

Iran's Nuclear Ambition

Haokai Li*

St. George Campus, University of Toronto, 27 King's College Cir, Toronto, Canada

Haokai.li.Calvin@gmail.com

**corresponding author*

Keywords: Iran, nuclear ambitions, sanctions, international relations, nuclear development history.

Abstract: The relations between Iran and the Western world has been deteriorating in the recent years due to Iran's nuclear development. Iran's nuclear program was firstly sponsored by the U.S. and western world, but now they deemed Iran is threatening regional security and world stabilization with its nuclear ambition. When facing the abominable situation create by the U.S. and rest of the world, Iran had no choice but to continually strengthening its national security. Fairly to say, Iran's nuclear aim is both motivated by its internal intension to be recognized as a powerful state and the external pressure that provoked it to pursues national security. U.S. and the western world could not risk letting Iran become an effective regional power with its nuclear capability, while Iran could not turn away from the temptation to hold nuclear power. The existing confrontation between Iran and the U.S. is not going to vanish soon. However, the U.S. should understand the consequence and backlash of its sanctions, construct a new method to resolve the current situation.

1. Introduction

The 21st century witnessed increased nuclear development globally, which became a significant point of security concern. Over the years, Iran can be considered one of the oil-rich country which has ventured into nuclear development to engage in an arms race among superpowers. Iran's pursuit of nuclear development undoubtedly fits the need of its national pride, and national interest. Iranians have a sense of pride in their long-standing Persian civilization and their national identity in the modern Iran nation-state. They believe that Iran, originated from an ancient civilization, cannot be without nuclear capability since nuclear power's development corresponds to its history and status as a significant power in the world. It is also crucial for Iran to withhold some degree of nuclear technology, significantly when the western world suppresses Iran. The U.S. and the West's world believe Iran, as an oil and gases rich country, does not have to develop nuclear power. The culture and ideological differences between them and Iran further distanced the two-party and deepening the mistrust between them. The western world considers Iran's "obsession" on nuclear development is threatening the regional and world peace; thus, implemented a hostile policy towards Iran. While doing so, the U.S. also carried out nuclear cooperation with India, and allows Israel to possess a nuclear weapon in the Middle East. The double standard which the U.S. implemented in the Middle East did not stop Iran's nuclear ambition; rather, it provoked a sense of

insecurity and pushes Iran further on the path to develop nuclear capabilities. When viewing from the perspective of IR theories, some schools of thought may help people understand the justification as well as objections on Iran's nuclear ambition.

2. History of Iran's Nuclear Development

For a long time, the USA and Iran had maintained successful cooperation towards nuclear development as part of the world's superpowers. Balan (2013) posits that the two parties signed a cooperation agreement dubbed the U.S. Atoms-for-Peace initiative in the 1950s. Understandably, the cooperation came to an unexpected end in the year 1979 after the famed Iranian Revolution. [1]

Primarily, the nuclear-energy ambition by the Iranian government continued after the strained diplomatic relations whereby Iran sort technical support from European nations. Imperatively, the United States- in its quest to promote and sustain global peace and reduce the risk of the unregulated development of nuclear power- instituted comprehensive sanctions on Iran (Balan, 2013). The strategy on permissions was achieved through the United Nations and Western nations (Balan, 2013). [1] In Iran's defense, it has never aimed to have a nuclear weapon, however, along with improving Iran's national power, its nuclear program also shifted from merely civilian use to other purposes. Civilian and peaceful use of nuclear power could be considered the initial and primary goal of Iran's nuclear development before the sanctions were implemented. However, as the sanctions posted on Iran's economic became significantly severe and the opposition from the international community grow strait, the motivations that drives Iran's nuclear program went beyond the energy concerns and entangled with Iran's national interest.

