

The Strategy of "Sword and Smile" In New IRAN & US Foreign policiesHeshmatollah Falahat Pisheh (PhD)¹, A. Ali Askari (PhD)², Amir Abbas Ghassempour (M.A)³¹. Department of Political Science, Allameh Tabatabaee University, Iran
Head of Sub-Committee of Foreign Relations at Iranian Parliament (7th & 8th terms of Legislature).Email: drfalahatpisheh@yahoo.com, Tel: +989121473148². Department of Iran Broadcasting University, Iran

Ph.D in industrial engineering, Disposition: Systems and efficiency

³. International Relations, Experton Inter-Parliamentary affairs & political researcherEmail: Tarjoman_2020@yahoo.com

Abstract: The goddess of "Dionysus" of the year 2009 was substituted with the goddess of "Apollo", just four years later in the election atmosphere of 2013. These two Greek goddesses, always competing and incompatible to each other, suggest certain fluctuations occurred aftermath of past two presidential elections in Iran. Dionysus as the god of sensation, exaltation, love, inebriation, excitement and revolt vs. Apollo, the god of wisdom, order, quiet, calculation and law. The mistake, being often made by most of the Western as well as American officials in particular, is that they have occasionally pursued the policy of misusing Dionysus conditions of Iranians for disturbing Apollonian order of the country. In other words, they have misused the Iranians' sensations to disturb peace of the people. More interestingly, instead of recognition of the realities of the Iranian society, they have been following the goal of imposing an identical and self-made definition on a nation that are not disposed and willing to witness their own order, peace and tranquility and also their think of development and progress to be sacrificed by foreign coveting, though they are master in Dionysus behaviors construed by "Hannah Arendt" as prerequisite for freedom. Iranian are well aware that these powers had stood against the revolutionaries' Dionysus-inspired love and enthusiasm in the second half of the 1970s, in order to maintain the despotic order of the deposed Shah of the day, and now the same power are using the same Iranians' excitement and stimulation to weaken diplomatic bargaining power, denying their undeniable rights, imposing sanctions on them, chaos making, interferences as well as taking their peace and tranquility away. [Heshmatollah Falahat Pisheh, A. Ali Askari Amir Abbas Ghassempour (M.A). **The Strategy Of "Sword and Smile" In New IRAN & US Foreign policies.** *NY Sci J* 2014;7(6):- 23-36]. (ISSN: 1554-0200). <http://www.sciencepub.net/newyork>.5

Keywords: Arab world, popular uprisings, Iran's national security.**1. Introduction**

Iran, however, is a wonderful land. Since the time when the first Western travelers set foot in the East to explore the ecological & demographic characteristics of this old land until today, the reason for non-recognition of Iran and Iranians, has been the dominance of the "Identically thinking" of this territory by western commentators. And that's a kind of view and looking void of any possibility for recognition of the Iranian society's intricacies, as the most ancient and the most glorious country in the East. As the most influential theory of recent era, the theory of the "Clash of Civilizations" sponsored by "Samuel P. Huntington", has practically caused "Muslims and just Muslims" to be killed in different wars and conflicts in the whole world since 1994. So, it can explicitly be said that allegorically 999 out of one thousand bullets fired in the world are striking a Muslim on the chest. And that's, in fact, the bloody illustration of a "Solitarist Identity", which has also aroused some objections from different fair commentators of the West. (Amartya Sen). In 2013, Iranian people managed to reject the same Western theory and

analysis of Solitarist theory. Contrary to developments relevant to the previous Iranian presidential elections in 2009, the Dionysus spirits of exaltation, love, sensation and excitement, were put, this time in service order, stability, law, calculation and demand for the advancement of the country. In other words, Iranians proved that whatever occurred in 2009 was a historical exception and contrary to the "Greece Tragedy", the both goddesses of Apollo and Dionysus, in Iranian myth, have spent most of their life in co-existence, until in contrast and challenge. In Iran, this soft relationship between wisdom and love, based on rich literature of the country is described as a Hafez-inspired doctrine. The outstanding poet, "Hafez – e Shiraz", together with some other Iranian great poets, are among the promoters of the both intimate characters of "Epic Sensation" and "Interactive Wisdom". So, in the year named by Iranian Supreme Leader as the year of "political Epic", the Apollonian presidential elections in June, 14, 2013, and also the Dionysus demonstrations of Revolution's Victory Days in February, 11 & 27, 2014, were both performed with a similar goal and slogan. Furthermore, these two important events of

special relevance to Iranian society, comparing with other regional societies, were put in service of the boosting of diplomatic negotiating power of the new incumbent government.

The importance of the topic:

The present article is aimed at presenting a "theory", which according to "Carl Pauper" to be enjoyed with a necessary scientific audacity and temerity of being "rescindable". So there is no value-related judgment, in this research, rather, the authors are of this belief that one of the reasons for the prolongation of the crisis and difference between Iran & West, is conservative "equivocation". We mean by the West, the entities as well as players confronting Iran under the different titles, individually or integrated or in the form of a union: United State of America, European Union, representatives of the critical dialogue, Troika, and at present 5+1, but the reality, here, is that the two major parties to this relationships (equation) are Iran and US, and other players are performing their role within the framework of specific conditions ruling international system and also international organizations and particularly within the framework of their power as well as influence distribution. Their role, however, is mainly marginal or supplementary. This article intends to present a taboo-breaking theory with regard to the interactions between Iran and other players with the USA as a party with a pivotal role to play.

Question:

What Strategy can be applied by the Islamic Republic of Iran to proceed its trend of threat-eradication, détente, and interaction (with view to the realization of its 20-Year Outlook Document) with all of the current world powers while maintaining diplomatic conditions in its relations with 5+1?

Hypothesis:

The strategy of "Sword in sheath", or the sheathed sword together with "Diplomatic Smile" in the foreign policy, can lay the realistic grounds necessary for the materialization of the principle of "International Interaction" stipulated in the document of 20-Year Development Outlook.

This hypothesis that, if proved, can be turned in to a theory for research, include different experiences, both strong & weak points, and also reactions of the adverse parties towards the policies pursued by the two previous governments in Iran. The hypothesis considers also the unique, solitarist strategies followed by the both governments under Khatami & Ahmadinejad during past 16 years as effective in shaping the solitarist viewpoints of foreign parties who have been unable to realize the complexities and intricacies of Iranian society. Both previous Iranian governments have been responsible

in their own shaping a solitarist definition as well as identity of Islamic Republic and thus their policies can be put under critique. The strategy of "Diplomatic Smile" by "Khatami's government" and also the strategy of "Unsheathe (bare) Sword" by "Ahmadinejad's government" were not compatible enough with the realities of Iranian society and also with national 20-Year Outlook document (The horizon of 2025). Of course, one cannot deny the serious differences between these two governments in terms of strategies, and even the level and kind of achievements attained in the field of foreign policy. In this analytical framework, however, the critique of solitarist viewpoint towards the positions taken by the both government is justified. Regarding the Khatami's government, some "opportunities" in foreign policy were lost, and during Ahmadinejad tenure, the Islamic Republic, encountered with some threats. Generally speaking, these two leftist & rightist governments during their tenures of 16 years never left much defensible function when calculating and scrutinizing the equation of threats and opportunities. But, now, in our view, Rouhani government should follow the strategy of "Diplomatic Smile together with Sword in Sheath", learning from 16-year experiences of the previous governments.

