from helping Iran through importing oil from it, thus started from July 2012, (Cordesman, Gold, Coughlin, 2014), And an agreement to start discussion of IAEA investigations about the Iran's nuclear program in 2012.

In addition to that, the meeting that many countries witnessed during this period between Britain, China, France, Germany, Russia and the United States of America did not reach anything that had a positive sign on the Iranian nuclear program, whereas the US administration insisted that solving the problem of Iran's nuclear program is a central issue for its relations with Iran, and therefore it refused to discuss any other issues such as the war in Iraq or in Afghanistan and Iran's role in that, until a final decision is made on the Iran's nuclear program.

Another factor caused freezing in the steps that were aimed to facilitate the way for direct negotiations between US and Iran, it was the speeches of Ahmadinejad about the Holocaust, his speeches about the Holocaust since 2005 till 2013 was offensive to the Holocaust, which caused fueling the attack on him by the United States and Israel, (Cordesman, Gold, Coughlin, 2014).

4.16 Important Features In The Relations Between Iran And The United States Of America During The Term Of President Ahmadinejad

The United States of America adopted two different policies towards Iran during the period in which President Ahmadinejad was in power from 2005 to 2013, and the features of the American foreign policy towards Iran during the era of President George W. Bush differed from the policy adopted by President Barack Obama, (Stokes, 2010), So, the US foreign policy toward Iran in the era of George W. Bush was as following:

- Internal Pressure On The Regime In Iran

The United States of America has sought to change the ruling political system in Iran since the success of the Iranian revolution in 1979, and former US President George W. Bush tried to change the regime by:

- Supporting Demonstrations In Iran

Former US President George W. Bush tried to show support for the protest movements in Iran. He declared his support for the student demonstrations that took place in 2002, and President George Bush's plan did not stop at this point. Rather, he sought through his speech in 2005 to put forward a project to support the peoples, (Stokes,2010), The Middle East region, including the Iranian people, in addition to that, the US administration has allocated hundreds of thousands of dollars at this time to monitor the human rights situation in Iran, and then issue a law to support the Iranian people in 2006, (ZORA,2009).

- Supporting The Iranian Opposition

The administration of former US President George W. Bush tried to employ the Iranian opposition in order to confront the Iranian regime, by financing Iranian opposition groups worth 400 million dollars to collect information about Iran's nuclear program and manipulate the Iranian currency, (ZORA,2009).

4.17 External Pressure Of The US Administration On The Iranian Political Regime

The previous US administration, which was led by former President George W. Bush, sought to exert external pressure on the Iranian regime through:

- Formation Of An International Coalition To Confront The Iranian Regime

This grouping also brought together regional states, as they wanted to be part of an international coalition facing Iran's nuclear program and to work to ensure that Russia and China do not support Iran, and to dismantle Iran's regional and state relations, (DURMUŞ, 2005).

- Pressures From The US Administration Alone

The Bush Administration Pressured The Iranian Regime Through, the Economic sanctions as The US administration sought during this period to impose more US sanctions on Iran, especially since the sanctions will cause an economic collapse of the Islamic Republic, and thus will prompt citizens to demonstrate to bring down the Iranian regime, (DURMUŞ, 2005).

Pressures on the nuclear program: The Bush administration sought to prevent Iran from strengthening its military infrastructure and developing the mechanisms of its nuclear project. During this period, the US administration sought all means to prevent Tehran from obtaining nuclear technology, (David ,2009).

- The US Administration's Policies Against Iran During The Period Of Former President Barack Obama

This period was characterized by Barack Obama's awareness that the escalation policy against the Iranian Republic had not achieved any results that Washington wanted. Therefore, President Barack Obama announced a new policy with Tehran based on direct dialogue and containing Iran's influence in the region, and the Obama administration also sought to strengthen its relations with the European Union, especially after The Iraq war, to secure European support for Washington's policies against Iran, (Alkaçar, 2018).

Preparing the climate for direct dialogue: The Obama administration sought to dismantle the crises in the Middle East, especially after the decline of Washington's position in the Middle East due to the war in Iraq and the increasing influence of Iran and sought to express approval for direct dialogue with Iran about its nuclear program, (Alkaçar, 2018).

Basic elements in the relationship with Iran: The Obama administration sought to change the escalating American rhetoric against Iran in order to create an atmosphere for direct dialogue, as well as a policy of non-interference in Iran's internal affairs, in addition to adopting a more comprehensive policy in dealing with the Iranian crisis, (Akbarzadeh, 2011).Hence, it can be said that Ahmadinejad's period witnessed two completely different patterns of US policies towards Tehran, one of which was the failure of events, which is the policy of escalation and isolation of Iran from the countries of the region, but the second policy that Obama adopted was based on dialogue and direct discussion with Iran on important issues in The region, this policy was one of the main reasons that paved the way for the signing of the nuclear deal in 2015, (El-Sayed,2016).

5. BARACK OBAMA AND THE NUCLEAR AGREEMENT DURING HASSAN ROUHANI TERM

With the arrival of the presidential candidate, Hassan Rouhani, to power in Iran and the departure of President Ahmadinejad, Rouhani was able to start from previous rounds of negotiations with Washington over the Iranian nuclear program and to achieve the most important international agreement in his country's history with the approval of the United States of America. This agreement caused a real crisis for Trump, as US President Donald Trump believed that Iran was able to deceive Obama and conclude a historic agreement that served the interests of the Islamic Republic at the expense of the interests of America and the West. (F.R.A.N.C.E,2015).

After difficult negotiations, Iran and the 5+1 group reached an agreement guaranteeing the lifting of all sanctions on Iran in exchange for preventing it from developing nuclear missiles and agreeing to visit its nuclear sites. (B.B.C,2015b). The agreement concluded in Austria in 2015 included giving Iran part of its funds frozen in bank accounts abroad. European and American financial sanctions on Iran have also been lifted. (A.L.J.A.Z.E.E.R.A, 2015). As for uranium enrichment: The agreement included Iran's pledges to use old centrifuges to enrich uranium, with specifying a specific type of centrifuges in the development of uranium enrichment, with specifying the permissible percentage of uranium enrichment and the timing available for that, in addition to the percentage and size of Iran's uranium stockpile. (A.L.J.A.Z.E.E.R.A, 2015).

The agreement also included Russia's oversight of securing nuclear fuel for Iran. Likewise, the Arak reactor will be converted into a reactor with peaceful goals for scientific research. (A.L.J.A.Z.E.E.R.A, 2015). Likewise, Iran will not build during the next 15 years, any heavy water reactors. The agreement included Iran's agreement to the terms of the historic agreement in return for lifting all sanctions on Iran, including those imposed by the United Nations and the

International Atomic Energy Agency, and not imposing any new embargo on Iran by America and the European Union. (B.B.C,2015b).

5.1 Iran-US Relations In The Period Of Donald Trump's Term

Over the past years, the united states of America had sought to create a middle east free from armed and terrorist movements, and not dominated by any regional parties that have agenda that contradict the interests of united states, or Israel in the region. Seeking behind that, to achieve stability in the entire region, which would facilitate the movement of the energy market and export and importing Gaz, but the presence of an expansionary iranian project, as well as major economic crises, was the reasons for Washington's failure to achieve this. (Parsi, 2017). Likewise, the middle east region was real test for US former president Barak Obama, as it witnessed many radical political transformations such as the Arab Spring demonstrations, the war in Syria, and the war in Libya in addition to the growing role of Tehran in neighboring countries such as Iraq, Lebanon, Syria and in the gulf region, for that, the middle east has been a source of inconvenience to America as the region has a great important to the white house. (Parsi, 2017).

As a result of Iran's pivotal role in the middles east. A region of fundamental importance to the white house, Barak Obama's administration has resorted a method of rapprochement and appeasement with Tehran in attempt to contain it and reduce its influence, which was growing dramatically in the neighboring countries, the appeasement policy that Barak Obama adopted with Iran emerged through the signing of the famous nuclear agreement in 2015 with the participation of America, in o official recognition by the united states of the iranian peaceful nuclear program, and even supported it by agreeing to be a part of an international agreement with other European countries. (Office of the Press Secretary, 2015) But the policy adopted by Barak Obama, lured Tehran instead of pushing it to co-ordination and logical cooperation with the white house, rather, it pushed it to believe in the logic of the status quo In international relations, as it reached the point of no return, it began to expand strongly in the region, and did not consider Washington's interests in the region, absolutely after 2015 nuclear deal. (Office of the Press Secretary, 2015)

It was also one of the motivates that forced Barak Obama administration to resort to approving the nuclear agreement with Iran, is that the threats that appeared every period regarding America intentions to bomb Iran militarily did not have any real benefits, especially since its risks are much greater than the positives. This policy that Barak Obama adopted with Iran was one of the strong motives of the current US president Donald Trump to fundamentally disagree with his American predecessor against the Islamic republic, since the elections campaign for the 2016 presidential elections, trump began a severe criticism on Tehran calling for the abolition of the nuclear deal and Washington's withdraw from it. (ANDERSON, SADJADPOUR, 2019). Trump was targeting the American right, which rejects Tehran's role in the middle east, and at the same time he presented himself as an alternative president to Barak Obama, the democrat who caused success in the Iran nuclear deal, threatening America's interests in the middle east. (Parsi, 2017).

Therefore, it is possible to monitor the features of the change in the policies of the both Barak Obama and Donald trump, regarding the most important issue in the middle east , which is the Iran case.at the outset, it should be noted that the general appearance in Trump's policy is that of the nation state , or national thought , as trump seeks to serve America's interests, did not care to develop his country's role externally if that would affect America's international cohesion and strength. (ANDERSON, SADJADPOUR, 2019). On the other hand, Barak Obama believed that America's true power is in its ability to manage international and global conflicts with wisdom, and ability to find rational solutions to these wars and conflicts, which help to strengthen America's external presence and to rally the world around it as the largest country in the world. (Washington post, 2015, July 14)

Also, as for the middle east region, Obama's policies were supportive of the iranian position, unlike trump, who has tended to support Israel, and strengthen its role in the region to confront the Islamic republic of Iran, whose presence in the region has grown significantly. But Barak Obama, did not try to show his rejection for the Arab Spring revolutions or the heads of states who came to power because of these revolutions, in return trump clearly supported all Arab

regimes that came through military coups in the middle east as is the case In Egypt. (Washington post, 2015, July 14)

5.2 Features Of Donald Trump's Foreign Policy During The US Elections In 2016

Clearly, the features of the policies adopted by Donald Trump during the campaign for the US presidency in 2016 differed from other previous presidents, trump is coming from the business world to the political world and striving to reach power in the unites states. Consequently, Trump's perceptions of governance and administration and even his country's relations with the middle east or the rest of the world are perceptions stemming from his economic and not political backgrounds. (ANDERSON, SADJADPOUR, 2019). Thus , the first features of Trump's policies that he adopted during the propaganda in the US elections in 2016 is that the America is a head of all other countries, as he believed that America does not have to pay the cost of protecting other countries and that the US military must return from all conflict countries around the world, including the middle east region, and that those looking for America protection must pay billions of dollars for this protection, and that America's interests are the first and last motive for the white house moves abroad. (B.I.,2020, December 3).

Trump's belief in the value of his country , and that it should not be involved in middle east conflicts without a great financial reward produced with him another feature of trump's foreign policies, that he prompted in the propaganda in the US elections in 2016 , which is a sign of isolation , as trump was one of the presidents who believed strongly with the importance of America being closed to its internal problems, and not interfering in any external crisis unless it affects Washington's national security. (ANDERSON, SADJADPOUR, 2019). This was evident in the absence of a clear role in the beginning of the Libyan crisis after Khalifa Hafter announced work to storm the Libyan capital, Tripoli and rule it, so there was no a clear role for the white house in the beginning in this crisis. (B.I.,2020, December 3). So other country's role expanded like Russia, and Turkey, in addition to countries from European union, which strengthen the differences in Libya without any solutions, also there was no role

for Washington during the trump era in the Uyghur crisis, which witnessed massive violations by china, but with the international pressure, the white house seemed to respond partially and ineffectively to the crisis, in addition to the crisis in Yemen, in which there was no real role. Effective for Washington and its absence allowed for major interventions by Iran, Saudi Arabia, and the Emirates, which caused the entire country to disintegrate. (Sterio, 2016).

Likewise, according to the isolation policy adopted by Donald Trump, he believes that European Union must pay the costs of defending itself, and Washington will not pay any money to establish military bases that protect Europe. Likewise, Trump's position, which supported the transfer of the US embassy to Jerusalem, was a decision that caused a political crisis around the world, as the US president does not care with international agreements and does not care also with Arab, Islamic or international reaction, especially those European countries that rejected the decision. (Sterio, 2016).