In 1973, Iran experienced a tough economic period caused by the oil crisis in the region. Such an oil crisis presented devastating economic effects in Iran and the social-political framework in the country. In 1974, the Iran government came up with more measures and strategies to reduce oil reliance. The political leadership in Iran had to diversify the country's electricity course. Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEIO) was developed in the mid-1970s to oversee nuclear power development and provide a reliable source of electric power for use in Iran. Such a move aimed to advance the people's living standards and provide affordable and reliable electricity through supplementary production of nuclear energy in the region.

Precisely, the propositions made by Mousavian (2006) dismiss the allegations made by the Western Nations- that Iran's move was the pursuit of nuclear weaponry, which poses a substantial risk to global security. [2] In the detailed article, the author, Mousavian (2006), admits that Iran experiences grave shortages in power supply from the national-grid; thus, unfavorable economic and social effects resulting from the phenomenon. [2] Mousavian (2006) asserts that it is imperative to note that nuclear development in Iran helped solve power outages in industrial and residential zones where the civilians reside. [2]

Mansour (2008) opines that over some time, the hard-stance and vehement positions are undertaken by the Iranian government on the matter of political and economic liberation among the Islamic states and have presented Iran as a sharp critic of the western-influence, especially the United States. [3] As such, the revolutionary tendencies expressed by Iran have been interpreted as anti-American. Mansour (2008) points out that Iran has progressively and consistently pursued a plan for independence (democracy) and sovereignty (self-rule and power). [3] In this regard, the idea of adopting nuclear technology through nuclear development is an agenda that aims to achieve economic and political agenda (Mansour, 2008). [3] Therefore, the generation of atomic (nuclear) energy would promote power and financial independence in Iran (Mansour, 2008). [3] Overall, both internal and external factors provoked Iran's nuclear development, which significantly impacted the region.

The Iran's rich history legacy that enable its people to form a sense of national identity was an important internal factor that motivated nuclear development. Therefore, the pursue for nuclear power was also supported by the people to attain the global recognition needed. National pride can be linked to ability of Iran to maintain successful cooperation with US before 1979. Iran prides itself in having rich oil and gas production which has provided the required national income. To safeguard its nuclear ambition, the country continued to receive technical support from European nations after 1979. It is therefore clear that national pride as part of internal factors greatly contributed to the nuclear development process in the region as part of arms race in the world. By developing powerful weapons, Iran was trying to communicate the message that they are not inferior in the battlefield. It was also a way of defying what Iran perceived as continued control from the western countries.

International Relations theory (IR) can explain the motive of Iran's nuclear development in the region. It is an essential concept that Iran's atomic development can be analyzed based on a few ideas, such as realism. Engagement in nuclear development despite the set agreement by superpowers violated the terms set out in the arms race across the globe. The next step will entail analyzing Iran nuclear development using IR theory, which will support vital information.

3. Analysis Using IR Theories

Fundamentally, Iran forcefully pursued nuclear development's plan with a total disregard of the international community's highly powered sanctions. From an international relations (IR) perspective, several thought schools help explain Iran's move (Wendt, 1992). [4] The IR theories that incisively draw compelling reasons for Iran's undertakings include Realism, Institutionalization, and Copenhagen-School (Keohane, 1984). [5] Remarkably, the Copenhagen-School's perspective posits that Iran is justified in its deliberate action to acquire and establish nuclear-power (Hansen, 2012). [6] Further, the Copenhagen-School states that the international-community and the international-security-agencies should focus on the de-securitization of the Iranian nuclear-development agenda (Williams 2003). [7] As such, the international entities should seek to handle the matter without raising concerns about the threat posed by Iran's nuclear-agenda on global security (Buzan et al.,1998). [8] Moreover, the Copenhagen-School recommends that it is crucial for nations to ascertain the extent to which Iran's nuclear-development strategy threatens their state of security (Wendt, 1992). [4] On the other hand, the Kantian understanding dictates that Iran's agenda is motivated by the threat posed by their enemy-states regarding their acquisition of nuclear-power (Hansen, 2012). [6] In consideration of a realist perspective, the motivations and ambitions of Iran on the issue of nuclear development are (appropriate) and well-meaning. Primarily, the concept of realism explores the idea that international relations are propelled by force generated from the state of anarchy (Norris & Kristensen, 2010). [9] In this regard, realism admits that the lack of a central command or agency which enforces the policies linked to international affairs presents a significant security dilemma to the global nations. Concisely, the countries under review resort to pursuing concerns guided by their autonomous nature while disregarding other nations (Waltz, 2012). [10] Therefore, states focus on the acquisition of military power; hence, a provocation ensues. The other countries endeavor to respond (counter) to the nation's enhanced military strength under consideration (Waltz, 2012). [10] Principally, because of the practical application of the realism theory, it befits to understand Iran's nuclear-development move. It would help advance their nuclear weaponry by establishing nuclear power (Waltz, 1979). [11] It is imperative to consider that Israel's hesitance to declare itself a fully-fledged nuclear-power nation is a strategic move to hoodwink the Middle-East geopolitical framework and power balance. Thus, based on the realist understanding, Iran's action aims to destabilize Israel's status quo as a regional monopoly in regards to military power (Norris & Kristensen, 2010). [9] Fundamentally, a realist