New International Atmosphere:

One of the indicators of an active and powerful political system in international arena is the ability to cause changes in behaviors and theories of international atmosphere towards its political system, utilizing mechanisms such as modernization, reform, reinforcement as well as renewing its abnegation and devotion toward its national political system. As a proof to this indicator, we can refer to the substitution of "George Walker Bush" with "Barak Obama". With a stern face, an aggressive and even insulting tone, a hard and blood shedding policy, together with a hegemonic and interventionist strategy who had tarnished the international image of the United States, "Bush" was replaced by "Obama", with a smiling face, a mild tone, a soft, strategic and inner-directed policy. This change in transition period provided US Administration with a fresh international atmosphere. With no intention to create a simulation from one period of government in Iran with the ones in US history, we can mention that the change of administration and executive power in Iran in 2013, encountered a change in psychological atmosphere of international arena. So it can be said that a new era in Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy has been initiated. In fact, the condition relevant to the recent Iranian presidential elections with 73 percent voter turnout, on the one hand and its unexpected results on the other, has left a significant

impact on foreign policy field. Some Western analysts and politicians with an identical view towards experiences of the elections in 2009 were expecting that the next presidential election (2013) would turn to an element used for the weakening of the diplomatic negotiating power of the Islamic Republic. But, the elections were put in service of the "Apollo" goddess, not the "Dionysus" that was the stage manager of the events and excitations of 2009. On the other hand, the same group who expected to witness the elections as commanded and finally declaring the victory of the candidate whom they thought was closer to the Establishment could label Iran among the countries refused in "democracy", encountered a diverse result. The shaped democracy was not directed or engineered one. Thus, the meaningful and constitutional participation of Iranian people in the elections turned in to one of the indicators for Iran's negotiation power to be strengthened, accompanied by the ballistic missiles as well as demonstrations. Those elections, however, turned into strategic depth of the country. These two types of political participation and mobilization of Iranian people were replies to the questions and ambiguities that could ruin many diplomatic opportunities in negotiating table and also the riot – centered interventions by Iran's enemies, the situation that happened to the two previous governments.

1. The age of Smile

Khatami was, in fact, "Savonarola" the priest. The same, Italian Dominican faithful and good-natured priest, friar and preacher of the historical theory of "Nicola Machiavelli", who was defeated from cunning, armed and deceptive Pope of the day, Alexander 6. Machiavelli was of this opinion that prophets without weapon are always defeated. Indeed, contrary to the Machiavelli age, if everyone was telling the truth in that time, the strategy of "dialogue among civilizations" by Khatami turned into a winning one. He had neglected of the reality of power play.

Even, the year 2001 was named as the year of "Dialogue among civilizations" by the UN General Assembly. Today, General Assembly is, however, a circle for the idealists of the world. At that time, the world powers were plotting other schemes against Iranian people in United Nation Security Council as the body mandated with the use of force and exercising power, based on chapter 7 of the UN Charter. United States that had adopted and exacted its first trans-border laws to impose sanctions against Iran (D'Amato & Helms Breton laws), was pursuing to enforce these self-adopted laws, using its position as superpower. A few years later, the Americans exercised this unfair right of being super power, in

the form of sanction-related policies and resolutions (Article 41). Moreover, the expression "Military option on the table" is of reference to the Article 42 of the seventh chapter which issues the approval for military action against the countries. The regretful issue is that during different governments' ruler ship in Iran, American officials removed any possible opportunity to change and interaction, insisting on their own solitarist strategies. Thus, the mild policies followed by Khatami in foreign arena, couldn't leave the strategy pursued by the warmonger neo-conservatives off the agenda. According to this strategy and through an Action Plan by "American Enterprise Institute", the Islamic Republic of Iran was clearly recognized by George Bush (Father) Administration, clearly recognized as US prime target of interventionist policies and actions relevant to overthrow and regime change in Iran. According to this Action Plan, submitted for execution to the US Defense Department, after military action and establishing military bases in both Iraq & Afghanistan, the superpower had to clip or pluck Iran's wings in its strategic depth in Palestine, Lebanon and Syria through joint military actions accompanied by its regional allies such as Israel and then enter in to military action against Iran at the final stage. All different anti-Iranian action plans are shaped in such framework. (Hersh, 2006).

The Republicans were precluded from proceeding and advancing the plan, due to Bush failure after invading Iraq. Eight Year after the defeat of "Democratization" policy followed by "Bill Clinton", however, Republicans returned to power with Bush, the Second, as US president, placing the fulfillment of unfinished "Enterprise Action plan" on their agenda with the help of a catalyst such as 9/11 events, so that both US & Israel wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Palestine and Lebanon as well as support to violent changes in Syria cannot be assessed beyond the reality of strategic confrontation between United State and Iran. (Falahatpisheh)

Right at the time when Iranian ex-President Khatami was pursuing the policy of dialogue, the then president Bill Clinton was considering universalization of "D'Amato & Helms Breton" anti-Iranian sanctions laws, as his top agenda. Moreover, his successor, "George Walker Bush", was paving the way to put Iran under the inclusion of Article 42 (Threat). The "Greater Middle East" plan, and also its Caesarian-born wicked and illegal offspring named "Iran-phobia" were launched and unveiled, in line with these policies.

The culminations of US power play and suicidal policies as well as Iran's weakness of financial resources were simultaneously seen in

Khatami's era. So, the practicability needed for the détente policy between the two parties was never provided. And specially when the US reacted to the Iranian green light to indirectly coordinating and involvement in activities against terrorist states and groups in Iraq and Afghanistan in Saddam & Taliban times, by placing and labeling Iran as the "Axis of Evil", the situation of pro- détente forces in Iran was vehemently watered down.

So, for the same reason, the Bush Administration as well as the European Union's Green Party, were, in fact, among the major elements for the radical foreign policies adopted by the next government in Iran. Through the "threatening" policy of "Mission for combat against terrorism", Bush placed Iran in the position of "Guilty" and culpable, and also the EU was labeling and considering Islamic Republic as "Accused" and arraigned, by means of their humiliating strategy of "Critical Dialogue", while the main culprits of terrorism, including perpetrators of 9/11 catastrophe, were of Arab citizenship, considered to be American friends and allies. Furthermore, while, in some countries, as the US & EU contract party in security, arms sale and trade pacts and agreements, women even had no rights to drive a car and human beings were decapitated in the public view as a so-called canonical punishment, the Islamic Republic of Iran was roughly holding one election each year. More interestingly, in the first stages of the US military expedition to the Middle East, Bush categorized 11 Arab states of the region with the kingdom ruler ship as "democratic" while, the Islamic Republic of Iran was just labeled as "Undemocratic"!