Likewise, one of the features of US President Donald Trump's foreign policies is that there is no way for military intervention in any country facing conflict or war around the world to save millions who face humanitarian crises, as long as that crisis does not affect US interests, and therefore Washington in this case is unlike previous US administrations, It does not support humanitarian crises or seek solutions for them, for example, the calls that came out for years and are still calling for the necessity to intervene to save Uighurs from the violations of China as well as Muslims in Myanmar, as well as the Kashmir crisis and India's violations, (Samadi, 2018). as well as the situation in Africa, especially in countries such as Mali where the French violations are, other countries that witness massive humanitarian violations, where the US role does not exist. But if the American interests were threatened in this case, Washington would intervene even if it did not obtain approval from the United Nations to pass this military intervention. (Entessar, Afrasiabi,2019).

Another feature of Donald Trump's foreign policy is that the United States of America is not interested in opening to the world, but rather closes its borders to those coming from abroad, with his decision to immigrate to the United States of America, where he aimed to reduce the execution coming to his country, as well as Building a wall on the border with Mexico to prevent the influx of

migrants and refugees. But all of this can be considered policies that come within the framework of addressing the American voter to always gain support and electoral votes, (Harzli, 2018). but the important feature in US President Donald Trump's foreign policies is the absolute support for Israeli policies in the Middle East, the realization of all its interests, and an attempt to prevent any changes in the region to not affect the security of Israel. (Entessar, Afrasiabi,2019).

5.3 Features Of Trump's Political Speech

With the different features of Trump's foreign policies, which differed from what many of the recognized US policies were, also comes Trump's political speech, which differs with the speeches of US former American presidents, especially Trump's speech naturally matches the features of his foreign policies. (Entessar, Afrasiabi,2019).Where Trump's political speech is characterized by strange in its vocabulary, terminology and political connotations, in addition to the many attacks sometimes, insults, accusations and lack of discipline in choosing terms, and even lying at other times, which are all vocabulary inconsistent with the position of the President of the United States of America, but it could be from The reasons of that Trump has no political background whatsoever and has no experience in political or media practice, in addition to lack of diplomatic experience, which produces such discourse. (Conley, 2017).

The other important thing that constitutes the political discourse of US President Donald Trump is that his terminology is influenced by the terms investments and businesses, as US President Donald Trump is a businessman and therefore many of the terms he uses in his media, political or even diplomatic speech are vocabulary where it is commercial , and even focuses Always on the money accounts and America's gains and financial losses, without regarding to America's political and diplomatic value around the world. (Conley, 2017). This was evident in his frequent talk about arms deals to Saudi Arabia, and even his appearance in a press conference with Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman to talk about billions of dollars in arms deals, as well as the many statements regarding the need to obtain funds from Saudi Arabia and the Gulf countries to provide security services to their country. (Gardner, 2018).

Despite the strangeness of the American rhetoric during the era of President Donald Trump, he tried to win over the largest popular bloc in America, which is not concerned with the political philosophy of their country, so he succeeded to win high percentage of popularity all over United States of America. (Gardner, 2018). Otherwise, the political speech of US President Donald Trump was closer to the commercial propaganda rhetoric, as if he was promoting a commodity, trying to convince the public about it, which is what he succeeded in, especially in his relationship with the Middle East and the Gulf countries in particular, as he was able to exploit the Gulf crisis represented In the blockade of Saudi Arabia, the UAE and Bahrain against Qatar in concluding billions of dollars in arms deals for all of these parties and providing hundreds of thousands of job opportunities for the Americans because of these huge sales of American weapons. (Ben-Meir, 2020).

5.4 Factors Of US Foreign Policy Toward Iran In The Period Of Donald Trump

The US President Donald Trump discussed Iran affairs in many of his speeches, even when he was a candidate in the US presidential elections in 2016, and repeatedly warned about Iranian policy in the Middle East and around the world as well, so it was expected that US President Donald Trump's policies towards Iran would be punitive and Very cruel to the Iranian regime and economy as well. Although in the early period of US President Donald Trump's rule, his policies towards the Iranian Republic were unclear, and it appeared that he had no real agenda in dealing with the Iranian issues, but with the passage of time, the features of the US policy against the Iranian Republic appeared, so there was a series of punitive measures such as US sanctions against the Iranian regime, trying to reduce Iran's military influence in neighboring countries, especially Syria and Iraq, and other measures that clearly shown the White House policy against Hassan Rouhani government. (Ben-Meir, 2020).

Likewise, Trump's statements before coming to power in America and after his success in the American elections carried clear hostility to the Iranian Republic. On the other hand, Trump's success in elections was an unexpected matter for the Iranian side, which committed to restraint in its reaction to the results of the American elections, and the Iranian republic's statements tightened on the need

to continue the nuclear agreement concluded in 2015 with the previous US administration, which was headed by former President Barack Obama. (Gurtov, 2020).

5.5 The Factors Of Iran's Foreign Policy In The Middle East

It is not possible to discuss the American foreign policies towards the Middle East and Iran, without discussing the determinants that relate to Iranian foreign policy and their implications in the Middle East and the interests of the United States of America, (A.L.J.A.Z.E.E.R.A,2017) especially since these determinants are among the deep and complex components that accurately define the policies of the Islamic Republic in the region, like:

The religion in the Islamic Revolution: In the Iranian case, there is an ideology that is strongly present in the political scene and has a strong influence in Iranian foreign policy towards the West and America, especially Tehran still remembers the military coup that was carried out by the CIA against the government of former Prime Minister Muhammad Mossadegh in 1953, And that the revolution was launched mainly to reject the American influence in Iran. (Gurtov, 2020).

Citizens' economic demands: This item is one of the important items in the determinants of Iranian foreign policy, as Tehran has been suffering from catastrophic economic conditions for decades, and the government seeks to get rid of American and Western pressure related to its nuclear project in order to be able to make huge investments that allow progress in the lives of citizens And if the Iranian government succeeds in providing economic investments that push the economy forward, this will help to ensure that citizens continue to support the Iranian revolution and its representative in government, and ensure the continuation of the Iranian revolution in ruling the country for long periods. (Phares, 2020).

Relations with neighboring countries and the West: There is no doubt that Iranian relations with the countries of the region, in addition to Iran's relations with the Western countries, are one of the main determinants of the foreign policy of the Islamic state, as, Tehran suffers from isolation in the Middle East

due to its military and political interventions in some countries, (Al-Alwani, 2018). in addition to being A real source of inconvenience for the US interests in the Middle East, and thus Iran's interventions in Syria, Iraq and Yemen created a state of competition between the countries of the region with it and with its influence, which caused instability, in addition to the presence of perceptions in Iran evaluating the country's foreign policy orientations, as Some believe that the foreign policy should be managed from a sectarian perspective, while another party believes in the importance of managing Iran's foreign policy from a national perspective. (Rinehart, 2018).

5.6 The Environment Of The Islamic Republic's Influence In The Middle East

with the expansion of the Islamic Republic's influence in the entire Middle East region, considering the continuing conflict in the region and the failure to resolve and end any existing wars, it is necessary to refer to some of the ingredients that helped strengthen Iran's policies in the region, such as:

Wars in the Middle East region: such as the war in Lebanon in 2006 between Hezbollah and Israel and the complication of the crisis in the country, the occupation of Iraq and the departure of Saddam Hussein, then the emergence of ISIS and other armed organizations, then the situation in Syria and Yemen, which helped Iranian intervention to control the fate of these countries. (Abramson, 2019).

The crisis of the Arab countries from the Palestinian resistance: With the decline of Arab support for the Palestinian cause, the Iranian role appeared financially and militarily in support of the resistance in Palestine, so Iran became the most important alternative to the resistance away from the Arab routine and the agendas of the Arab regimes that consider the American and Israeli interests in the Middle East not the Palestinian interests. (Abramson, 2019).

Demonstrations in the Arab world: Iran supported the demonstrations as the owner of a successful Islamic revolution and took advantage of chaos in some Arab countries to expand its influence in them, such as Yemen and Syria. Also, Iran has tried to expand its influence in the Middle East to strengthen its

position in its political conflict with the United States of America, and America's allies in the Middle East such as Saudi Arabia and some Gulf countries, in addition to forbid the emergence of a strong Arab bloc facing Iranian influence. (Martin, 2019, October 1).

5.7 The Starting Points Of The US-Iranian Conflict In The Middle East

The Iranian revolution was one of the issues of great challenge to the interests of the United States of America in the Middle East region, especially this revolution sought to end Washington's interference in Iran's interests, after the coup that was led by the CIA and Britain against the well-known Iranian Prime Minister Muhammad Mossadegh in 1953. (F.O.R.E.I.G.N.P.O.L.I.C.Y, 2018). Therefore, considering the success of the Iranian revolution, the United States of America adopted policies from the beginning aimed at ending the Islamic revolution and stopping the spread of its principles in neighboring countries in the Middle East, so, United States of America has sought over the past years to stem any development in Iran's foreign policies in the region. (Woodward, 2019).

- United States' Moves Toward Iran's Policies In The Middle East Region Were Based On Some Factors Like

The oil industry in the Middle East region, where the region possesses enormous wealth of oil and gas, and United States imports a large proportion of oil consumption from the Middle East region, therefore Washington believes that the expansion of Iran's influence will negatively affect the oil industry, and It undermines the import of oil needs for the United States of America, even threatens the entire oil industry in the region. (Woodward, 2019).

One of the important elements that formed the basis of the US-Iranian conflict is the American fear of the Islamic Republic's nuclear project, as, Tehran's possession of the nuclear program will threaten the national security of Israel, and this is essential for America, which seeks every effort to provide security for Israel in the Middle East region, so Washington sought With all ways to confront Iran's nuclear aspirations by suing the Islamic Republic in the Security Council and trying to create an international lobby to face Iran to stop the

nuclear program, in addition to the sanctions weapon that Washington has relied on. (Ben-Meir, 2020).

Also The main issue in the Iranian-American conflict in the Middle East, after the crisis of the nuclear program, is the Iranian influence in Iraq, and the attempt to undermine it by the American administration, especially after the occupation of Iraq in 2003, as Iraq witnessed a political and military competition between the influence of Iran and America, which naturally affected On the stability of the country, on the other hand , Iran was able to employ Shiite military militias in Iraq to disturb the American presence in Iraq and target American soldiers for many years. (Javier E,2017).

This proxy conflict in Iraq between Iran and the United States of America created a new political and military situation in the region, as Iran became one of the main countries that control the fate of Iraq in exchange for the American military presence in the Arab country, which ended with it any attempts to save Iraq after the lean war years (F.O.R.E.I.G.N.P.O.L.I.C.Y, 2018).. Likewise, the United States of America sought to arrange its conditions in Iraq in a permanent and stable manner, but on the other hand Tehran pressed for an end to the US military presence in the neighboring country, so, there was the military clash between Iran and America on Iraqi lands for many years. (Javier E,2017).

5.8 Islamic republic Of Iran And Donald Trump's Foreign Policy

At the outset, it must be noted that the US administration during the era of the current President Donald Trump faced many fundamental problems in the Middle East region, as a result of the expansion of Iranian influence , the first of these issues is the nuclear program of the Islamic Republic and Trump's desire to adopt policies different from those adopted by the President The former Barack Obama, then the issue of the Arab-Israeli conflict, in addition to the Iranian-Israeli conflict, in addition to the presence of armed organizations in the region, which represent a great threat to American soldiers in the countries of the Middle East. (I.I.I.S, 2017). In all of this, Iran is the biggest challenge to the influence of the United States of America in the entire region. (Ritter, 2018).

On the other hand, the American perception during the era of President Donald Trump of the Iranian role in the Middle East was that Tehran represented a real threat to the interests of the United States of America, (BROOKES, 2018). its military bases and its soldiers in the region, and Tehran is threatening the allies of the United States of America in the region, such as Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and the UAE in addition to Until Tehran represents a real threat to the situation in Yemen, after its support for the Houthi group. (Ritter, 2018).

The Donald Trump administration also believes that the Iranian Republic supports armed groups and militias in Iraq, in Lebanon such as Hezbollah, and in Yemen such as the Houthi group and in Syria. This support increases Iran's influence in the region, which threatens the stability of the entire Middle East countries. (BROOKES, 2018). The administration of US President Donald Trump also believes that Iran's influence in the Middle East region will cause the spread of the principles of the Islamic revolution, which is a dangerous indicator that affects the cohesion of Gulf states which are supported by the United States of America that reject the pattern of revolutions adopted by Iran. (Ritter, 2018).