perspective on the balance-of-power logic would suffice to explain the Iranian pursuit and ambitions of nuclear development and militarization (Waltz, 2012). [10]

On the other hand, the institutionalist approach to the Iranian's agenda on the acquisition of nuclear power would be premised on the aspect of seclusion by the nuclear-power treaties signed by some nations such as Israel in the Middle-East region (Keohane, 1984). [5] As such, the institutionalization theory negates Iran's move, but it helps to promote an understanding of Iran's strategic position and its quest for nuclear-development. Indeed, a policy-oriented approach (backed by institutionalism) seeks to strengthen the command of the NPT (non-proliferation) treaty (Müller, 2010). [12] In essence, Iran's strategic move attempts to address the extent of seclusion imposed by the seemingly powerful and authoritative nations with no considerations for new entrants in the military-power sphere. Therefore, Iran's move on nuclear-development (in spite of the trade sanctions) disregards the institutionalization theory's foundations due to its economic capacity and access to capital resources that are availed to institutionalized states who are featured in the treaty (Müller, 2010). [12] Without a doubt, the non-proliferation agreement locked out the middle-power states (a category under which Iran fell) from participating in nuclear-oriented (Bahgat, 2015). [13] Similarly, the global-security schedule, which is in tandem with the efforts of the NPT, limits Iran's ambitions on nuclear-development. Strategically, Iran's pursuit of nuclear-power has an institutionalization angle to it, and its motivation is based on the destabilization of the status-quo set by Israel.

Without a doubt, the viewpoints expressed by the scholarly discourses on the matter of nuclear-development as well as a militarization by Iran shall be instrumental in shaping the discussion on the tense diplomatic (international) relations between Iran and the United States coupled with backing from the members of the International Community (Waltz, 1979). [11] The next process will involve discussing how the adoption of Iran nuclear development has had a significant impact on its economic and other aspects of life. It will be essential to highlight various implications due to the Iran nation's adaption towards the social and financial aspects. Iran's move of developing nuclear weapons has posed severe security threat concern to the world, resulting in an increased arms race in the region. At the same time, there were counter measure that were imposed to pressure Iran which induced Iran to further dedicate on improving its national security. Such security dilemma was created due to the external pressure Iran was experiencing.

4. Impacts of the Adaptation

Moshirzadeh (2007) draws the audience's attention by crafting a razor-sharp counterargument on Iran's strategic move to establish a robust nuclear-development program. [14] Indeed, Moshirzadeh (2007) submits that Iran has faced adverse economic and social consequences of implementing the nuclear plan. [14] Indeed, the state of security, from a regional perspective, has deteriorated based on the idea that neighboring nations (Islamic World) are not convinced about the motivations behind Iranian's nuclear policy (Moshirzadeh, 2007). [14] At the same time, Iran has encountered bouts of violence and insecurity within its territory. Remarkably, some factions on the Iranian political scene have fueled violence through protests in a bid to compel the government to halt on the agenda to promote nuclear development (Moshirzadeh, 2007). [14] Moshirzadeh (2007) argues that Western powers could be the force behind Iran's devastating political and social turmoil. [14] Due to Iran's adoption, several sanctions were imposed by several countries such as the USA and other international entities. One of the notable sanctions imposed by the US in November 1979 involved freezing about \$ 12 billion in Iranian assets, which included bank deposits and other properties. The US's second sanction was imposed in 1987 while the third sanction was imposed in 2006, which had a significant financial impact on its economic and social aspects in the country.