Sanctions & embargoes, as well as, critical dialogue were the results of idealistic smiles. Iran had to destroy and remove its power leverage, while others were being rewarded for acceding to the present global power structure. Iran had to pay the costs to prove its good will, in a manner that there was no ultimate chance for Khatami's government to justify and legitimize this policy for Iranian people. The "Smile Government" was consequently forced to take a righteous action and break and remove the suspension for the first time. The suspension of UCF facilities in Isfahan (Yellow Cake production) was removed in Khatami's tenure of office and then Ahmadinejad government, alongside the removal of other suspensions adopted the policy of peaceful nuclear program advancement, emphasizing the US and its allies as unreliable. Ahmadinejad had correctly derived the evidences relevant to the US unreliability through practical experiences perceived from it toward his predecessor. He used these proofs when taking the positions that shaped the "era of

unsheathed sword" in the field of foreign policy in Islamic Republic of Iran.

2. The era of unsheathed sword

When Ahmadinejad took the reign of Iranian government, United States was on the slope of declining its hegemony, as well as the failure of the policy of "pre-emptive war". On the other hand, Iran was also on the peak of its oil revenues with no entanglements and bottlenecks relevant to the past. During 8 years, the oil revenues amounted to over than 700 billion dollars. Also, the bungling and clumsy exertion of power by US in regional states had resulted in activating and releasing the capacities inside the strategic depth of the Islamic Republic of Iran. In spite of the Bush, intoxicated by US military power, who believed in viability of powerfully imposing American values, Obama was seeking a way to get US military forces out of both Afghanistan & Iraq. The decline of US hegemony was providing a chance for both sides to find their positions closer to each other, at least in a détente - oriented framework.

In the second era, each one of the two types of American analysts' theories, elaborates how the US hegemonic decline can occur, in such a way that the theory of "Relative decline" by Joseph Nye, (Nye, 2012, pp 215-217) and also the theory of "Absolute Decline" by Christopher Lynne, (Lynne, 2012, pp 203-213) regarding the current situation of US hegemony and its impacts on international development management are shaped. This issue has become a major subject of discussion in US strategic centers and also circles related to political and election-related challenges since recent decade. In Ahmadinejad era, however, through taking some radical positions and stands, as well as making hardline speeches, the possibility for analyzing the situations and positions, aimed at creating a fresh strategy as a diplomatic opportunity, was regrettably ruined by the antagonist power. The practical result appeared was confirmation of Nye theory as a prevailing theory that "United State has been able to use the "soft power" in managing its strategic confrontation with Iran". Of course, certain strategic and operational weaknesses in Iranian foreign policy should be also added to the problem. In spite of the reality of the indications relevant to declining US global hegemony and consequently the Mid-Eastern one, these kinds of elements have caused the hegemonic role and approach of the US towards Iran to be continued.

Josef Nye, American "Harvard university" professor, never admits the claim of US hegemony decline, though some indications related to the relative decline of the superpower's hegemony can be derived from the gist of his analysis. Nye,

however, is of this belief that the current situation of the world is not comparable with the hegemonic transition period of the past, and the US can finally sustain its hegemony through soft & strategic management of the world development. This important issue, however, has some requirements such as coping with the insecurities and instabilities in some parts of the world. The issue has been emphasized and separated in another conception in American strategy of national security for the 21st century.

6. The elements and indications of US hegemony decline:

The main elements indicating the decline of US hegemony are categorized in two types of external & internal. External elements : The incurrence of new great powers, as well as the matchless transformation of the economic power focus from "Europe-Atlantic" area into the "Asia" can be considered as the most important motives and external elements for US hegemony decline . The rise of a power such as "China" is a clear sign of ending unipolar system. Formation of new economic clubs like "Bricks Group" (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) and also the equations beyond US dollar area are analyzable in line with this issue.

The second : Domestic financial crisis can also be named as the other motive and element for US hegemony decline, that shows relative decline, and in some cases is viewed by some theorists as absolute decline of the economic power of the country . The most significant indication and result of this situation are as follows:

"The economic position of dollar as a credit card and backing for US authority and negotiation power has weakened". The end of the second world war , was the age of American- inspired peace (pax American), and this country became the most powerful player of international system in military and economic arenas ,using its uncontested power . "Kristopher Lynne" believes the American- inspired peace lasted for 6 decades, but it has expired since 2012. (Lynne, 2012, p.215). In our view , on the issue of US hegemony decline, the theory by Lynne is more proved than the Nye's , who denies the decline . In strategic domain , however, the Nye theory is more approvable , that means : the same power which is faced with the status of declining, in the field of confrontation with Iran's strategy, enjoys an unprecedented hegemonic power and the reason for that was found in application of Nye's "soft power" theory by the United States , on the one hand and strategic weak points of the Islamic Republic regional power, on the other . In the matrix of soft power theory, the hegemonic power is absent

but effective. In case of incorrect execution of Iranian 20-Year Outlook document , the regional power is , in fact, the player who is inclined to show himself as the goal and also as the threat . The strategy of unsheathed sword by Ahmadinejad had a major role to play in the augmentation of these threats as well as, losing different diplomatic opportunity faced by Islamic Republic.(Falahatpisheh,1392). The result of Ahmadinejad's strategy of unsheathed sword was, however, "Iran phobia". And it was the policy that US & its two regional allies had not succeeded to impose, in Khatami era , but with the glittering of Ahmadinejad's unsheathed sword, this US strategy was provided with needed ground to be shown .

3. The age of Sheathed Sword.

3/1: The reasons for adopting the strategy of "armed negotiations":

There are several reasons according which an Iranian diplomat cannot and should not sit on the negotiating table without the sheathed sword on his back, as follows:

1. The backgrounds of the US-Iran relationships:

United States of America has granted no concessions to Iran but when being in situation of the cold war or stalemated in the chess play. They also have been suffering from miscalculations , in spite of Iran's readiness as well as the goodwill for negotiations and détente . In other words, they have always been relying on the punitive instruments instead of the encouraging and inciting ones.

2. US foreign policy strategy:

According to this strategy , at least when proclaiming formal positions, US is utilizing the military tools to blackmail Iran . American politicians and analysts, still, have some differences over the two alternative options i.e. soft one for trade, economic and diplomatic tools vs. hard options for military one, confronting Iran. Despite non - occurrence of war, the military action against Iran has often enjoyed staunch proponents in the US. (Friedman.2012)

Off course, in Obama terms of office, US Administration distanced from military strategies of Bush era, adopting a calculating outlook. The reason for that was partly because of the huge costs of the war as well as the defense budget in a time that US economy was suffering from a heavy debt of 17 billion dollars. Meanwhile, according to Nobel Laureate in economics, "Joseph Stieglitz" , the direct and indirect costs of the Iraq war amounted 3 billion US dollars .(Stieglitz, J, and L, Bilmiss, 2008) . In fact, the theory of military action or military option against the Islamic Republic of Iran,

had turned into a mere military bluff as well as a non-real menace in the second term of Ahmadinejad, a few months after the termination of his tenure, this reality was proved again with the unexpected hesitation of Obama Administration in attacking Syria. The historical experiences, however, remind Iranians of that in spite of Democrats, the issue of war with Iran has been followed by the Republicans with an emotional and non-calculating viewpoint. An analysis of the behaviors and also positions taken by "Ronald Regan" (the main supporter of Saddam Hussein in imposed Iraqi war against Iran), George Bush the Father, (sponsor of the action plan against Iran) and George Walker Bush (who branded Iran as axis of evil) may simply justify the Iranian people concerns. So, it is natural that the Islamic Republic of Iran can boost its defensive strength based on the capacity to confront with the most suicidal bipartisan strategies, supported by both Republicans and Democrats.