- The Strategies Of Donald Trump Foreign Policy Against Iran

US President Donald Trump adopted the strategies of direct confrontation with the Iranian Republic, (R.T,2017). in contrast to the policies of US Former President Barack Obama, who tried to contain Tehran, so, it is possible to refer to Trump's strategies against Iran, through the following three items:

- Confronting The Iranian Nuclear Program

US President Donald Trump's relationship with the Iran-American crisis began since his election campaign in 2016, when he repeatedly declared his rejection of the nuclear agreement in which US former President Barack Obama participated in 2015 with the participation of major European countries, the 5 + 1 Group. (R.T,2017). Where Trump indicated in his explanation of his reasons and convictions regarding his rejection of the Iranian nuclear agreement that there are fundamental and complex flaws in the agreement, as Trump believes that the agreement does not prevent the Islamic Republic of Iran from producing

a nuclear bomb, all these reasons prompted the US President to announce the withdrawal from the Iranian nuclear agreement in May 2018. (Ritter, 2018).

In addition, US President Donald Trump's decision to withdraw from the nuclear agreement caused a crisis for the Iranian side and led the Iranian authorities to be in an embarrassing position in front of the Iranian opposition. One of the reasons that US President Donald Trump mentioned in the context of his withdrawal of the nuclear agreement concluded in 2015 is that the agreement in the current form, will not prevent Tehran from acquiring nuclear weapons, as the agreement allowed the Islamic Republic to continue enriching its uranium. (Rezaei, 2018).

Donald Trump also says that the nuclear agreement is not based on the assumption that Iran's program is for peaceful use, but he believes that Iran's nuclear program is a major threat to the entire region, in addition to a threat to the security of Israel and America's allies in the Middle East region. Also, one of the main reasons for the disagreement between President Trump and his predecessor, former President Barack Obama, is that the current president believes that the nuclear agreement in which Barack Obama participated, provided the Iranians with more investments, and canceled many economic restrictions and sanctions that Iran was suffering from because of the nuclear program. (Rezaei, 2018).

Also, Iran, according to the convictions of US President Donald Trump, exploited the nuclear agreement in order to increase its spending on the military aspects in the country, which helped to strengthen Iran's military capabilities and strengthen the capabilities of Iran's military arms in the region as well, as Trump believes that the money that Iran obtained from the agreement of The nuclear program was used to produce missiles and spread chaos in the Middle East by Iran , (A.C.R.P.S,2017) in addition to that there were no clear mechanisms in the agreement preventing the Islamic Republic from adopting activities that threaten the region and the interests of the United States of America. (Rezaei, 2018).

One of the negative repercussions of the American decision of the withdraw of the nuclear agreement in mid-2018 was at the international level, Trump's decision weakened international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear

weapons and showed America's negative position in the international system. (ELÍAS, 2017). The other matter is to dispel the convergence of views between America and the leaders of the EU, The Europeans demanded many times from Trump not to withdraw, but he did not listen to their desire and decided to unilaterally withdraw from the nuclear agreement. The other matter of the repercussions of Trump's decision to withdraw from the nuclear agreement is that the American decision gives Iran the right to withdraw from the nuclear agreement as well and work to revitalize its program, which allows the existence of a country in the Middle East with a nuclear project, that will threaten the national security of the region. In full. (ELÍAS, 2017).

- Confronting The Iranian Missile Program

One of the reasons that prompted US President Donald Trump to withdraw from the nuclear deal was his desire to stop Iran's continued development of its missile system, especially since Tehran did not fill any warnings from Washington in this matter. America was concerned that Iran would obtain long-range missiles that would push it to target Israel or America's interests in the Middle East. (A.C.R.P.S,2017) Trump's rejection of the nuclear agreement came because the agreement does not place clear restrictions on the Iranian missile program, which opens the door for Tehran to develop its missile system, and Trump adopted this hypothesis as part of the US sanctions imposed on Iran were related to the missile program. (Khomeini, 1981).

In addition to the US position on the missile program, there was also the European position, which views Iran's missile program as a clear threat to the interests of America and its European allies and their interests in the Middle East, as the European parties are concerned about Iranian missile activity. (Khomeini, 1981). Moreover, of course, the Gulf countries have clear concerns about the Iranian missile program, as countries in the Gulf fear the ability of Iranian missiles to target Gulf institutions and facilities. Therefore, the US decisions to withdraw from the nuclear agreement in addition to the sanctions imposed by the US administration on Iran's missile program. (Khomeini, 1981).

- Confronting Iran's Influence In Neighboring Countries And Yemen

The United States of America realizes that the Islamic Republic is a threat to its interests in the Middle East, considering an Iranian desire to extend its influence, in some countries, despite the geopolitical and national security considerations of these countries. The source of the danger is that there is an Iranian desire in the country's political system to control the Arab Gulf and spread the ideas of its revolution in all countries of the region. Therefore, Iranian foreign policy has an intertwined nature, and is based on several constituents, including the geographical component. Iran's distinguished geographical position in the region helps it control international sea lanes that have an importance in global trade movement such as the Strait of Hormuz, and Iran's geographical position has helped in drawing policy. (Juneau, 2019). The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic and drawing up the mechanisms of its dealings with neighboring countries, as well as the historical, ideological, and ethnic components, all of which are ingredients that help strengthen Iran's movement in the region. (Juneau, 2019).

On the other hand, Iran has developed a fundamental strategy for its role in the Middle East region that relies on the need to transform the Islamic Republic into a regional power that has an influence on the countries of the Middle East, in addition to the ability to confront all threats facing Tehran from any Western or Arab side, as well as building strategic and strong relations. (A.C.R.P.S,2017) With the countries of the Middle East. Therefore, the Islamic Republic has an integrated project for the countries of the Middle East region. This project assumes that threatening the allies of the United States of America in the Middle East, such as Saudi Arabia, the Emirates and Bahrain, will push Washington to accept Iran as a regional partner in the region. Sharing the influence of Iran and America in the region according to this assumption. (Alavi, 2019).

On the other hand, the Iranian intervention in Syria differs from the reasons for the intervention in Yemen, and from the reasons for the intervention in Lebanon and Iraq, which are reasons that carry many contradictions. Abdullah Saleh, and then supported the Houthi group after that, while in Iraq it supported Shiite militias in the face of the American presence, while its position in Lebanon was

through supporting a Shiite political party in the face of the entire Lebanese state. (Alavi, 2019). Therefore, the American position during the era of President Donald Trump was clear towards Iranian influence in neighboring countries and in the Middle East region through the weapon of sanctions and the decision to withdraw from the nuclear agreement. (Alavi, 2019).

5.9 Donald Trump's Administration Sanctions Against Iran

Since he came to power in America, US President Donald Trump adopted a policy that was called the maximum pressure policy, from which the US president aimed to pressure Tehran to choose between stopping its activities that worried America and its interests in the Middle East or bearing the economic consequences of this US policy. (Fraihat, 2020). In 2018, US President Donald Trump withdrew from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding the nuclear agreement that was signed in 2015, as part of the maximum pressure policy that Trump adopted to counter Iran's influence in the Middle East region, but Trump was not satisfied with withdrawing from the nuclear agreement, but his administration presented 12 demands for Tehran, Through these conditions, he sought to pressure Iran to limit its influence in the Middle East region, and returning to other negotiations for another nuclear agreement , but of course the American demands were closer to a lack of logic because these demands included in the first place decreasing Much of Iran's influence, both in the region and in relation to its nuclear project. (Fraihat, 2020).

The demands included the necessity of stopping uranium enrichment and closing its heavy-water reactor, and A complete abandonment of the nuclear program and allowing inspectors of the International Atomic Energy Agency to reach the sites of nuclear reactors in Iran with ease. (Ghattas, 2020). In addition to that, the demands of the United States, which was announced by US Secretary of State Mike Pompeo in May of 2018, included stopping the deployment of ballistic missiles, especially these missiles cause a major crisis for America's allies in the Middle East region, as these missiles can reach Saudi Arabia, the Emirates, Bahrain, and other countries of importance Strategy of the United States of America in the region. (Fraihat, 2020).

America also demanded the release of all detainees from the United States of America who were arrested in Iran on charges of espionage, in addition to non-interference in Iraqi affairs, the withdrawal of all Iranian forces from Syria, and an end to the funding of armed militias in the Middle East region, such as the Lebanese Hezbollah and Shiite organizations in Iraq, In Bahrain and Yemen, (F.C.R.S,2017). in addition to stop the activity of the Quds Force which belong to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, stopping the threat to the Gulf states and not threatening international maritime traffic in the Strait of Hormuz, and finally stopping the so-called cyber-attacks. (Ghattas, 2020).

- US Sanctions Against Iran In 2017

In the first period following the success of US President Donald Trump in the US presidential elections, the US administration resorted to new policies in order to confront Iranian influence in the Middle East region, Among its most important features is the escalation against Iran all the time, criticizing it and making permanent accusations against it, threatening the nuclear deal and imposing increasing sanctions on Tehran, policies that in the end clearly crystallized the features of Donald Trump's policies and his administration towards Iran in the years following his arrival to the US presidency. (Seliktar, 2019).

- The Features Of US Policies In The First Year Of US President Donald Trump's Term

Threatening Iran nuclear project: Trump's policies in the first year of his rule were mixed, as he promised his electorates to cancel America's signature on the nuclear agreement, but after he came to power, he resorted to postponing withdrawal from the nuclear agreement for a year and a half after pressure from His administration and advice from international parties. and despite Donald Trump's retreat in the first year of his rule from the promise he made to his voters, which is to withdraw from the nuclear agreement, he asked the US administration to evaluate the joint comprehensive action plan that was the reason for signing the 2015 agreement with Iran, so the positions varied Trump vis-à-vis the US nuclear agreement in 2017, (F.C.R.S,2017). In April of the same year, Trump signed a resolution that included recognition of Iran's

commitment to the terms of the nuclear agreement, and accordingly Trump extended the suspension of sanctions imposed on Iran. (Seliktar, 2019).

Likewise, in July 2017, Trump signed a declaration of Iran's commitment to the terms of the nuclear agreement and extended the suspension of US sanctions on the Islamic Republic, but in October of the same year, Trump announced that Iran would not abide by the terms of the nuclear agreement, which is the opportunity he was waiting for the sake of The implementation of the promise he made for his voters to cancel the nuclear agreement, so he referred the Iran nuclear agreement to the Congress in October 2017 to decide its fate within 60 days, but Trump was forced to sign a declaration of Iran's commitment to the terms of the nuclear agreement, because the of Congress's position on withdrawing from the nuclear agreement. (A.L.J.A.Z.Z.E.E.R.A,2016).

The use of sanctions policies against the Islamic Republic: Although US President Donald Trump did not impose any sanctions on Iran to stop its nuclear project considering the developments that appeared in the first year of his rule, but of course the US administration resorted to other types of sanctions that affected other issues where they were as follows:

Military arms of the Islamic Republic of Iran: The US administration sought to reduce Iran's influence in the Middle East region by targeting its military arms, especially Washington, as well as other countries, see that Iran is a state that does not abide by the law and uses many military arms in the region to implement its policies, whether inside Iran or in the neighborhood countries. Therefore, (F.C.R.S,2017). in 2017 the US administration targeted people who were linked to the Iranian missile program, in addition to companies and officials in China, Lebanon, and the UAE who were linked to the Iranian missile program. The sanctions also targeted Iranian military entities that support Bashar Al-Assad and Iran's policies in Syria, in addition to that, the Casta Law was passed in the US Senate, where the law targeted sanctions on Iran because of its ballistic program, then sanctions related to the Revolutionary Guard and sanctions against the Lebanese Hezbollah. (A.L.J.A.Z.Z.E.E.R.A,2016).

Sanctions against the missile program: This military program has always been causing a real crisis for America in the Middle East and its fundamental and military interests in addition to its allies in the Gulf states, especially the

program helps Iran to reach all the required targets in record time and with high accuracy, which threatens the security and existence of America In the region, in addition to the security of the Gulf states, that is why the US sanctions have targeted individuals, entities, and people outside Iran who are directly related to the missile program. (Hussain, 2016).

Targeting the Iranian economy: The US sanctions were and are still targeting the Iranian economy to prevent it from pumping billions into military development. Therefore, in the first year of Donald Trump's rule, the sanctions targeted the Iranian economy, financial transfers, and then foreign investment inside Iran. (Hussain, 2016).

Sanctions targeting the Iranian regional influence: The United States of America oversaw the holding of an expanded Arab-Islamic summit in the Saudi capital, Riyadh, in May 2017, followed by a mini-summit with the Gulf Cooperation Council in order to confront Iran and reshape America's relationship with the Gulf states, then targeting Iran and its forces in Syria, establishing military bases in Syria and increasing American soldiers in Syria to counter Iran's influence, (Solomon, 2017). as well as accusing Iran of supporting the Houthis in the war against Saudi Arabia, As well as strengthening relations with Saudi Arabia, and choosing Riyadh as the first capital that Trump visited after his arrival in power in the United States of America to emphasize America's clear and firm policies against Iran in coordination with Saudi Arabia in the region, and then establish an expanded American Islamic coalition to confront terrorism in the region, but without Iran, Aiming at the strong and effective confrontation of Iran's influence in the Middle East. (US-Iran Relations: Issues, 2015).