Since the Iranian revolution overthrew the Pahlavi dynasty, Iran and the United States' relationship turns to an end. Layers upon layers of sanction were put in place by the United States in the hope of restricting Iran's nuclear development. Balan (2013) provides that the first-level (stage) of sanctions involved minor restrictions aimed at placing Iran at an unfavorable position on the trade with the United States of America. [1] In this regard, the American government focused on freezing all the assets under Iran's care, but with authorization by the U.S. government (Balan, 2013). [1] The restrictions on trade were directly as well as indirectly affected under the authority of the United States. Despite the first wave of sanction does not directly punish Iran's nuclear development, it does, however, have profound impacts on Iran's perception towards its nuclear program; and to some extent, puts weight on Iran's commitment on nuclear development as the sanction's aftermath significantly injured Iran's economy. Thus, forcing Iran to seek help from the rival of America: Russia, with its development and installation of a nuclear-based reactor. The author, then submits that the second wave of sanctions entailed the facilitation of strategies that would counter any intentions by the government of Iran to advance its programs on the list of nuclear development. Namely, starting from 1995, the US prohibited certain transactions with respect to the development of Iranian petroleum, and banning US trade as well as investment in Iran. Indeed, the second-stage sanctions are American-based, but they receive immense support from some European States (Balan, 2013). [1] In this case, the Iranian government's program on purchasing and establishing nuclear weaponry is countered to a significant extent (Balan, 2013). [1] The substantially increased the magnitude of the sanctions happens after the government of Iran succeeded in signing a cooperation agreement with Russian authorities (Balan, 2013). [1] With the US President Bill Clinton seeking reelection, the 1995 sanctions could also be the result of Clinton's intention on gaining public support. Yet, there is no doubt that these sanctions were a "heavy blow" to Iran's energy industry and the impacts of these sanctions radiated beyond the scope of energy, in addition, had negative impacts on multiple industries due to the diminishing investment. (Balan, 2013) [1]

The third-stage sanctions are characterized by multilateral as well as international cooperation. The US was able to convince other permanent member in UN Security Council to target Iran's nuclear and ballistic missile programs directly by prohibiting "investment in uranium mining, production or use of nuclear materials and technology and in activities related to ballistic missiles technology". (Balan, 2013) In this regard, the author indicates that the American government focused on crippling any form of extensive development of nuclear technology in Iran by devastating its domestic economy through international assistance (Balan, 2013). [1] Indeed, the ban on Uranium-trade at the global market had far-reaching consequences. Further, reducing Iran's capacity concerning the purchase of appropriate equipment and material for the facilitation of nuclear development was implemented (Balan, 2013). [1]

Iran continues experiencing the security dilemma due to the sanctions that were imposed and the need for Iran to safeguard its national security in the region. As Iran was developing its nuclear weapons, the US and other nations felt that in case Iran gains its nuclear capability, their national security will also be at risk. As a result, such sanctions affected Iran's oil and gas sector due to trade restrictions in the region. Therefore, the sanction and national security impact were some of the significant external factors that contributed to the nuclear development in Iran.