3. "The threshold of war" among the countries of Middle East, and in particular, threats by the two allies of the US in the region.

In other words, the all-out threats from Zionist regime in a possible proxy war against Iran and also the "vexing proxy" threat from terror groups associated to Salafists in an area of ideological competition, and also the threat from undemocratic world in the area of political competition and finally from economic competitors in the realm of development-related competition.

4. The matchless role of the elements and forces of Iranian power, together with the strength of negotiating power in foreign policy with regard to the political participation and supports such as institutional element of nationwide elections as well as the customary element of popular demonstrations, which we witnessed them as the two convincing proofs in 2013, and in the climax of the diplomatic relations and challenges between Iran and 5+1.

3/2. Indications of the Sheathed Sword

The metaphor of the unsheathed sword includes each military and non-military element that's to be the symbol or indicator of Iran's power and authority. Some are as follows:

1. The people

Considering the speedy rate of events and also political fluctuations in the ties among the states and nations of the Mid-East region, even among some countries of the South and East of Europe as well as East Asia, the year 2014 was unique. From Arab countries to Greece, Spain, Italy, Ukraine and Thailand in which the people showed a political exciting participation from themselves, the Islamic Republic of Iran was the only one who used the

vibrant political participation of its people to boost the national negotiating power. Presidential elections, nationwide demonstrations in the fourth of November, and eleventh of February (victory day of Islamic republic) and even attending the extensive religious rites and customs by the people, were in fact parts of their political and justice-seeking mobilization. Iranians enjoy a very outstanding and strategic position, thanks to the characteristics such as being tirelessness in defending their country, as well as showing resistance in the situations of war and sanctions together with the belief in the justified positions of incumbent government, and in particular, due to their being so sensitive to foreign interference.

In 1994, four years after termination of the 8-year Iraqi imposed war against Iran, Iranian people gave interesting answer to a survey according which 61 percent of them said that if the war begins again they would immediately go for war to defend their country. (Rafi pour, 1999, P.555). This figure was, however, separate from the number of military personnel that had gotten seasoned in the war which was imposed against Iran in the Revolution transitional period and exactly when the Iranian national army was put under sanctions imposed by both the East & West blocks and ultimately turned in to one of the unjust wars of the world. According to the relevant documents, 36 countries of the world including 5 superpowers and permanent members of the U.N Security Council fully supported Saddam. (Nikkhah Bahrami/ Falahat pisheh, Modarres conference). Further developments also proved that Iranian people had enjoyed an influential participation in both election and mass mobilization fields nationwide in accordance with universal standards. This reality has been occasionally confessed by the same foreign adversaries that have initiated a new round of political interaction and diplomacy toward Iran since last November.

2. Strategic depth of the Islamic Republic

Despite the relative decline of Shiite standing in both eras of Qajar and Pahlavi kingdoms, the capacity and strength of spirituality and also the role of religion in political life of the whole Mid-East region became prominent thanks to the victory of the 1979 Islamic Revolution in Iran and certain developments such as regime change in Iraq, victorious wars of the Lebanese Hizbollah with Israel and also revolutionary movements belong to Shiite communities in Bahrain and Saudi Arabia, have again attracted the world attention to the issue of the Shiism. Whatever separates Shiism and ultimately Islam from different currents is its enjoying with the power of logic in confrontation

and also resistance from one side and the capacity to being flexible and entering in to interaction from the other side . So , this kind of religion is believed to be as the most significant challenge of the contemporary West .

At the other hand, West takes this reality in to consideration that the Arab Shiites, suffering from being kept in poverty and destitution by Sunni governments in the region , and protesting against their situation , may be provided with taking absolute or relative power, thanks to any possible abrupt change in the political conditions of certain countries . Moreover , the Shiite populations of Arab world are strategically located and resident at the heart of the largest oil fields of the Middle East region as well as in the route to the Persian Gulf oil highways . Fuller opines in his book titled : "Arab Shiites : forgotten Muslims" that : "Theoretically, Arab Shiites are able to take the most oil benefits and revenues of the Persian Gulf under their own absolute control with the help of Iran".

3. Nuclear-related and other scientific advancements that have crossed the monopolistic red lines of the superpowers of the day

The second chapter of the law on the Fifth Development program of the Islamic republic of Iran is totally related to the "Knowledge-based Development". This chapter has been considered for the sake of the realization of the national 20-Year development Outlook, according which Iran should occupy the first place in different fields including scientific one, across the Middle East and some parts of the north Africa and central Asia and Caucuses which totally are composed of 26 countries . The audacious entry by the Iranian scientists and university students into the same borders of the knowledge and technology that have been previously monopolized by some world powers , has resulted in a kind of fundamental confrontation . So, nuclear technology is, in fact, the first and at the same time, the most important dimension of this confrontation. Iranian indigenous nuclear technology has reached a level of independent and self-supporting advancement that enjoys the necessary technologic capacity and caliber to develop any kind of nuclear product, and even the bomb. Iran, however, never chose this route due to "religious reasons and jurisprudence-related prohibitions". The phased and diversified advancement in peaceful nuclear technology have always been as one of the most important elements for strengthening the negotiating power of the representatives of different governments of Islamic Republic in nuclear talks. Iran's regression from introducing at the level of 20 % of nuclear fuel was in fact the most important cost paid for one of the few and of course the most

palpable retreats in the history of the US relationship with Iran. This retreat, however, never ruins Iran's capabilities. According to senator Menendez of US Congress who is representing part of the concerns of US politicians : "The clear and deeply worrying fact is that Iran is practically distancing from nuclear evasion just a couple of weeks to a few months and doesn't seem that the elements and contents mentioned in the joint action plan on the final nuclear agreement be able to drive Iran's capabilities back for more than a couple of weeks" . He also opines: "Iran says it won't negotiate with a gun to its head, well I would suggest it is Iran that has put a nuclear gun to the world's head. (Menendez, 2013). Based on Geneva Joint Plan of Action, one of the final ends is, indeed, recognizing nuclear rights of Iran as an "entitled (rightful) and bound" member of the IAEA, which means all members that honor their commitment and fulfill their duty, even additional and voluntary ones , should be provided with their legal rights stipulated in the constitution of the IAEA as well as the contents of the NPT. This technology elevates tens of scientific and industrial national courses to the level of "master technology" due to its fundamental standing. So, this technology is relying to the upper laws such as the Constitution, 20-Year Outlook plan, the general policies relevant to the Resistance economy , as well as the three legislation which were adopted in the seventh term of Islamic parliament of Iran. Nuclear technology is considered to be the most tangible lever of negotiation for Iranian diplomats after the suspension of nuclear facilities of UCF in Isfahan, Yellow Cake, as well as enrichment activities in Natanz had been broken.