- The Iranian Reaction Against The Sanctions

On the other hand, the US policies pursued by Donald Trump in the first year of his rule caused strong reactions inside Iran, as Iranian President Hassan Rouhani faced great criticism from the government and the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Revolution after the US sanctions, especially Rouhani was claiming that America's policies in the era of Trump will be far from the escalation against the Islamic Republic, and these expectations have not been fulfilled. (US-Iran

Relations: Issues, 2015). Therefore, Iran has sought to confront US sanctions through several steps and measures such as:

Iran relied on the terms of the nuclear agreement it signed in 2015 and sought to build large economic partnerships with Europe in the fields of oil, energy, cars, infrastructure, and aircraft. also, Iran has sought to strengthen its relations with international partners in the nuclear deal, such as the European Union, in order not to find itself alone in the face of sanctions and arbitrary decisions by America. (farhan, 2019). Trump imposed it on the Islamic Republic. then Iran insisted on proceeding with the development of the ballistic program and the missile program in response to the US sanctions, as it sought to ensure that it would not be affected by Trump's new policies, and that Tehran would try to bypass all sanctions and obstacles to continue its weapons programs. finally, Iran relied on economic austerity to face economic sanctions, a policy that, of course, led citizens to complain. (farhan, 2019).

5.10 US Sanctions Against Iran In 2018- Maximum Pressure Policy Against Iran

Trump sought to erase all the policies of former President Barack Obama towards the Iranian Republic, therefore the first year of Trump's rule passed without the US President being able to implement what he promised, as local and international pressures hindered the cancelling of America's association with the Iranian nuclear agreement concluded in 2015, but in the year 2018 With the escalation of events in the Middle East, Donald Trump adopted a policy he called the policy of maximum pressure against Iran. (Katzman, 2020).

The maximum pressure policy aimed primarily at paralyzing the nuclear agreement signed in 2015 and stripping Iran of all the options of this agreement, so in 2018 he imposed two packages of sanctions on Iran, the first package of sanctions targeted the non-oil economic sector as well as foreign currency trade in Iran, and trade Gold, silver, precious metals, supplies of minerals to Iran, large deals in Iranian riyals, and transactions involving Iranian sovereign debt securities. (Solomon, 2017). Then was the second package of US sanctions on the Republic of Iran, as they were very difficult sanctions on the Iranian economy, targeting the purchase of Iranian oil and oil materials, Iranian ports,

shipping lines, shipping industries, the Iranian energy sector and providing Iran with insurance services. (Katzman, 2020).

- Iran Reactions On Trump's Sanctions In 2018

On the other hand, Iran found itself facing a big problem, which is how to confront the American sanctions imposed on it by the American administration, especially as it is one of the strongest sanctions imposed by Washington on it. Therefore, Iran initially sought cooperation with Western countries that rejected the US sanctions, as well as some other countries, such as the European Union, China, and Russia. Tehran negotiated with the European Union, which decided not to withdraw from the nuclear agreement and announced the search for financial mechanisms to help Iran to confront Trump's new policies. (BEHRAVESH, 2020).

The other matter that Iran has resorted to face the harsh US pressure and severe sanctions against it is its constant threat to enrich uranium again, as it waded to return to uranium enrichment in the event of the collapse of the nuclear agreement concluded in 2015. In addition, Iran has sought to counter US pressure to reduce oil exports because of the sanctions through coordination with neighboring countries such as Iraq, Turkey, Afghanistan, and some Gulf countries. (BEHRAVESH, 2020).

The other measure that Iran sought to use to confront the US sanctions is the threat of the regional security, as Iran tried to threaten to halt oil exports in the region completely, which would cause a major security crisis in the region and thus affect the interests of America and its allies in the Middle East. Iran also sought to circumvent America's decisions on oil-related sanctions, as it resorted to attempts to smuggle oil away from international monitoring, (Solomon, 2017). and to use middlemen to sell oil and lure importers by offering discounts on oil prices. In the same context, Iran has sought to find alternative systems, as it discussed a Chinese proposal related to the use of the Chinese currency in trade between it and Iran, as well as resorting to illegal trade, money laundering, and the use of banks in neighboring countries. (U.S, 2017).

5.11 Assessment Of US Sanctions On Iran In 2018

America sought through the sanctions imposed by Donald Trump on Iran in 2018 to paralyze the Iranian economy, but at the same time, after the adoption of sanctions that sought to completely prevent the export of Iranian oil, 8 countries excluded from this decision, including Turkey, and the aim of this decision was trying to avoid any angry reactions or strong reaction from Iran towards these sanctions. (Solomon, 2017). Despite Donald Trump's attempt to destroy the Iranian economy through these harsh sanctions, the reality was to the contrary, Tehran has become accustomed to American and international sanctions that have continued since the Iranian revolution in 1979, and thus it has had extensive experience that helps it face any effects resulting from US or UN sanctions, Or European, so, Donald Trump's sanctions did not cause the Iranian economy in 2018 to destroy the Iranian economy, but of course they caused damage to the economic situation of the Islamic Republic. (U.S, 2017).

The US sanctions also aimed to inflame anger inside Iran and push citizens to demonstrate against the Iranian regime, but this was not achieved with the percentage that America was seeking, as Iran has witnessed protest demonstrations over the past many years, and therefore the demonstrations are not new to Iranian society, as Iran has witnessed demonstrations in years, were different and were strong and did not affect the regime in Iran. Therefore, the demonstrations that took place in Iran and came out against the economic situation are normal and not new to the political community in Iran. (C.R.S,2020).

As for pressuring Iran to improve its policies in the region, according to what Donald Trump sought through the harsh sanctions he imposed on the Iranian regime in 2018, especially Washington sees Iran as a real threat to security and stability and to US interests and to America's allies in the Middle East, However, the US sanctions did not achieve the required, especially the Iranian behavior in the region stems from a major Iranian project that seeks to export the Iranian revolution in the region, (Solomon, 2017). and thus, Iran's expansion project will not stop, regardless of the sanctions or obstacles to it. However, on the other hand, the sanctions issued by the US administration against the Iranian regime had a great negative impact on the Iranian people, who now see

themselves in the middle of the conflict between the US administration and the Iranian regime, considering each of the parties of the conflict adhere to its political and military position in the Middle East region. (C.R.S,2020).

5.12 US Sanctions On Iran In 2019

In the sanctions he imposed on the Iranian regime in 2018, US President Donald Trump targeted the military arms inside and outside Iran and its political and military influence in the region, but in the sanctions, he imposed on the Iranian regime in 2019, was aimed primarily at putting pressure on the Iranian regime and embarrassing it. Therefore, in his sanctions in 2019, he targeted areas that primarily affect the Iranian people, (A.A.W.S.A.T,2019). While the US administration refused to resort to the use of military force against Iran in 2019, but it pressured hard on the Iranian regime to embarrass it in front of the Iranian people, so it imposed many economic sanctions that targeted oil, transport, aviation and industry, and targeted the Revolutionary Guard, and the most important decision on the part of Donald Trump was to stop renewing Exemptions for countries that import oil from Iran, a measure that caused a major crisis for Iran. (C.R.S,2020).

Focusing on the Iranian economy was the first goal in the 2019 sanctions, in order to provoke the Iranian citizen, who in turn will pay the price for US policies towards Iran, which will push him according to America's expectations, to go out in demonstrations in order to pressure the Iranian regime to change its policies in The region and search for a way to negotiate with the US administration and end the state of conflict that has continued for decades, and indeed, 2019 witnessed many mass demonstrations due to a grinding economic crisis in Iran, so there were huge demonstrations against the increase in the price of fuel, (A.A.W.S.A.T,2019).so in the end of 2019,Iran and its cities witnessed mass demonstrations This resulted in dozens of deaths and thousands of arrests, and it was the first time that the demonstrations witnessed strong chants against the Supreme Leader of the Iranian Revolution and the echoing of explicit corruption accusations against the Supreme Leader, Iranian President Hassan Rouhani and his government. (Solomon, 2017).

The protests have caused strong reactions inside and outside Iran, the Iranian government has taken arbitrary measures against the demonstrators and citizens who participated in the demonstrations, and has disconnected the Internet to prevent the transmission of the demonstrations and their events through social media platforms or news sites to the world, and in return America sought to employ the demonstrations in its favor for the sake of Sending many messages to the Iranian people demonstrating against their government, that Washington supports their legitimate demands in the face of the Iranian regime. (C.R.S,2020).

the other thing that America targeted through the policies of President Donald Trump in 2019 in light of its efforts to confront Iranian influence in the Middle East region, is reducing Tehran's role in the region significantly and trim its nails in neighboring countries, as America sought to establish an Arab NATO in the year 2019, but it was not made public, as well as increasing the military forces in the region by sending military ships led by the aircraft carrier Abraham Lincoln to the Gulf, as well as mutual accusations between Iran and America of shooting down an American drone, as well as trying to form an international coalition to protect the navy in the Gulf Then sending 3000 American soldiers to the Gulf. (Abu Al-Qasim, 2018). This was followed by an important meeting of foreign ministers and representatives of 60 countries in Poland in February 2019 to discuss the future of security in the Middle East and to coordinate efforts to confront Iran's military and political influence in the Middle East. (A.A.W.S.A.T,2019).America also sought, through pressure on European countries, to withdraw European support of Iran in its nuclear project, also Washington pressured Europe to withdraw from the nuclear agreement concluded in 2015, but no response to these pressures was achieved. (Abu Al-Qasim, 2018).

- The Iranian Situation Of The US Sanctions In 2019

To confront the US sanctions, Iran has sought to adopt policies in different directions to reduce the American pressure on it. These Iranian policies included attempts to clash with America's allies in the Middle East, and to put pressure on global shipping traffic through riots in the Strait of Hormuz, then Targeting

US interests in Iraq, (A.A.W.S.A.T,2019).so the Iranian policies adopted by the Iranian government to confront Trump's sanctions were as follows:

Iran adopted the option of confrontation to face US sanctions. At the local level, the Iranian regime was able to take advantage of US sanctions in response to the demonstrations calling for the departure of the Iranian regime, and to reproduce terms such as “the greatest enemy of Iran,” and “death to America,” which are political slogans that appeared with The Iranian revolution, indeed, the Iranian authorities sought to send messages to the Iranian people, the content of which is that everyone must unite to face the US sanctions, and that talking about economic demands for citizens is a matter that contributes to serving America's goals that seek to besiege Iran and its people. (R.T,2017).

The other matter that Iran resorted to confront Donald Trump's sanctions in 2019 is to proceed with the development of its missile program and it carried out many tests in the beginning of 2019, also the Iranian regime tested several satellites in order to send messages to America's allies in the Gulf, including Iran's ability to Accurately reaching its goals in the Gulf states, Iran also sent a statement to the Security Council that includes holding America responsible for the possible collapse of the 2015 nuclear agreement. (A.A.W.S.A.T,2019).

In terms of the Iranian response externally as well, Tehran sought to clash with America's allies in the Gulf region to force them to pay part of the cost of the US sanctions on Iran, so the famous Saudi Aramco oil-producing company was targeted by one of Iran's arms in the region, the Houthi group, this was in September 2019, as this caused a major crisis in the region. Iran also targeted the shipping movement in the Strait of Hormuz, targeting many ships in the Strait of Hormuz, which had a negative impact on the movement of oil exports from the Middle East, and even created a state of fear for America and its allies in the region, of Iran's future intentions regarding shipping traffic in the Strait of Hormuz. (AL BAKER, 2019).

On the international level, Iran has not stopped its policies, through which it sought to create an international crisis in response to Donald Trump's harsh sanctions on the Iranian regime. It froze 8 articles of the nuclear agreement in response to America's sanctions, and then Iran announced some other measures that it has also making, including the announcement of not committing to selling

the excess quantities of the enriched uranium stockpile, and then raising the percentage of uranium enrichment, as well as not complying with any restrictions related to the nuclear project research, and in the end, it announced the resumption of uranium enrichment activities at the Verdu. (AL BAKER, 2019).

5.13 The US Sanctions Against Iran In 2020

With the continuing conflict between the United States and the Islamic Republic, Washington moved in the early 2020s to impose more pressure on the Iranian regime, especially after targeting the commander of the Quds Force, Qassim Soleimani, who was killed in Iraq, in an assassination operation with a strong impact on Iran of course, especially and that Soleimani was one of the powerful figures in the care of Iranian policies in the region. The targeting of Soleimani was not the most prominent incident that caused Iran's image in the region to shake, but the US pressure increased in Iran's arms in Iraq and Syria, in addition to targeting the Popular Mobilization militia in Iraq. Washington's pressure on that did not stop, rather it sought in the early 2020s to target more of the individuals and companies that provide facilities to Iran to overcome US sanctions. (A.R.A.B.I.C.S.P.U.T.N.I.K.N.E.W.S,2020).