5. Consequences of Sanctions

It is worth noting that a series of events has dramatically changed the course of Iran's nuclear development. Starting in 1976, the US was initially a helping hand for Iran's nuclear energy development. Their relations since the 1979 quickly went downhill following by the revolution in Iran and significantly intensified due to Iran's cooperation with Russia. Staged of sanctions aiming

to counter Iran's nuclear development were in fact, target the Iran's oil-gas industry. The effect is devastating, especially for Iran which as one of the top oil exporter, the oil-gas industry closely links to Iran's body of economy. Iran is indeed, facing a dire situation. The shortage of foreign exchange reserves due to the trade restricting continue to raise unemployment rate, and inflating commodities price, leaving Iran with less room to react. Iran respond the sanction with counter measure such as limiting imports to decrease the expanse on foreign exchange reserve, economic reforms, decrease government subsidy, and combating corruptions. Despite these actions will not have immediate results, they does demonstrate to the public that Iran's economic has not lost its vitality, and the government continue to seek new opportunities under the external pressure. While the effect of sanctions is prominent, the result of sanctions is questionable as the US's actions, to some extent, grand the Iran government the necessary conditions for promoting political propaganda and invoking nationalism within Iran's society which only boost its nuclear ambition rather than discouraging it. The events leading to the country's penalties and the imposers' intended consequences reiterate realism's international relations theory. According to Pashakhanlou (2017), realism asserts that the global relations environment relies on human behavior and concerns. [15] Powell (2015) argues that the West sanctions imposed on Iran revealed that it did not conform to the West's somewhat profound desires, passions, and ego in the Middle-East. [16] Consequently, the West being a world power, arguably, tries to maintain control in the Middle East, using the military and economic might (Powell, 2015). [16] The conflict and imposition of sanctions are the epitome of the international relations theory of realism, where Iran is the victim by going against world-powers.

Farzanegan (2013) and the article captured in *The-Economist* (2010) demonstrate the adverse economic effects that arose due to the restrictions subjected to the Iranian government. [17] Indeed, the ban on trade-in Uranium (Iran-based) resulted in the loss of thousands of jobs (Farzanegan, 2013). [17] Simultaneously, the institution of trade restrictions reduced the foreign-exchange earnings by Iran: thus, the level and pace of economic development declined substantially (Farzanegan, 2013). Indeed, the reduced revenue earnings by the Iranian government slowed economic development concerns. [17]

Positively, Cheraghali (2013) asserts that the USA government's sanctions, and the United Nations took a toll on the pharmaceutical sector in Iran. [18] The pharmaceutical market encountered operational challenges precisely, especially given the supply-chain mechanism (Cheraghali, 2013). [18] Thus, the production, marketing, and distribution channels were immensely affected by the trade restrictions. Cheraghali (2013) adds that the pharmaceutical industry makes it clear that the communities in Iran were in an unfavorable position. [18] The sanction based on Iran also adversely affected the Iran economy towards the region's oil and gas sector. Majidpour (2013) presents a thorough review regarding the industry (economic-sector) of petroleum (gas-and-oil) in the nation of Iran following the implementation (adoption) and institution relating to trade restrictions. [19] The author asserts that the country's oil and gas were adversely affected by the ban on trade since the supply-and-demand dynamics interfered with the other players (Majidpour, 2013). [19] Majidpour (2013) posits that the U.S-based sanctions devastatingly impacted the petroleum sector (gas-and-oil) which the industry serves as strategic support for the Iranian economy. [19]

The economic and industrial impacts of the sanctions on Iran cannot be understated. The World Bank (2019) valued Iran's GDP at \$463 billion in 2019/20, with the dominant sectors being hydrocarbons, agriculture, service sectors, and manufacturing and financial services. [20] Moreover, the country has a population of 82.8 million and appears 2nd (second) in the world's reserves based on natural gas as well as 4th (fourth) in the crude-oil deposits (reserves) (World-Bank, 2019). [20] However, economic development was primarily affected by sanctions more so due to the

dependence of oil revenues. The realism theory fundamentally informed these sanctions due to recent armed conflict, ideological inconsistencies, and heightened tensions among Iran and the United States. Powell (2015) asserts that the approach reiterates military capability as natural antagonism is less likely to bring peace and cooperation. [16] The decisions to crumple economic development would significantly lower Iran's government revenues, affecting military capability, including nuclear research programs. However, the affected industries also degraded economic sustainability, therefore affecting ordinary citizens. Targeting the oil and industrial sectors was a strategic attempt to reduce the Iranian government's resources to fund military development, thus reducing Iran's perceived threat in the international environment.