4. Power of deterrent defense with regard to regional and ultra-regional probable threats

In this part of the article, the following elements are emphasized as the convincing reasons for the "legitimacy" and "non-negotiability" of Iran's military achievements:

4/1. Bitter experiences of the past:

Ballistic missiles as defense – related red lines of Iran and this fact are not negotiable, and they never should be inspected or monitored. The self-supporting and self-reliant defensive and aggressive power of Iran's air force is resulted from bitter experiences of war with neighboring Iraq. In that time , the aerial battle with the invading enemy has turned to a weak point in military tactics of the Iranian combatants , due to cancelation of the arms procurement from the Western partners by former regime, in particular non delivering pre-paid F14 fighters and other ammunitions by US. If Iran could have been provided with just a small part of the present indigenous technology and products, Iraq

would not dare invading Iranian soil. Moreover, if any such war broke out, the result was definitely different. So, the practical experiences gained from the wars and also regional animosities as well as foreign instigations and intrigues against Iran, are to be the most significant element justifying Iran's defense-related policies as well as achievements.

4/2. The necessity of Military Balance and Adjustment:

A major part of the whole arms produced by the West & East of the world are spilling towards Middle East, in particular toward Israel and certain Arab regimes of the region which have always had challenges with Iran. Considering indicators relevant to military procurement, the Islamic Republic of Iran is at the lowest grade in the region, and if this non-balance is not adjusted and the domestic defense-related products are not produced sufficiently through an appropriate strategy, the Iranian national security elements will face a serious weakness. In 2013, an arms sale contract at the cost of \$ 10 billion between US and its allies in the Mid-East region- including Israel- to strengthen their defense power against Iran was finalized. (Iranian diplomacy, 2013). The contract was signed in the name of augmenting the Israeli, Saudi Arabia and UAE's defense capabilities against Iran. According to this accord, Israel will be allowed to buy aerial refueling jets to increase its ability in targeting Iran. Buying new missiles and fighters for transferring military personnel have also been included in this contract. While Zionist regime has spoken many times of taking military action against Iran during recent year, pressurizing Iran for development of entirely "defense-oriented" missile program is contrary to UN Charter. Based on this Charter, the countries subject to menace have the right to strengthen and equip themselves for defense and "retaliation". In 2010, also Saudi Arabia had revealed a contract with US to buy F15 Fighters, costing \$ 29500 billion. Saudi Arabia and a number of Arab oil- exporting states of the region have been the biggest arms purchasers of the last 30 years. What has aroused the concern of the international society is, however, this reality that roughly the entire arms in the hands of the terrorist groups currently activating across the Middle East and North Africa are taken from the Arab countries arsenals, and while the Israel is directly threatening Iran to military action, "Vahhabi" terror groups have ignited a proxy war against Iran representing some Arab conservative regimes of the region. And this is an unfortunate reality that is construed to be the additional reason, besides the continues threat by the Zionist regime, for the legitimacy of Iran's defense programs. With an experience of victory in the wars with Arabs in 1948 (the Arab wars against

existence of Israel), 1956, 1967 (the Six- day war), 1973 (Ramadan war), 1982 (occupying south of Lebanon) and aerial bombing of Iraqi nuclear facilities of Osirac (1981) which left unanswered as well as recent attacks against Syria, Israel has turned in to a record- breaker as well as the most important element in igniting the bloody wars in the Mid-East. Both 33-day war against Lebanon and 22-day war against Palestine, were perpetrated by this regime in recent years. Israel's self-confessed fiasco in these two wars inspired and resulted from an Iranian resistance pattern, called "Asymmetrical war", was considered as a tested major obstacle preventing Netanyahu from committing any possible military suicide. This is, in fact, the same war that US is deeply concerned on spreading, becoming erosive, and particularly non- manageable of it, thus US is not unpleasant with the conditions of "Armed peace" created by Iran. Till now, no other Arab country has been able to forge and strike a balance with the Zionist regime. From the other hand, creating a solid front and powerful commanding of this confrontation by Iran against Vahhabi terror groups, has led to non-spreading of atrocities which Westerners cannot endure to perceive and watch even on their TV or computer screens at their homes. And it is forecast that the time will come when the United State and the whole world will rely on Iran's anti- terror role, just like in current situation that Iran is continually being appreciated for its great part in combating drugs and narcotics.

4/3. Being prepared with respect to "Military option on the table". The expression of "Military option on the table" is still a part of the political literature of US as well as Zionist regime. Considering this issue and based on the principle of "retaliation", Islamic Republic of Iran's defense program is of needed legitimacy. Iranians are, however, entitled to be sensitive towards another country's policy that while planning possible military action against Iran, requiring its military disarmament. This policy of behaving towards Iran's case is reminding of "Iraq" in 1990s (UNSCOM), the path Iranians never intend to enter and even prefer "war option" to this humiliating process. In addition to humiliating Iraq, that process imposed conditions on that country that an Iraqi 'elite group named it as imposition of 70 years of backwardness to their country and also as the most terrible extirpation and uprooting of the "Mesopotamia", leaving hundreds of people killed, handicapped, widowed, and also 5 millions of orphans. In our belief, an armed Iran, is guarantor and sponsor of peace & security of Persian Gulf region and its 50- percent share of the world energy. Of course, with respect to forced changes imposed to the US strategy of "pre-emptive

war", the "military option" against Iran within incumbent Obama administration has turned into a "political bluff". This option was not even realized on Syria. The reality, however, is that countries like Iran which have used the worst experiences of imposed foreign wars and invasions as a prop for their defense-related strategies, have formulated this strategy based on probable behaviors of a "supposed enemy" often conducting "illogically and emotionally" when speaking on military option. Iraq and Afghanistan are samples of such behaviors by Republicans who will possibly return to power in next elections. The probability of the defeat of democratic party in next elections, whether in midterm or in presidential one, is serious and high. Since 1997, Iranians have been regulating their defense strategy based on the analysis towards the inhumane behavior of the commander of the US "Vincent" warship, and after this war criminal had been praised by American officials, unfortunately, the number of such commanders increased in US army! All US military bases contributing in any possible attack on Iran are within the carry and gun reach of Iranian missiles with the range of 2000 km. With an appropriate investment in the field of designing and building missiles and unmanned drones that are considered as a critical pillars of any modern army in today world, Islamic Republic of Iran has been able to introduce itself as a regional major power in recent years. 2 (Iranian Diplomacy, 2013). The both sides, however, have not prepared the necessary ground to adjust these "cold war like" conditions.

5. Orientation of the regional democratic developments towards Iran's benefits : Political developments in the Middle East and North Africa are moving towards Iranian strategy and interests from two directions : 1. Unavoidable democracy-seeking process of the Arab youth.

2. Revealing process of horrifying terrorist small islands that has approached the West to the old analysis and warnings of the Islamic Republic, after the fake current of Iran-phobia had been retreated. This process is leading to the strengthening of Iran's negotiating power with the West.