In addition to the above, relations between America and Iran witnessed several developments in the first quarter of 2020, as Washington imposed a lot of pressure on the Iranian regime, especially with the worsening of the Corona virus crisis in the Islamic Republic, so the United States accused Tehran of hiding the real information about the Corona victims In the country, in addition to threats issued by the United States of America to companies that are interested in shipping, to prevent them from dealing with Iran and to prevent the storage of Iranian oil (U.N.I.T.E.D.S.T.A.T.E.S.I.N.S.T.I.T.U.T.E.O.F.P.E.A.C.E, 2020) The United States also continued its efforts to undermine the nuclear agreement signed by Iran in 2015, as Washington announced the end of the exemptions for peaceful nuclear cooperation, The United States also sought to persuade the countries participating in the nuclear agreement to change their position on Iran. America

also extended the arms embargo imposed on Iran, and depriving Tehran of obtaining its financial dues abroad. (A.R.A.B.I.C.S.P.U.T.N.I.K.N.E.W.S,2020).

- The Iranian Situation Of The US Sanctions In

On the other hand, Iran sought to alleviate US pressure on it, so it tried, diplomatically, to communicate with other countries in order to draw attention to the US sanctions on the Iranian government, especially in light of the escalation of the Corona epidemic that caused the Iranian economy to cripple, and the Iraqi arena was also the scene of military clashes Between Iran's Shiite military arms and between the US forces and interests, especially after the killing of Qassim Soleimani in Iraq. Likewise, Iranian reactions in Iraq did not stop. Rather, the military arms of Iran in Yemen were also moving, and the Houthis, supported by the Islamic Republic, targeted Saudi interests, especially some airports.

(U.N.I.T.E.D.S.T.A.T.E.S.I.N.S.T.I.T.U.T.E.O.F.P.E.A.C.E, 2020).

The Strait of Hormuz was also one of the goals that Iran used to respond to the United States of America, as there were friction operations with Western and American ships in the Strait of Hormuz, so Iran tried to evade the harsh US sanctions, but Washington's insistence to go ahead with its sanctions caused a major economic crisis for the Iranian side.

(U.N.I.T.E.D.S.T.A.T.E.S.I.N.S.T.I.T.U.T.E.O.F.P.E.A.C.E, 2020b).

5.14 Donald Trump's Policy Effects Against Iran, And The Role Of The European Partners

Donald Trump has come to power in the United States of America, and he seeks to reduce Iran's influence in the region, especially as he sees that former President Barack Obama made a big mistake by agreeing to participate in the nuclear agreement concluded with Iran in 2015, (Al-Wadaei, 2020).so he imposed many decisions that It represented great pressure on the Iranian government, including increasing and large sanctions, then withdrawing from the nuclear deal, then reimposing US sanctions on Iran, and he wanted from that:

First: Continuing the maximum pressure policies that he adopted since he came to power in the White House in 2016-2017, where he aimed, after withdrawing from the nuclear agreement, to exert pressure on the Iranian nuclear program, as he targeted the countries that support Iran's program, in order to try to change their position against Iran as well as impose Many sanctions affected Iran's nuclear program, also Trump tried to remove the nuclear program card from Iran in order to force it to submit to new negotiations on American terms and not on Tehran's conditions. (Abu Al-Qasim,2019).

Second: Forcing Iran to violate the nuclear agreement and losing international supporters, as Trump sought, through maximum pressure policies, to paralyze Iran's financial capabilities and then deprive it of any sources of income, and thus this would negatively affect its economic performance, and cause its inability to continue the nuclear program and then Iran will be forced to violate the nuclear agreement in response to the policies of the United States of America, and thus this causes new sanctions against Iran from European countries that were supporting the nuclear program. (Al-Wadaei, 2020). Consequently, Iran finds itself alone in the face of harsh US policies without the presence of any supporters, whether in Europe, China, Russia, or even any partners in the Middle East. All these policies will end by pushing the Iranian people to frustration and suffering due to the expected economic crises because of the strangulation of the Iranian economy, and thus the emergence of huge protests in the country. (Abu Al-Qasim,2019).

Third: the order of policies steps pressures the maximum, where Washington had a clear plan for sanctions on Iran, and a clear plan to reduce the influence of Iran in the Middle politically East, militarily, and geographically, and in return to Iran had not have a clear-cut plan to counter US pressure, but its policies rely only on the reactions toward Washington's policies. (Al-Wadaei, 2020).

On the other hand, the Iranian authorities had nothing but to deal calmly with the new American policies that seek to cripple their influence in the entire Middle East region, and sought to create new means to help them overcome the economic crisis, and searched for new ways to export oil away from American control, to create new mechanisms for economic cooperation with China, with Russia and with the European Union, especially these parties reject US policies

and call for a change in America's position on the nuclear deal, especially after Donald Trump's withdrawal from the nuclear deal in 2018. The Iranian regime also wagered on the possibility of Donald Trump leaving power in the US elections in 2020, and it also wagered that a new American administration would come adopting new less severe policies in the face of Iran, and that the new US administration would be able to debate again about the nuclear deal, but on acceptable and reasonable terms for Iran. (Al-Wadaei, 2020).

In the end, American policies failed to topple the Iranian regime and replace it with another regime, while American policies on Tehran revealed that the Iranian regime has become able to face any kind of sanctions with great flexibility, especially as it has long experience in dealing with sanctions. But it must be noted that the US sanctions have already created an economic crisis for the Iranian regime, and it has not been able to provide clear answers to the demonstrations in the country due to the decline of the economy, and the Iranian regime has no choice but to use the two most important means to confront the demonstrations, namely repression and the means of mobilizing to confront the American conspiracy, as America is the only enemy of the Iranian revolution. On the other hand, Iranian influence in the region did not decline. On the contrary, Tehran tried to draw some Gulf countries into the arena of conflict by clashing with Saudi Arabia through its military arm in Iran, the Houthi group, which has become a real crisis for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in Yemen, and it also clashed with American interests in Iraq and Syria. (Al-Wadaei, 2020).

6. IRAN'S BEHAVIOR BETWEEN THE US SANCTIONS, AND ITS POLITICAL PROJECT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The thesis reached a set of conclusions regarding Iran's behavior in the Middle East region and its relationship to the policies of the United States of America in general, and the policy of US President Donald Trump in particular, in light of the policy of maximum pressure that the White House adopted during the Trump era against the Islamic Republic. (BEHRAVESH, 2020), In addition to tracking and monitoring the development of Iranian policy in the Middle East region since the Islamic revolution in 1979, through all the major events in the Middle East region, including the invasion of Iraq in 1990 and earlier, the Iraq war with Iran in 1980 and the subsequent wars in the region such as the Syrian war. And the Arab Spring revolutions and the development of events in Yemen to the present time.

To answer the main question of the thesis about the impact of US sanctions during the Donald Trump era on Iran's behavior in the region, it must be noted at the outset that among the conclusions reached by the thesis regarding Iran's position on the 2015 agreement and its escalatory behavior in the region:

Iran has expanded influence in the region since the Islamic revolution in 1979, as it sought after the success of the revolution to start a new phase in the first phase of establishing the pillars of the revolution by creating a political system that governs Iran based on the principles of the revolution, (Bayandor,2010), so that this system is a model to be followed In all countries at home, as a first stage.

As for the second stage, Iran aimed to export the Iranian revolution to neighboring countries, which created a situation of early clash between Iran and its neighbors in severe wars affecting the region. At this stage, Iran adopted the philosophy of exporting the Iranian revolution to neighboring countries through the direct clash , (Bayandor,2010), which created a great chaos in the region,

left behind it a devastation in countries such as Iraq, and caused economic and military disasters for Iran itself, as well as the consolidation in the Gulf countries that Iran and its revolution have become a real threat to the ruling regimes in these countries and thus Iran has become a main enemy for many countries of the region.

This state of clash and its disastrous consequences for the region was a great motivation for the Iranians to change the philosophy of dealing with neighboring countries. Far from the philosophy of direct armed clash, (Bakhash,1985), Tehran pursued another policy, which is supporting the arms movements in neighboring countries, directly and indirectly, without fighting the war itself. As happened in the 2006 war, when Iran supported Hezbollah to confront Israel, and it was a new philosophy that helped Iran avoid repeating the mistakes of the past by waging wars that are useless except for the many military losses.

Therefore, we are facing a clear development in Iran's philosophy in the Middle East, crystallized in the following points:

The first stage: gaining the legitimacy for success and creating a political system in Iran, to be able to highlight the revolution's ability to solve all political and military problems, (Bakhash,1985), and that the revolution has become the alternative to all oppressive dictatorial political regimes in the region.

The second stage: Work to export the Iranian revolution to neighboring countries through direct confrontation, which is a bitter experience that caused disasters in the region and Iran itself.

The third phase: Supporting the armed movements in the region to be the passage for exporting the Iranian model in the region, (Bakhash,1985), and for a period they succeeded in that.

The fourth stage: But with the occurrence of fortunes in the Arab region, and this resulted in the departure of established political regimes, usually Iran once again to adopt a policy of exporting the Iranian revolution by direct order even if this causes a direct war, (B.I. ,2020), because Iran has found that the absence of political regimes in the middle East after the Arab Spring revolutions will

create new regimes that may cause crises for Iran, and therefore Iran wanted to be one of the parties that create new regimes, which is what happened in Yemen, Iraq and Syria.

Based on the development of Iranian philosophy in the Middle East, the thesis concluded that Iran has an expansionist political project in the region and the 2015 agreement with the participation of the United States of America was a great gain for Iranian policy, but the nuclear agreement was not the end of Iran's aspirations in the region, (B.B.C, 2015). even When Donald Trump came to power in the United States of America, he accused Iran of violating the 2015 agreement and that it was able to use the agreement to pass some things such as proceeding with uranium enrichment without being deterred by anyone.

Therefore, Iran did not rely on the nuclear agreement to stop the political and military expansion in the region. Rather, it exploited the political and military conditions in neighboring countries such as Iraq, Syria, and even in Lebanon to pass its military and expansion project clearly in front of everyone without considering any agreement or even To international law, Therefore, the thesis concluded that the nuclear agreement in 2015 did not deter Iran. (B.B.C, 2015), On the contrary, it was one of the reasons that Iran used to expand in the region and that the absence of the agreement in the first place would have pushed Iran into military and political expansion as well.

But at the same time, the nuclear deal placed Iran in front of international responsibility, and its actions and behavior came under the supervision of the West and international organizations, as well as the United Nations and even its opponents

in the Middle East region, The nuclear agreement, which the United States of America agreed to, despite its belief that Iran was able to achieve many gains through it, established a formal framework for dealing with the Iranian Republic.

This is the framework from which the Donald Trump regime, who has been working all the time to impose US sanctions on Iran, claiming that the Islamic Republic has violated the terms of the agreement signed in 2015, Consequently, the agreement was also a means of pressure on Iran by international

organizations, as well as the United States of America during the period of Donald Trump.

As for the theory of realism and Iran's behavior towards US sanctions, Iran has adopted the theory of realism in its foreign policies in the Middle East and in its dealings with US sanctions, as the new realism includes two types, namely offensive realism and Defensive realism, as Iran has acquired military strength and sought to develop its military arsenal and project Nuclear, (Avgustin, 2017), in order to impose its hegemony on neighboring countries and impose conditions of negotiation on the American side, and through the development of its armed arsenal, it sought to deter its opponents in the region, as happened with the Houthi issue in Yemen, Syria, and Iraq.

Before presenting the impact of US sanctions on Iranian behavior in the region, according to the basic topic of the thesis, the thesis concluded that Donald Trump's policies towards Iran stemmed from the following issues:

Withdrawing From The Nuclear Agreement: Trump's steps varied from the beginning of the authority and until 2018, between continuous sanctions and the threat to withdraw from the nuclear agreement, but his last decision in 2018 was to withdraw from the nuclear agreement in a step that had negative effects on the Iranian side of course. (Ritter& Hersh,2018).

Continuing Sanctions Policies Against Iran: Trump resorted to imposing continuous economic sanctions on Iran since he came to power in the United States of America, targeting human rights issues and Iran's military arms abroad and then the nuclear program, all of which were issues that Trump, by focusing on, was able to impose US sanctions against the Iranian Republic. (Kerr & Katzman, 2018).

Reducing The Influence Of Iran's Military Arms: The Trump administration sought to reduce the influence of the military arms that follow Iran in the region and inside Iran, so the decisions were made to classify the Revolutionary Guard as a terrorist organization, as well as to classify the Quds Force as a terrorist organization, targeting Hezbollah in Lebanon and targeting Shiite military militias in Iraq. (Ritter& Hersh,2018).