On the first issue it should be mentioned that the people of Arab States which until the outbreak of Islamic (or Arabian) Spring and also consequent general concerns of the people in most regional countries about democracy process are taking steps in direction that are in line with the interests and goals of the Islamic Republic of Iran. This part of Arab Societies is, in fact, the main addressee of US plan of Greater Mid-East region as well as the addressee of the pattern of the Iranian Islamic Republic and political Islam. Iran and America

have reached a kind of "overlapping in their interests", with respect to certain situations such as developments in Bosnia Herzegovina, Iraq and Afghanistan. Utilizing the figurative space, the awakened people of Arab states have turned in to a grave reality in regional developments, and in face of their rulers' anti-revolutionary role, they are considering themselves close to either Iran or US, depending on their view towards their own revolutionary movement. Non-Salafi Muslims are close to Iran and liberal Muslims are close to the US. They, however, have not emphasized on their gap in the phase of deliverance and emancipation or reform-seeking level. Thus, the doubt by the Arab conservatives towards these two global and regional powers has, for the first time, encountered anti-Iranian coalition and its regional allies with fluctuations. According to both international standards and the contents of US-sponsored plan of Greater Middle East region, whenever the issue of the political standing of the people of Arab states is concerned, the friendly governments are considered as the blind spots of US regional policy. The clear difference in strategic co-ordination with United States among undemocratic Arab rulers and regimes, on the one hand and the demand for democracy and political participation by the people of these countries on the other, are among internal contradictions in the Greater Mid-East region plan. On the Second issue, the extremist terror groups including Al-Qaeda, Taliban, armed militants in Iraq & North Africa, Jundollah in east of Iran, "Daesh" (Islamic government of Iraq & Shaam), "Al-Nosrah" (with two branches of "Shaami" in Syria and "Ottoman" in Turkey and so on) whose terror acts from bombardment of Twin Trade Towers in New York to suicide attacks, and particularly utilizing any possible vacuum in national sovereignty and security of the Islamic countries, have turned this collection into a de facto terror threat in Middle East & North Africa.

On the contrary, in spite of available analysis about the Greater Mid-East region plan, the Shiite geo-politics, intellectually, philosophically, religiously, and even with respect to its strategic view, lack the needed capacity as well as necessary conditions to embark terror operations. As an indication to this reality, it can be said that out of 42 terror groups mentioned in the annual report of the US Foreign Ministry, including 27 Islamic groups, there is only one group named from Shiite entity called Lebanese Hezbollah. Surprisingly, out of these 42 entities labeled as terror groups in US Foreign Ministry and Intelligence services black list, Hezbollah is the only group that is never considered "terrorist" by the people, government

and even political rivals inside Lebanon, but on the contrary, is enjoying a necessitated and affirmative role in domestic interactions as well as grave political competitions such as national "elections" and forming "coalition government", utilizing from political Islam of "Shiite – Iranian" pattern.

6. Weakening of Anti- Iranian Lobbies

Developments occurred in Iran and Middle-East during recent decade, resulting in more transparency towards the facts, demands and particularly the menaces of this region, have caused certain weaknesses and differences among anti-Iran lobbies and have diminished their role - playing in pressurizing US senior officials. Tangible weakening of the role played by the three major lobbies on Iran-related decision making is considered to be a boosting element

Of the positions taken by the present Iranian negotiators:

6/1. US Neo- Conservatives (Neo-Cons) and proponents of the hard policy:

For the first time in the history of the hazy Iran - US relations after Iranian revolution, an American president threatened to interpose a "veto" against any possible plan on fresh Iranian sanctions. The holders of veto power are usually utilizing the veto leverage to protect their strategic allies. Obama is not recognizing and considering Iran as US friend, speaking about the necessity of keeping the general structure of sanctions against Iran in transitional era, particularly with respect to its probable results. This principle, however, indicates the formation of the soft approach in America, and this is the same approach that Iranians can show a better play using relevant elements.

These remarks by Obama in US congress that "After 'Geneva 3' agreement, in my opinion, Iran will never threaten our interests and our allies", has a strategic meaning and effect. 13 years ago, the then US president, "George Walker Bush", branded Iran as an "axis of evil" and also named this country as immediate future target of America, while Iranian had just an inactive cascade of 164 "centrifuges" but today, President Obama is speaking implicitly about the death of the "Iran-phobia", while Iranians are producing nuclear fuel at industrial level by their own active 19000 centrifuges. The two parties, with no doubt, have a long way to the realization of détente policy but they had never achieved to current level of mutual understanding to prevent "aggravation of crisis". The bottom line is, however, that Obama has clearly emphasized that he maintains some differences about the applicability of the threats against national interests of the US and those of some of its allies such as Israel, with both Netanyahu of Israel and 15 democrat senators who had lined up

alongside with the anti-Iran Republican congressmen. 6/2: Lobbies of the Jews:

Zionist regime extremist prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, had turned to one of the most active diplomats of the world during the last half of the year 2013. In his many trips to different capitals of the world countries, and semi-residing in Washington, Netanyahu did struggle to prevent forging a rift and split in anti-Iranian international coalition. This event was not, however, occurred and for the first time since 1990s, the most powerful anti-Iranian Jews lobby was also suffering from fissure and shake. AIPAC (The American Israel Public Affairs Committee) was not able to secure sufficient anti-Iranian support as well as anti-Geneva agreement vote in US congress like in the past. Some analysts opined this phenomenon is a result of splitting of the AIPAC on the Iranian issue. They believe the G-street known as the young AIPAC, is now working against Iran sanctions. This led to a situation that Obama finally took advantage of the weakened Israeli lobby. This lobby that has been able to influence US policies towards Iran, is presently subject to change and this can increase the power of Iran for maneuvering. (Slavin, 1992)

6/3 The Arab lobby (Oil and Arms):

During recent century, the oil and arms as well as the political-trade relationships between Arabs and US, has proved to be the most important element involved in problems such as lack of development, wars, corruption and delay in democratization process in the Middle East. Two lobbies of oil & arms inter-linked with the interests of the Arab kings and conservatives of the Middle East, have been playing undeniable role in decision-making process of both US Administration and Congress towards Iran. Aiming at goals and motivations such as preventing export of the Iranian anti-despotism revolution, seizure of the economic and development-oriented opportunities resulting from Western-imposed sanctions against Iran, as well as slurring over democracy-seeking movements of their citizenries, this lobby has always appeared as an obstacle in the way of easing Iran-US relationship. During recent three years, however, the lobby's role has diminished and accordingly Iranian maneuvering space has developed, due to different reasons.

The Arab world is from among few demographic regions in the globe that lack democracy. The indicators of democracy and political participation in this region are even lower than the ones in Africa and Afghanistan. The evidences relevant to continual interferences, involvement and having a hand by the intelligence and security officials of these countries in training and spreading terrorism are increasingly revealed. The inevitable

challenge faced by the Middle East in future , will be challenge between "Democracy & Terrorism" . If terrorism wins in this battle, the interests pursued by the West across this region as the source of the world energy will encounter serious threats and the terrorists will also be equipped and armed with weapons of mass destruction by 2025. This is, in fact, from among the newly-revealed cards of the Arab kings to sustain their hereditary power structure. On the contrary, if democracy turns into prevailing political literature of the future Arab world, this region will seem less horrifying, its population will be happier and there will be more certainty by the world on "energy security" , as well. But , it should be regretfully be said that the era of war and transition with both terrorism and democracy (Demon & Charming) in the Middle East will be the bloody one .

In fact, for the same reason, the US Administration was obliged and obligated to put an end to independency of the country on the oil of the Middle East in a 10-Year period, based on a law adopted by US Congress. Americans , however , are most probably negligent and inattentive to this plot of Saudi Arabia as adopted mother of the region's Arab Kings to counteract that legislation . Forecasting US challenge with "China" over assuming the world hegemony in the decade to come , Riyadh is poised to substitute Western partners with Chinese, in un-renewed oil contracts. Saudi officials are of this hope that they will be able to turn their democracy challenge , delayed up to now with the help of the West's capitalistic "greed" , into a collusion issue within the framework of the "Orientalism" . Anyway, West criticism over human rights & democracy issues towards China and Arab conservative leaders, will result in their getting closer to each other .

Study on the future of the Iran- US relationship and the balance between Smile and Sword :

After 13 years of US- sponsored wars as well as violent strategy pursued by this country in the Middle East and Indian subcontinent, but now, we are witnessing a more stable foreign policy from United States. This strategic change or adjustment, however, has not been made just based on a decision by president Obama. A glance at the US strategy for the 21 century appears that this conservatism is also applicable in the country's long term strategy. In this document, US interests are divided, in order of preference, in to three categories relevant to the "Survival", "Crucial interests" and finally "Important" ones.

1. The interests related to the Survival:

These kind of interests are involved with the security of the main territory of the United States in face of direct attacks particularly with the weapons of

mass destruction by other foreign countries or terrorists as well as sustaining the order based on US Constitution in domestic field .

2. Crucial / Critical interests including the continued security of the key international systems such as energy , economy, transportation, intelligence atmosphere and communication and health & hygiene on which the life and peace of Americans are relying and that, there should be no serious rival for the Americans world over individually or in the form of any competing coalition , and also there should be no threat against the security of America and its allies' and finally the de facto and potential US adversaries , should never access to the weapons of mass destruction and nuclear ones . (274/ 275)

3. "Important interests" is involved with the confrontation with regional threats that are not threatening US interests directly. These interests also include follow up of the issues of humanrights and democracy as well as combating the narcotics and drug smuggling. Considering the pragmatic foreign policy of the US, these interests, however, are of slogan-centered nature, unless they are followed with the aim of pressurizing the states menacing the two more fundamental interests of that power , mentioned above . (Falahatpisheh, 275). Yet , the interpretation of new US strategy towards Iran , is still formed within the framework of the past challenging triangle : "Punishment" , "Sanctions" , and "Prolongation" of Iran's dossier are forming the three sides of the US enmity tringle with the Islamic Republic of Iran. The political literature of different US officials is proving this negative strategic viewpoint that is even forcing president Rouhani's negotiating team to attend the negotiations in an "equipped and armed" manner . The above - mentioned strategic triangle , planned against Islamic Republic of Iran, is a manifestation of applying the Us soft power that has been formulated based on the theories by people like Joseph Nye, according which in a world that can be described in the form of a 3-dimensional chess plate. In this plate, the foreign policy of United State as the greatest military power (might) of the world , has to be supported by military threats , since the upper dimension shows the US military galloping, and second dimension , there should be sanctions as the most important lever for reaching agreement with other economic powers . The third dimension is relevant to the "prolongation and extension" of the psychological conditions against Iran through inculcating this country , e.g. an extended, interpretable range for creating accusations against Iran aiming at turning other leverages (punishment & particularly sanctions) into an enduring and indelible image on the stone with regard to the relationship with Iran.

A. Punishment: Maintenance of the military option at the first level as a threat to "Iranian political survival" and putting Iranian case on the threshold of UN Charter, seventh chapter, article 42. Based on this analytical framework, the US will definitely be of more success if it is appeared to manage, restrict and surround the whole developments at the upper level of this chess plate. For this reason, the expression of "Military option is still on the table", is emphasized in every diplomatic message to Iran.

A-"Sanctions": The successful management of interactions of the second level in the chess (economic field) together with keeping the Iranian dossier under the article 41 of the seventh chapter of UN Charter is considered as a major obstacle for Iranian "development-oriented goals".

B-"Prolongation" of the "Containment policy" and considering Iran as a "target" in the framework of the chess third level. In this level it is claimed that Iran in not honoring its commitments as a member of international organizations and this prolongation is continuing until a fresh definition from Iranian political geography be presented and let it be returned to strategic realm of the West. Labeling Iran as one of the main players in the ultra-national field of hidden threats aimed at keeping Iran at the threshold of constant sanctions, and also threatening and punishing this country, have turned in to a major current in the United States. So, it is anticipated that in the third field, the unfinished and interpretable accusations, such as physical, proxy and cyber terrorism, money laundering, human rights violation and so on, will be still on the agenda, till the return of Iran in to the strategic realm of that power. For instance, in November 2013, some members of US Congress drew up a plan according which anti-Iranian sanctions should be extended with the continuation of its missile program, and also because of human rights issue, even though, the country is sustaining to build the trust in its nuclear program. Preparing a bill of indictment for a 240 billion dollars compensation from Iran on 9/11 catastrophe is formulated with respect to the said issue, e.g. it's an amount that is 24 times more than the whole assets due to be unfrozen and freed in the form of installments upon noisy agreement over Iranian nuclear program in Geneva 3. The entire oil revenue for Iran in current situation of sanctions and embargoes is estimated to be roughly 23 billion dollars in the year 2014 budget, based on 800, 000 barrels per day, each barrel 90 dollars.

In other words, Iranian is wondering whether the Americans have planned to plunder their national revenue equal with their oil revenues in eleven years.

7. Diversity in foreign policy

Due to some political, economic and demographic geography as well as enjoying a lenient intellectual foundation, Islamic Republic of Iran has the capacity and possibility to apply a diverse foreign policy, providing with maneuvering power. But, after 25 years of failure in forging an international coalition against Iran, the US and its certain regional allies finally proceeded the process since 2003 to be end with "Iran-phobia" that caused Iranian case to be put under the seventh chapter of UN Charter. This strategy limited the Iranian maneuvering power and also needed capacity to utilize its diverse attractions in foreign policy arena. The Geneva 3 Joint Action agreement in last December, together with the country's determination and good will to tear up this fake & unreal curtain, however, provided Iran with necessary psychological atmosphere to return to the international atmosphere relevant to 1995. Iran's veracity confirmation on its new nuclear commitment by American intelligence agencies had certain impacts on these conditions.

Some part of an annual report on "Global threats assessment" by US Intelligence Community handed to US Senate in last February on the impacts of the realization of the said Joint Action indicates that "According to our assessments, if Iran accomplishes the Geneva agreement, then, developing its enrichment will be stopped, and this country transforms its uranium reserves of 20-percent and will allow additional access to the current as well as future nuclear facilities. This transparency will make feasible early warning on any probable leap from Iranian side towards building nuclear weapons in present active facilities." (Tabnak News Agency, 2013)

The important point in the said report is that it is confessing to the sufficiency of planned transparency in Geneva Joint Action to guarantee the non-diversion of the Iranian proclaimed nuclear facilities towards building weapons.

So, upon the signing of the temporary agreement, many states including numbers of European and East-Asian countries put reviving and resumption of trade exchanges with Iran on their agenda promptly. Some countries such as Russia, India and China planned a program for "Barter or clearing" exchange with Iran. This system of exchange can increase the level of Iran's oil exports at least two times of the ceiling of the sanctions in first half of the 2013.