Trump's Policies Against The Missile Program: Of course, the Iranian missile program remains one of the reasons that worry America's allies in the Gulf, as well as American interests in the Middle East, especially in Iraq, so Trump targeted the Iranian missile program to prevent Iran from reaching US targets in the region and preventing Iran from reaching Targets related to America's allies in some Gulf countries. (C.R.S,2018).

Decisions Related To The Iranian Economy: By working to reduce foreign investment inside Iran and stop any investment dealings between Iran and any other countries such as China and Russia, as the Trump administration has restricted the oil trade and the movement of transferring hard currency into Iran, as well as stopping and prohibiting the sale of weapons to Iran from Any other country, and they are all policies that have caused great crises for the Islamic Republic. (C.R.S,2018).

The Large Military Presence In The Middle East: Trump adopted policies related to the strong reinstatement of the military presence in the Middle East, as he believed that Obama's policies allowed Iran to expand its influence in the Middle East, so Trump sought to intensify his country's military activity in the Arabian Gulf through military partnerships with His allies in the Gulf, especially after Iranian harassment of navigation in the Strait of Hormuz, Trump also targeted strongly confrontation with Iran in conflict areas in the Middle East, where US forces targeted Iranian interests in Syria as well as the US escalation against symbols of the Iranian regime such as Qassim Soleimani in Iraq, as well as clashes with targets of Iran in Iraq, as well as supporting some Gulf countries with arms deals, such as Saudi Arabia, to confront the Houthis in Yemen. (Ritter& Hersh,2018).

Strengthening Relations With The Gulf States: Trump set out to restore his country's relations with Saudi Arabia and some other Gulf states to create a front for a struggle against Iran in the Middle East, as well as work to form a US-Arab alliance in the region in order to confront Iran as well. (C.R.S,2018).

Therefore, the conclusions reached by the thesis regarding the impact of US sanctions on Iran's behavior in the region, for example:

6.1 increasing Tensions In The Middle East Due To Donald Trump's Policies And Iran's exploitation of US pressure to pass its expansion project

The policies adopted by US President Donald Trump prompted the Iranian side to adopt policies that created clear tension in the Middle East region, a(Al-Wadaei, 2020).And even the tension continued to a large extent and mainly in the region due to US policies, among these Iranian policies that the Islamic Republic adopted to confront Trump:

6.2 Ensuring The Survival Of European Countries In The Nuclear Agreement:

Iran sought to ensure that the rest of the European countries remain in the nuclear agreement, after the withdrawal of US President Donald Trump, to preserve the positive provisions in the nuclear agreement that support Iran's political and military position in the Middle East. (Al-Wadaei, 2020).

6.3 Searching For Foreign Investment:

Iran has supported policies that include economic openness to the world to confront the US sanctions and their difficult economic impact on the country and its people, by searching for economic partners in China, Britain, Germany, and France, which of course are countries that will serve Iran's economic interests to face US sanctions. (Al-Wadaei, 2020).

6.4 Continuing To Strengthen Its Military Arsenal:

Iran began strengthening its military and missile arsenal and tested many ballistic missiles as well as developing its arsenal of weapons, and Tehran sought to emphasize its military capabilities in the region and that sanctions would not prevent it from developing its capabilities. (AL BAKER ,2019).

Expansion In The Region: Iran did not surrender to US pressure and Trump's sanctions and did not stop expanding militarily and politically in the region, but rather supported the Houthis in Yemen, and caused huge losses to the Saudi economic sector after targeting the giant oil company, Aramco through its military arms in Yemen and Iraq, as well as supporting Its military militia in

Iraq has continuously targeted American targets in Iraq, as well as supported its presence in Syria as well as in Lebanon through continuous support for Hezbollah. (Al-Wadaei, 2020).

6.5 Targeting America's Allies And Washington's Interests:

US sanctions have caused a great crisis for Iran, so Tehran was not willing to pay the price for its struggle with the United States of America alone, but was keen to drag America's allies into the conflict, so it targeted economic interests in Saudi Arabia, supported the war in Yemen and supported the Houthis in Confronting the Arab Islamic coalition led by Saudi Arabia, targeting navigation in the Strait of Hormuz and targeting American soldiers in Iraq and targeting, through its military arms, the US embassy in the Iraqi capital Baghdad. (AL BAKER ,2019).

In general, the region was facing constant tension due to America's policies against the Islamic Republic, and the Iranian response to the US sanctions, especially Washington's dealings with Iran were based on directing successive and powerful strikes simultaneously in order not to give Iran the opportunity to respond. However, the thesis concluded that US policies pursued by the Donald Trump administration were not aimed at overthrowing the entire Iranian regime, changing it, or even changing the political philosophy on which the Iranian regime relies in its moves and expanding its military and political influence in the region. (AL BAKER ,2019).

Rather, the White House targeted what could be called an assessment of Iranian behavior in the region and reset its orientations away from US interests and the interests of America's allies in the Middle East region, as it sought to strike strikes against the Iranian regime to paralyze its moves and reduce the continuity of its influence in the region, but without ending this influence. Especially Iran represents a strategic value for American influence in the Middle East. Where America can, through the scarecrow of Iranian influence in the Middle East, pass its military deals and policies in the region with ease and acceptance by its allies in the Middle East, like what happened from the normalization agreements that America supported and sponsored between Israel,

the Emirates, Bahrain, and Sudan, depending on the scarecrow of Iranian influence in the region. (Ben-Meir, 2020).

But on the other hand, the American policies adopted by the Trump regime failed to evaluate Iran's behavior in the Middle East region, especially Tehran has the vast experience it has gained over decades, these experiences help it cope with any size of US sanctions and absorb American pressure, and to benefit from it internally and externally, and to reproduce its political and military discourse in the region and internally, depending on the harsh policies imposed by Washington against it. (Woodward, 2019).

6.6 Proxy Wars In The Region

A proxy war begins when a state seeks to transfer its conflict with another country to a third location away from their respective territories, and the two parties of the conflict are only partially involved, which is what happens in the US-Iranian case, whether in Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, or The Iranian-Saudi case, where the proxy conflict in Yemen is through the Iranian-backed military arm, the Houthi group. Therefore, the proxy war with regard to Iran is the use of military arms and armed elements in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen and Afghanistan to confront the United States of America and its allies in the Middle East. Also, Iran has sought through the proxy war to pressure the United States of America to withdraw its forces from Iraq and sought to put pressure on allies of America in the Middle East in order to blackmail them and pressure them, to escape from America's sanctions and reduce the severity of American pressure, like what happened several times against Saudi Aramco by the Houthis and Iraqi military arms backed by Iran. (Ben-Meir, 2020).

The thesis concluded that Trump's punitive policies against Iran have prompted the expansion of proxy wars in the region, or the so-called proxy conflict in the Middle East, as Iran has expanded its use of its military arms and neighboring countries to target US interests and the interests of America's allies in the Middle East. (Woodward, 2019).

Through its conflict with the United States of America, Iran was able to exploit its military arms in the region to fight proxy wars, according to the following:

Yemen, The Houthi Group: The Houthis were the most powerful military arm of Iran in the Gulf, which was able to threaten the interests of America's biggest ally in the Middle East and the Gulf, and to put pressure on Saudi Arabia to end the Yemen war in their favor. (Woodward, 2019).

The Popular Mobilization Militias: In Iraq, the Popular Mobilization Forces played a major role in the proxy wars between the United States and Iran, as it was a strong military arm of Iran in the face of US goals and interests in Iraq, and the crowd had suffered great losses at the hands of the US forces, but at the same time, the Popular Mobilization Forces enjoyed full support on the part of Iran, to pressure the US forces to leave Iraq and return to their country. (Woodward, 2019).

Lebanon, Hezbollah: There is the Shiite party in Lebanon that enjoys strategic relations with Iran, and Tehran uses it in its skirmishes against Israel on the one hand, or pressure on the Lebanese interior on the other hand, to achieve political gains at the expense of the influence of America and its allies such as Saudi Arabia in Lebanon. (Fraihat, 2020).

Militias In Syria: There is a large presence of Iranian forces and Shiite militias supported by Iran, in Syria fighting alongside the forces of Bashar al-Assad's regime and supporting its goals in confronting all parties in Syria, especially American targets. (Fraihat, 2020).

On the other hand, and to confront Iran's proxy war, America intended to form an alliance that includes countries from the region with Israel to confront Iran on behalf of the United States, and even supported the normalization agreements in the Middle East between Israel, the Emirates, Sudan and Bahrain and is trying to conclude an agreement for normalization between Saudi Arabia and Israel, in order to Creating a large political bloc in the region that conducts a proxy war on its behalf against Iran, in addition to that the United States has exploited countries in the Middle East in order to conduct a proxy war against Iran, as happened in Iraq, in Syria and in regions such as Afghanistan. (Fraihat, 2020).

6.7 Iran's Partners In 2015 Nuclear Agreement And Their Failure To Offer Acceptable Solutions To Help Tehran To Face Donald Trump Sanctions

One of the findings of the thesis was that, At the time when US President Donald Trump withdrew from the nuclear agreement with Iran concluded in 2015, (Abu Al-Qasim, 2018). Europe was keen to continue the nuclear deal, (Office of the Press Secretary, 2015) especially as it believes that the agreement is of great importance to the European Union, through:

The Goal Is To Solve A Major Crisis: The European Union believes that the nuclear agreement that was concluded in 2015 was one of the greatest agreements in the history of the Middle East, especially that America was one of the countries that participated in this agreement. This agreement is considered as a solution to the biggest crisis facing the Middle East in decades, which is the crisis of the Iranian nuclear program, (Office of the Press Secretary, 2015) which causes concern to all Western parties, including America and even America's allies in the Gulf and the Middle East. Therefore, the European Union was keen to continue the nuclear agreement with its current terms because it would enhance the ability to confront Iran and impede its continued development of a nuclear bomb that threatens the entire region. (Abu Al-Qasim, 2018).

Security Of Allies In The Gulf: The European Union also wants to ensure security for its allies in the Arab Gulf region, especially that the Arab Gulf region is one of the important regions for Europe and the world due to the volume of oil that is exported from the Arab Gulf. Also, finding a solution to the Iranian crisis will cause the stability of the East. Therefore, this will help reduce the influence of foreign intervention in the Arab Gulf, especially Chinese or Russian influence, as well as the stability of the region will help the recovery and prosperity of European investments in the Middle East. (F.O.R.E.I.G.N.P.O.L.I.C.Y, 2018).

Desire To Be Present In The Middle East: The European Union seeks, through support for the Iranian nuclear agreement, to be present in the Middle East as one of the influential and influential actors in international politics in the Middle East, as well as the European Union's desire not to leave the political

arena for one party to largely control the countries of the region. (F.O.R.E.I.G.N.P.O.L.I.C.Y, 2018).

Europe And The Necessity Of Continuing The Nuclear Deal

Despite the European Union's belief that Iran is committing violations related to the terms of the nuclear agreement concluded in 2015, but at the same time European countries were keen on continuing the nuclear agreement, especially as they see that this agreement is the best formula to counter Iran's influence in the Middle East, (BROOKES, 2018). and to be a real way for the following steps:

Ensuring Continued Contact With The Republic Of Iran: In 2018, the European Union sought to reassure Iran to ensure the continuation of the nuclear agreement, after the withdrawal of US President Donald Trump, so the European Union provided some guarantees to Tehran such as sponsoring oil sales and protecting them from US sanctions and then protecting economic transactions between the European Union And Iran, which are the guarantees provided by the European Union in order to enhance the chances of Iran staying in the nuclear agreement, and for the agreement to be a continuous means of communication between the European Union and Iran in order to work to counter its influence in the Middle East. (BROOKES, 2018).

The Search For A Suitable Financial Mechanism For Iran: In 2018, the European Union proposed a financial mechanism aimed at keeping trade with Iran away from US sanctions, but the European Union failed to obtain members' approval to pass this proposal. (Abu Al-Qasim,2019).

Supporting Understandings Between Iran And America: The European Union tried to open channels of communication between Iran and America to bridge the gap in views on the points of disagreement in the nuclear agreement, so France made a proposal that includes stopping US sanctions in exchange for stopping the reduction of Iran's nuclear obligations. (Abu Al-Qasim,2019).

Europe's Disagreements With Iran: But despite this, the European Union's position on Iran has changed, especially with the disagreements that have emerged on some important issues such as the missile program, human rights, terrorism issues, and Iran's regional influence. Iran's ballistic missile tests have

raised European concerns as well as those of Europe's allies in the Middle East. As a result, disagreements between the two sides over the mechanisms for supporting Iran to face the US sanctions. (Abu Al-Qasim,2019).