Respecting the technological halt in the in the program for increasing the range of Iranian Shahab missiles as well as assurance of Geneva agreement, the Europe is factually not considering Iran as a surprise threat against itself now. On the contrary a fresh nightmare entitled "Salafi terrorism and Al-

"Qidaism" has preoccupied Europeans. More than 80 thousands European Muslims, trained in so-called religious schools for "suicide missions" across the borders of Afghanistan & Pakistan and raised with huge money and intelligence support by Saudi Arabia, are seemed to be potential terrorists. Discontinuation of the half-way friendship of Western governments with these extremist groups in Syria, Iraq and other regions of Middle East, has subjected Europe and even US to vindictiveness and retaliation by Al-Quida and its associated groups, a vengeance that in the most severe situation is able to create another 9/11, and in the more usual situation can endanger life of the European citizens in some Asian and African countries.

This catastrophe has been, however, anticipated by the authors that if the West sustains its feigning ignorance towards real threats facing the world, the most terrible nightmare and incubus of humanbeings will be occurred after the terrorists had been equipped and armed with weapons of mass destruction. Thanks to delusions such as "Iran-phobia", will this feigning ignorance be maintained by the West?

Today, whatever horrifies Europe is more realistic than the fake ghost and apparition that US and Israel had created about Iran. Iran can provide new conditions for cooperation with EU members through restoring its public diplomacy as well as planning a formal and solemn diplomacy towards Europe. Contrary to the 1990s era, when Europeans lost many opportunities in spite of Khatami's smiles, it seems that the current EU generation, witnessed no war yet, and has no extra time to ask the so-called "green questions" as well as interfering in Iran's internal affairs. Here, there is, really a fear accompanied with the traditional incentives of trade and economy, strengthened by the Union's economic crisis.

Resorting to nuclear threatening and having recourse to some conducive and assisting conditions resulting from some radical, over-zealous positions taken in Ahmadinejad's era, United State could place a limit and confine a large part of the diversities as well as maneuvering power of the Iranian foreign policy. But as Benyamin Netanyahu, the extremist premier of Zionist regime and also some anti-Iranian senators in US Congress had anticipated, Iran will benefit from even the least diplomatic possibility made, to sketch up the classifications relevant to the applicability of "fear" and "threat" with respect to the organizers of international coalition and ultimately the wall of the sanctions and siege will crack. Moreover, the capacities for diversity in Islamic Republic foreign policy will be released in an

atmosphere construed as the strategic depth of pressurediplomacy pursued by Obama against Iran.

In addition to whatever said before, it can be mentioned that maintaining and strengthening the equal relationship with former allies like China and Russia and also with some neighboring countries such as Turkey, Oman, Qatar which are restoring their relations with Iran, after the wall of "Iran-phobia" had cracked and finally adopting détente policy toward the countries that has relied on Iran phobia approach are among the winning cards in Iranian new government's foreign policy.

4. Discussions

The year 2005 can relatively be considered as the starting point of simultaneous execution of the two major strategies in Middle East:

1. Iranian 20-Year Development Outlook.
2. US Plan of Greater Middle East.

The strategic goal of occupying the first place in Mid-East region in both strategies inevitably turns them into major rivals and challengers in regional developments. The vivid and plain element of the 20-Year Development Outlook is that Iran will place the first position of the region in the last year of the period considered for accomplishment of this long term plan. This superiority and lead by Iran should be distinctly indicated and applicable in all scientific, cultural, political, economic and defense-related fields.

At the other side, the Greater Middle East plan is following a similar but opposing goal. This plan is in continuation of American-inspired Democratization strategy placed on the agenda of US officials. In other words, US presidents from both major parties of Democrat & Republican were keeping themselves duty-bound and committed to the advancement of this political strategy of United States, in spite of certain differences in their techniques and arrangements. Based on US strategy for 21st Century, the country should benefit from all instruments and tools, even the military ones, to sustain its hegemony. (Falahatpisheh, 2014).

Footnotes:

1-In 2001, Iran formally proclaimed the ceiling range of its Shahab missiles is 2000 km and stopped Shahab 4 project. This technologic action was done based on a national strategic policy according which European countries were never targets of any development of weapons and missiles program. The program instead, will combat all regional threats and target any invading and assailant foreign military base.

2-"Kowsar", medium-range, land-based, anti-ship missile, equipped with remote control system. It can defeat electronic jamming systems and cannot be

thrown, off course. A ground-based vehicle that can bomb targets at high speed in three positions of coast to sea, sea to sea and air to sea, defending shore lines and Iranian Islands in Persian Gulf and combating any aggression from overseas. This missile is able to cripple corvette-sized vessels with a single hit and can sink a fast attack craft (FAC) with one hit.

The first long-range unmanned aerial drone or unmanned combat air vehicle (UCAV) called Karrar (Striker), manufactured by Iran in different designs with missions such as flying fast (for testing missiles), and also fast operations inside the enemy soil. Karrar has a range of 1000 kilometers (620 mi) and can carry two 115 kilograms (254lb) bombs or a precision-guided munition of 227 kilograms (500lb). The Karrar can also carry four Kousar light anti-ship missiles. It is 4 meters (13ft) long and is powered by a turbojet engine, giving a top speed of 900 kilometers per hour (560 mph). The Karrar uses a rocket assist system in takeoff and is recovered by parachute. Its flight ceiling is roughly 25000 to 40000 ft. Karrar can hit the assailant targets above the sea level.

Corresponding Author:

Heshmatollah Falahat Pisheh (PhD)

Department of Political Science, Allameh Tabatabaee University, Iran
Head of Sub-Committee of Foreign Relations at Iranian Parliament (7th & 8th terms of Legislature).
Email: drfalahatpisheh@yahoo.com
Tel: +989121473148

References

1. American National Strategy in 21st Century.
2. Slavin, Barbara, The Small Satan's Behavior is Changing, Tel Aviv Acclimatization to Nuclear Agreement, Iranian Diplomacy, February, 8, 2013.

3. "American intelligence society report : Could it Open the Path to Final Agreement with Iran ?", Tabnak, February, 7, 2014
4. Allies Mobilization Against Iran, April, 19, 2013
5. Iranian Diplomacy, Feb, 8, 2013,
6. Rafi pour, Faramarz, Development & Paradox, Enteshar press, Tehran, 2000
7. Amartia, Sen, Identity and Violence, translation by Fereydoun Majlesi, Ashian press, 2009, p. 73.
8. Falahatpisheh, Heshmatollah, Theory of declining American Hegemony and Iran's Regional Strategy, selected articles in scientific seminar on the role of International Relations in Middle East development, Tehran, Allameh Tabatabaee University.
9. Menendez, Robert, Iran has put a nuclear gun to the world's head, Fararou, February, 8, 2014.
10. Layne, Christopher, Supremacy is America's Weakness, CATO Institute, August, 13, 2013.
11. Layne, Christopher, This Time It is Real : The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana, international Studies Quarterly (2012), 56' 203-213
12. Layne, Christopher, US Must Stop Being a KLA Pawn, The Los Angeles Times, March, 5, 2000
13. Stilitz, Joseph, The American Dream has become a Myth, Spiegel Online, October, 4, 2012.
14. Harsh, Seymour, Iran Plans, the New Yorker, April, 8, 2006.
15. Friedman, Thomas L., The best of Enemies. The New York Times, 12/6

5/23/2014