Iran's Moves In The Strait Of Hormuz: Iran's resorting to the stage of engagement in the Strait of Hormuz by detaining oil tankers and threatening shipping security has caused the European Union to intercept and reject these practices, and to abandon any proposals that support Iran to confront Donald Trump's sanctions. (ANDERSON, SADJADPOUR, 2019).

The Nuclear Obligations Crisis: Iran's decision to reduce nuclear obligations caused embarrassment to the European Union, especially since Tehran was trying to pressure the European Union with this decision to find a European solution to help Tehran face the sanctions. (ANDERSON, SADJADPOUR, 2019).

Returning To The Same American Role: One of the findings of the thesis is that although Iran has relied on the European role to help it to face US sanctions, Iran has discovered that the European situation since the end of 2019 has approached the same US position, as Europe has played the same role of the same US pressure on human rights issues and terrorism issues, as well as the European Union's rejection of the Iranian missile program. The European shift in its stance against Iran was a result of the pressure exerted by the Donald Trump administration on the European Union. (ANDERSON, SADJADPOUR, 2019).

6.8 Normalization Agreements In The Middle East

One of the findings by the thesis is that Trump administration was not satisfied only with the great pressure on the Iranian Republic, whether it was political or military pressure. Rather, the Trump administration sought to consolidate and strengthen political and military blocs and alliances in the Middle East, one of the features of that was the normalization agreements that appeared in the Middle East in the past few months. (BEHRAVESH, 2020).

In August of 2020, the US administration announced the signing of a normalization agreement sponsored by the White House between the Emirates

and Israel. This agreement included full normalization of political, economic, and social relations, as the announcement of the signing of the Emirati-Israeli agreement came at a time when US-Iranian relations were in a state of great tension. The signing of the normalization agreement between the UAE and Israel comes as part of the maximum pressure policies adopted by the Trump regime against the Iranian authorities to force them to reduce their influence in the Middle East, especially in neighboring countries that include a large American presence such as Syria and Iraq. (BEHRAVESH, 2020).

The matter did not stop at the UAE and Israel agreeing to comprehensive normalization, but also the Bahrain and Israel agreement also on full normalization, as the UAE did, and it is all a policy that America was aiming from behind to block Iran's influence in the Middle East by blockading it with the Israeli presence in Israel .It should also be noted, according to the results of the thesis, that the Arab Gulf region, or the Iranian coast from the Persian Gulf, is the area of the Revolutionary Guard's presence and activity against the party's hostile to Iran. Therefore, the signing of normalization agreements between Israel, the UAE and Bahrain was an attempt by Trump to provoke the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, the stronger military arm For the Iranian revolution. (BEHRAVESH, 2020).

Thus, this step would provoke the Revolutionary Guard, which in turn will work to respond to these normalization agreements by rethinking once again the form of the relationship between Iran and some Gulf countries, such as the relationship with the Emirates. (BEHRAVESH, 2020).

Among the results of the thesis is that the United States of America wants, through normalization agreements between Israel and the countries of the Middle East region, to force Tehran to bow to the demands of the White House and to withdraw from threatening its interests and the interests of its allies in the Middle East, and that the normalization agreements constitute the establishment of an expanded regional front against Iran (farhan, 2019).

The normalization agreements came as part of the deal of the century adopted by Donald Trump, the transfer of the American embassy to the city of Jerusalem and the recognition of the Golan Heights as part of the Israeli sovereignty, not

the Syrian, through which the Trump administration sought to stifle the Iranian presence in the Middle East. (farhan, 2019)

7. CONCLUSION

Despite the size of the US sanctions imposed by the Donald Trump administration on the Islamic Republic of Iran, which varied between military, political and social sanctions, and even though the Iranian economy has been severely affected by these sanctions, the US administration has not achieved many results from its goals towards pressure on Iran.

Iran has great experience in dealing with US and European sanctions policies. Indeed, Iran can easily benefit from the sanctions and its climate and exploit them well for the benefit of its nuclear program and its political expansion in the Middle East, as it was able to exploit the US elections and the ongoing sanctions by the Trump administration and resorted to announce their continuation. In uranium enrichment, taking advantage of the state of political fluidity in America considering the US elections.

On the other hand, USA believes that the alliance of Iran and the Bashar al-Assad regime is less dangerous than the alliance of Russia and the regime of Bashar al-Assad. Therefore, America's policies against Iran in the Middle East were primarily aimed at reducing Iran's role in the region and reducing its influence, not eliminating, or eliminating it. Because USA believes that eliminating Iran's role in the Middle East will naturally result in the interest of the Russian role in the region, which is increasing dramatically, which will affect American interests in the Middle East.

Iran has been able to create alternatives, albeit not strong, to confront the US sanctions in the economic field. Had to conclude agreements with China and Russia, both of which are rivals of USA, of course, a step by Iran's resort to China and Russia would threaten the US presence and its interests in the Middle East, as it strengthens the alliance between Iran, China and Russia are part of the Russian, Chinese presence in the Middle East, whether in Syria, Libya, Sudan, or Ethiopia, which have been places of influence for USA for years.

The USA policy towards Iran, especially the sanctions, has strengthened Iran's indirect activities in the region. Trump's policy was not so effective that USA expected and Iran jumped above sanctions in the direction of recovering its natural rights for example to sell oil even it was regarded as illegal. Only way to survive within this atmosphere is to absorb the effects of the sanctions and create new paths.

REFERENCES

- A.A.W.S.A.T.** (2019, December 30). Iran 2019 ... “Walk on the brink of the abyss.” Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3rMc9un>
- A.C.R.P.S.** (2017, December 1). The Trump Administration’s National Security Strategy: Is It New? Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2L7db3s>
- A.L.J.A.Z.E.E.R.A.** (2015, July 14). The most important articles of the agreement between Iran and the 5 + 1 group. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/381SzTb>
- A.L.J.A.Z.E.E.R.A.** (2017, February 4). US sanctions on Iran .. from Clinton to Trump. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3pFmLts>
- A.L.J.A.Z.Z.E.E.R.A.** (2016, November 5). Iran and the Arab Revolutions: Narratives of Building Iranian Centralism. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/37OjHff>
- A.R.A.B.I.C.S.P.U.T.N.I.K.N.E.W.S.** (2020, May 21). New sanctions and repeated threats ... What is the secret behind the continued US escalation against Iran? Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3rMuTKk>
- Abrahamian, E.** (2008). A history of modern Iran (1st ed.). United Kingdom., Cambridge University Press
- Abramson, S.** (2019). Proof of Conspiracy: How Trump’s International Collusion Is Threatening American Democracy (1st ed., Vol. 1). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/37LNrCu>
- Abu Al-Qasim, M. A.** (2018). The US policy towards Iran after Trump, the mechanisms and future possibilities. *International Institute for Iranian Studies*, 12(2), 2–15. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3prCig2>
- Abu Al-Qasim, M. H.** (2019, February 19). What is the future for the shaky deal between Europe and Iran? Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2XeUYUB>
- Afkhami, G. R.** (2009). The Life and Times of The Shah (First edition ed.). California ,USA, University of California Press
- Afrasiabi, K. L.** (1994). After Khomeini: New Directions in Iran’s Foreign Policy (1st ed.). San Francisco, and Oxford, USA, and Britain: Westview Press.
- Ahrensdoerf, P. J.** (1997, December 10). Thucydides’ Realistic Critique of Realism. <https://www.Journals.Uchicago.Edu/Doi/Abs/10.2307/3235218>.
<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.2307/3235218>
- AL BAKER, B. D. O. U. R.** (2019, May 9). The future of Iranian influence in the Middle East region under US sanctions. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3513t9>
- Al-Alwani, M. J.** (2018, September 20). US sanctions, and their impact on: the effectiveness of the Iranian role in the region, and on the future of the international regime. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2Lfw3x2>
- Alavi, S. A.** (2019). Iran and Palestine: Past, Present, Future. Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/3poXKIU>

- Ali, M. O. A. T. A. Z.** (2019, June 12). A history of American defeats against Iran .. Why is America afraid of declaring war? Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3c9ITXk>
- Al-Wadaei, S. H.** (2020, June 20). European Parties and the Nuclear Deal with Iran: Declining Importance and Future Prospects. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2X0jAjN>
- Amirahmadi, H.** (1992). *The United States and the Middle East: A Search for New Perspectives* (1st ed.). New York, USA: State University of New York Press.
- Anderson, C. O. L. L. I. N., & SADJADPOUR, K. A. R. I. M.** (2019). *IRAN'S CYBER THREAT ESPIONAGE SABOTAGE AND REVENGE* (1st ed., Vol. 3). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/2LfuOxS>
- Antunes, S., & Camisã, I.** (2018, February 22). Introducing Realism in International Relations Theory. <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/02/27/Introducing-Realism-in-International-Relations-Theory/>. <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/02/27/introducing-realism-in-international-relations-theory/>
- Avgustin, D. O. J. R., & Nurnus, M.** (2017). *Realism in Practice: An Appraisal* (1st ed., Vol. 12). E-International Relations.
- B.B.C.** (2015b, July 14). The official announcement of a “historic” agreement on Iran’s nuclear program. Retrieved from <https://bbc.in/3hzMdxp>
- B.I.** (2020, December 3). Here’s what’s in the 2015 nuclear deal with Iran that Trump abandoned and Biden pledged to restore. Retrieved December 3, 2020, from <https://bit.ly/2KAmcSK>
- Bakhash, S.** (1985). *Reign of the Ayatollahs: Iran and the Islamic Revolution* (1st ed.). New York, USA: Basic Books; Rev ed.
- Bashiriyeh, H.** (1984). *the state and revolution in iran 1962-1982* (1st ed). tehran, Iran: Croom Helm
- Bayandor, D.** (2010). *Iran and the CIA: The Fall of Mosaddeq Revisited* (1st ed.). London, UK , Palgrave Macmillan
- BBC, B. B. C.** (2020, January 6). The United States and Iran: Conflict and hostility for 40 years that may turn into a direct military confrontation. Retrieved from <https://bbc.in/3cca03M>
- BEHRAVESH, M. A. Y. S. A. M.** (2020). *IRAN'S UNCONVENTIONAL ALLIANCE NETWORK IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND BEYOND*. MIDDLE EAST INSTITUTE, 3–20. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3po7gpp>
- Ben-Meir, A.** (2020). *Trump: The Wannabe Dictator: How We Got to This Dire State of Affairs* (1st ed.). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/3rwyBb8>
- Ben-Meir, A.** (2020). *Trump: The Wannabe Dictator: How We Got to This Dire State of Affairs* (1st ed.). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/3rwyBb8>
- Bill, James A.** (1988) *The Eagle and the Lion: The Tragedy of American Iranian Relations* (1st ed.) New Haven and London, Yale University Press.
- Blake, K.** (2009). *The U.S.-Soviet Confrontation in Iran, 1945-1962: A Case in the Annals of the Cold War* (1st ed), Ontario, Canada. UPA
- Booth, K.** (2011). *Realism and World Politics* (1st ed., Vol. 11). Routledge.

- BROOKES, P. E. T. E. R.** (2018, January 4). Brookes: U.S. must condemn Iranian regime, back protesters. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3aZDVhd>
- Brown, C. H. R. I. S.** (2009, June 24). Structural Realism, Classical Realism and Human Nature. <https://Journals.Sagepub.Com/Doi/10.1177/0047117809104638>. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0047117809104638>
- C.R.S.** (2020). Iran Sanctions. Congressional Research Service, 12(2), 6–80. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/38EImvf>
- Chehabi, H E.** (1990) Iranian Politics and Religious Modernism: The Liberation Movement of Iran Under the Shah and Khomeini (1st ed.). New York. Cornell University Press
- Conley, R. S.** (2017). Presidential Leadership and National Security: The Obama Legacy and Trump Trajectory (1st Edition, Vol. 1). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/3aNZamd>
- Crist , D.** (2012). The Twilight War: The Secret History of America’s Thirty-Year Conflict with Iran (1st ed.). London, UK, Penguin Books
- Darius, Rober G., Amos II, John W., and Magnus, Ralph H.** (1984) Gulf Security into the 1980s: Perceptual and Strategic Dimensions. Stanford. Hoover Institution Press
- Ebrahimi , M.** (2016). The British Role in Iranian Domestic Politics (1951-1953), (Springer Briefs in Environment, Security, Development and Peace Book 5) (1st ed.).
- Ebrahimi, M.** (2016). The British Role in Iranian Domestic Politics (1951-1953) (Springer Briefs in Environment, Security, Development and Peace Book 5) (1st ed.).
- Ehteshami, A.** (2012). Iran’s Foreign Policy: From Khatami to Ahmadinejad. london, UK: thaca Press.
- ELÍAS, F.** (2017, May 9). The Future of Iran’s Influence in The Middle East. Retrieved May 9, 2017, from <https://bit.ly/2WHx6sp>
- Engdahl, W. F.** (2011). A Century of War: Anglo-American Oil Politics and the New World Order (2nd ed.). Moscow. Russia. Progressive Press.
- Entessar, N., & Afrasiabi, K. L.** (2019). Trump and Iran: From Containment to Confrontation Hardcover (1st ed.). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/2Jk7qPj>
- F.C.R.S.** (2017b, August 12). Double letters: Why did Mogherini participate in Rouhani’s inauguration ceremony? Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2JGvY5q>
- F.O.R.E.I.G.N.P.O.L.I.C.Y.** (2018, August 6). Statement from the President on the Reimposition of United States Sanctions with Respect to Iran. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/352X6CX>
- F.O.R.E.I.G.N.P.O.L.I.C.Y.** (2018a, May 8). Remarks by President Trump on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2Mt1zZr>
- F.R.A.N.C.E.** (2015, July 15). Obama stresses that there are “deep differences” with Iran despite the signing of the nuclear agreement. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2X0TZqH>
- Falode, A. J.** (2009, February 22). The Theoretical Foundation of Realism. https://Papers.Ssrn.Com/Sol3/Papers.Cfm?Abstract_id=1347697#:~:Text=Adewunmi%20James%20Falode

- Farhan, S. H. Y. M. A. A.** (2019). US policy toward Iran in the Trump era. *Iranian Orbits Magazine*, 12(2), 120–140. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3nQ00Cu>
- Farndon, John** . (2006). *Iran: Everything You Need to Know* (1st ed.). New York, USA ,Disinformation Books
- Fraihat, I.** (2020). *Iran and Saudi Arabia: Taming a Chaotic Conflict* (1st ed., Vol. 1). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/3nTrasi>
- Freedman, Robert O.** (1990). *The Middle East from the Iran-Contra Affair to Intifada*. New York: Syracuse University Press .
- GANJI, B.** (2006). *Politics of confrontation The Foreign Policy of the USA and Revolutionary Iran* (1st ed.). Tauris Academic Studies. London, England
- Ganji, B.** (2012). *Politics of confrontation the Foreign Policy of the USA and Revolutionary Iran*, London , UK.B. Tauris
- Gardner, H.** (2018). *World War Trump: The Risks of America’s New Nationalism* (1st ed.). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/3mPqjHN>
- Gasiorowski, M. J., & Byrne , M.** (2004). *Mohammad Mosaddeq and the 1953 Coup in Iran (Modern Intellectual and Political History of the Middle East)* (1st ed.). , New York, USA .Syracuse University Press
- Gasiorowski, Mark J..** (1991). *U.S. Foreign Policy and the Shah; Building a Client State in Iran*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press
- Ghattas, K.** (2020). *Black Wave: Saudi Arabia, Iran, and the Forty-Year Rivalry That Unraveled Culture, Religion, and Collective Memory in the Middle East* (1st ed.). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/2WLoxNi>
- Goode, J. A. M. E. S. F.** (1997). *The United States and Iran In the Shadow of Musaddiq* (1st ed). LONDON, Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, London, UK
- Gurtov, M.** (2020). *America in Retreat: Foreign Policy under Donald Trump* (1st ed., Vol. 1). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/34IZApM>
- Hale Eryilmaz.** (1997, February). *US-Iranian relations before and after the Islamic revolution in Iran*. Turkey, Bilkent University.
- Harzli, A. A.** (2018, November 5). *New US sanctions on Iran: a reading into the causes and implications*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3n64sMi>
- Hiro, Dilip.**)1987(*Iran Under the Ayatollahs*. London; Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hunter, Shireen T.** (1990) *Iran and the World: Continuity in a Revolutionary Decade*. Bloomington. USA, Indiana University Press
- Hunter, Shireen T..**(1990) *Iran and the World: Continuity in a Revolutionary Decade*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hussain, N., & Ahmed, M.** (2016). *Rising Iran: Implications for the Middle East and Pakistan*. Researchgate, 24–35. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3mSo8TA>
- I.I.I.S.** (2017, September 25). *A Radical Disagreement: A Reading of Trump and Rouhani’s Speeches to the United Nations General Assembly*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3hABPFR>
- Javier E. David.** (2017, May). *US-Saudi Arabia seal weapons deal worth nearly \$110 billion immediately, \$350 billion over 10 years* (1). CNBC. Retrieved from <https://cnb.cx/37Odlpn>
- Juneau, T.** (2019). *No, Yemen’s Houthis actually aren’t Iranian puppets*. *The Washington Post*, 1, 1–2. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/37OkpCj>

- Katzman, K., McInnis, K. J., & Thomas, C.** (2020). U.S.-Iran Conflict and Implications for U.S. Policy. Congressional Research Service, 14(2), 3–15. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3ppinPa>
- Keddie, Nikki R.** (1990) and Gasiorowski Mark J. (Eds.). *Neither East Nor West: Iran, the Soviet Union, and the United States*. New Haven, USA, Yale University Press.
- Khomeini, I.** (1981). *Islam and Revolution: Writings and Declarations of Imam Khomeini (1941-1980)* (1st ed., Vol. 1). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/3aGXNpa>
- Korab-Karpowicz, W. J.** (2010, July 26). Political Realism in International Relations. Stanford University. <https://philpapers.org/rec/KORPRI-4>
- Kouhi-Esfahani, M.** (2019). *Iran's Foreign Policy in the South Caucasus: Relations with Azerbaijan and Armenia* (1st ed., Vol. 2). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/38PIesX>
- Kyle T. Evered.** (2010). The Truman Doctrine in Greece and Turkey: America's Cold War Fusion of Development and Security. *The Arab World Geographer*, 51–52.
- Marr, Phebe and Lewis, William** (1993). *Riding the Tiger: The Middle East Challenge After the Cold War*, New York, USA. Westview Press
- Martin, P. L.** (2019, October 1). President Trump and Migration Policy. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3pt6ojz>
- McMurdo, T. L.** (2012). The United States, Britain, and the Hidden Justification of Operation TPAJAX. *The Economics of Overthrow. Studies in Intelligence* Vol. 56, No. 2
- Neveen Talaat Hassan Abdelrehim .** (2010). *Oil Nationalisation and Managerial Disclosure: The Case of Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, 1933-1951 .* University of York.
- Niakooee, S. A., & Ejazee, E.** (2015, May 23). Foreign Policy and Economic Development: Iran under Rafsanjani. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/35SYMjF>
- Office of the Press Secretary, T. W. H.** (2015, August 5). Remarks by the President on the Iran Nuclear Deal. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3mNRR05>
- Panah, M.** (2007). *The Islamic Republic and the World Global Dimensions of the Iranian Revolution* (1st ed). London, Britain: Pluto Press.
- Parra, F.** (2009). *Oil politics A Modern History of Petroleum* (1st ed.). London , Britain I.B. Tauris,
- Parsi, T.** (2017). *Losing an Enemy: Obama, Iran, and the Triumph of Diplomacy* (1st ed.). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/3aHGuo7>
- Parsi, T. R. I. T. A.** (2017). *Alliance of Common Interests: Secret Dealings between Iran, Israel, and the United States of America* (1st ed.). Cairo, Egypt: Arab Science House.
- Phares, W.** (2020). *The Choice: Trump vs. Obama-Biden in U.S. Foreign Policy* (1st ed.). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/2WNVEQc>
- R.T.** (2017, April 24). Trump's new plan against Iran. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3rHUIex>
- R.T.** (2017b, June 28). CIA Director: Seven disastrous years allowed Iran to expand in the Middle East! Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3pJB6or>
- Rahnema , A.** (2015). *Behind the 1953 Coup in Iran: Thugs, Turncoats, Soldiers, and Spooks* (1st ed.), London, Cambridge University Press

- Ramazani, Rouhollah K.** (1975) *Iran's Foreign Policy 1941-1973: A Study of Foreign Policy in Modernizing Nations*. Charlottesville: USA , University Press of Virginia
- Rezaei, F.** (2018). *Iran's Foreign Policy After the Nuclear Agreement: Politics of Normalizers and Traditionalists* (1st ed., Vol. 1). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/3rrRY4U>
- Rinehart, C. S.** (2018). President Trump and Jerusalem: The Effects of the Relocation of the American Embassy on the Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process. *Research Gate*, 1, 1–10. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/37PBRX4>
- Ritter, S., & Hersh, S.** (2018). *Dealbreaker: Donald Trump and the Unmaking of the Iran Nuclear Deal* (1st ed., Vol. 1). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/2KPAcrv>
- Ritter, S., & Hersh, S.** (2018). *Dealbreaker: Donald Trump and the Unmaking of the Iran Nuclear Deal* (1st ed., Vol. 1). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/2KPAcrv>
- Samadi, F.** (2018, November 7). Will sanctions on Iran achieve what Trump wants? Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3o5qfVF>
- Scott Cooper, A.** (2012, May). *Fateful consequences: U.S.-Iran relations during the Nixon and Ford Administration, 1969-77* (Thesis). Wellington, Yeni Zelanda: the Victoria University of Wellington.
- Seliktar, O., & Rezaei, F.** (2019). *Iran, Revolution, and Proxy Wars* (1st ed., Vol. 1). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/2WInXj1>
- Sick, Gary.** (1986) *All Fall Down: America's Tragic Encounter with Iran*. New York: USA , Penguin Books
- Solomon, J.** (2017, November 27). High-level contacts between North Korea and Iran suggest greater military cooperation. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2WY5RKh>
- Sterio, M.** (2016). President Obama's Legacy: The Iran Nuclear Agreement? *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, 48(1), 69–80. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3aIbGU7>
- TAZMINI, G. H. O. N. C. H. E. H.** (2013). *KHATAMI'S IRAN The Islamic Republic and the Turbulent Path to Reform* (1st ed.). london, UK: I.B.Tauris.
- The National Archives Online Portal.** (1947). Transcript of Truman Doctrine.
- Theodosis Karvounarakis.** (2001). *The Truman Doctrine and its Impact on Greece During the Civil War Years, 1947 - 1949* .
- Touraj, Daryae.** (2012). *The Oxford Handbook of Iranian History* (1st ed.). ,England , Oxford University Press
- U.N.I.T.E.D.S.T.A.T.E.S.I.N.S.T.I.T.U.T.E.O.F.P.E.A.C.E.** (2020b, December 16). U.S. Sanctions on Iran in 2020. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2L7D438>
- U.S.** (2017, July 31). US Sanctions on Iran: 2017. Retrieved September 15, 2017, from <https://bit.ly/3mPIT28>
- US-Iran Relations: Issues, Challenges and Prospects.** (2015). *Researchgate*, 12(2), 29–49. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3aGomL4>
- Üzmez, S.** (2010, December). *Iranian Nuclear Crisis and its impacts on US-Iranian relations between 1953-2008*. Middle East technical university, Turkey.

- Washington post**, (2015, July 14). Full text of the Iran nuclear deal. Retrieved from <https://wapo.st/3mKdcHz>
- Woodward, B.** (2019). *Fear: Trump in the White House* (1st ed.). Retrieved from <https://amzn.to/3hmnJYr>
- Wright, Martin** (1989). *Iran: The Khomeini Revolution*. Missouri, USA , Glasgow: Longman, St. James Press.
- YOUSSIEF, A. Y. M. A. N.** (2008, January 1). *Iran in America's Strategic Calculations: From Dual Containment to the New Middle East*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3iQazDe>
- Zabili, Sepehr.** (1982). *Iran Since the Revolution*. Baltimore, Maryland. USA, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

RESUME

Name Surname: MAHMOUD SHAABAN BAYOUMI ALY

Education:

2001-2005 Bachelor of arts- English department- Beneswif university

2005-2006 Diploma Of education - faculty of Education -Beneswif university

2018-2021 İstanbul Aydin University-master's degree, political science and international relations Department

Work Experience:

2005-2008 Teacher of English language

2008-2011 Freelance translator

2011-2012 – journalist @ALMASRYALYOUM -Egyptian daily newspaper

2012-2015- journalist @alwatan-Egyptian daily newspaper

2014- till now Member at the Egyptian syndicate of journalists

2015-2018 Editor-in chief @ ALHIWAR channel (Arabic British channel).

2015-2017 Writer at "new Arab" Qatari newspaper

2015- 2018 Journalist at ALAKHBAR Lebanon newspaper

2016- till now Political researcher specialized in the Iranian affairs- freelance researcher

2018-2019 Researcher at the Russian political research center "realist" <http://arabic.realtribune.ru/experts/39>.

2018-2021 Research at company of documentary films product for ALHIWAR channel

2018- till now Journalist @Arabic post website

2020 -Till now Founder and owner of the "Cairo Film" documentary company

Languages:

-Arabic: Native Language

-English: Advanced

-Persian: Beginner

Skills:

-Communication, Teamwork, Problem Solving, Flexibility, Creativity

- Computer skills (Microsoft Office) and others.