The capitulation of aggression, conflict, and military expansion strategies in the Middle East assert the inherent need to contain Iran and prevent the country from possessing the capacity to gain regional dominance in the Middle East. Mehta and Whitlark (2016) argue that the industrial and economic sanctions imposed reduced the potential for the prevalence of democratic governance and economic linkage and globalization concerning Iran and her allies. [21] Assertively, the sanctions impacted Iran's domestic industries and crippled countries that relied on Iran for natural resources and trading. According to Pashakhanlou (2017), international pressure that Iran has long received is a political motivation to scientifically delay the nation's progress and make it difficult for the NPT (non-proliferation agreement or treaty) to function. [15] Iran's economy grew by 12.3% in 2016 after implementing the nuclear deal but declined in 2018 by 4.8% and was expected to shrink by almost 10% in 2019 (BBC, 2019). [22] The US sanctions in 2018 and 2019 affected industries, including energy, shipping, and finance, which affect oil exports. The delay in nuclear power significantly reduces the country's ability to run heavy industries at sustainable energy costs. The atomic dispute and sanctions inextricably aim at shrouding Iran's dominance in the Middle East while allowing the West to maintain control.

The US sanctions on Iran, which included the prohibition of economic and financial transactions impacted largely on the Iran economy. Such measures caused devastating problems such as soaring inflation to increased unemployment. As a result, there was increased growth in poverty levels which has hindered economic prosperity. The Trump administration therefore imposed such sanctions in order to prevent Iran from nuclear development which was a great threat to the region. Another notable economic impact that was imposed by American against different international banks that perform business in Iran. Such a measure had a great impact that resulted to decrease in purchasing power in the region. It resulted to devaluated currency and high level of inflation which affected the living standards in the region. As expected, the consequence of the economic turbulence brought by the sanctions resulted in a separation of opinion within the mass Iranian public as well as within the global community. Advancements in mass communication infrastructure, the internet, and social media platforms have proved efficient in gathering and analyzing public opinions on the controversial conflicts between Iranian government and the U.S.A. due to West's involvement. Some public opinion wanted the government to protect and maintain its national interest across the globe, especially when facing the pressure from America, while others seeking to resolve the devastating counter measures by putting a stop on Iran's nuclear development. According to Sanger and Mazzetti (2016), the recurrent theme in mass media suggests an attempt for neo-colonization in the region of Middle-East, a matter that the U.S.A. is accused of since the Iraq's invasion as well as Afghanistan's war (Mehta & Whitlark, 2016). [21] [23] The impact of military operations by Western countries and the United States in the Middle East is responsible for millions of people's death. Whereas most of the conflicts were global terrorism offers, there are vast differences and public understanding. For instance, Iran's theocratic and vehement denial of any interest in developing nuclear weapons is sarcastic due to Uranium enrichment's capability to develop nuclear weapons. According to Mehta and Whitlark (2016), Iran is arguably trying to

protect herself from neo-colonization. [21] Therefore, it targets being a potential competitor with the West in controlling the Middle East. As such, public opinions on nuclear conflicts and sanctions inadvertently focus on the political nature and intentions of the regimes that appear hidden.

Levis (2015) suggests that while the conflict with Iran began decades ago, the last few years, mainly during Donald Trump's reign, attracted more attention. [24] Initially, the public concern about nuclear weapon development was due to the West's global terrorism efforts. As such, the Middle East was arguably considered a global hub for terrorism, hence the region's experienced vast military operations. Consequently, the imposed sanctions were somewhat genuine. Despite the Islamic State (ISIS) terrorizing the region and almost overpowering Iraq, the United States chose to withdraw its troops. The decision made the public concerned about the United States' efforts and intentions as the countries were left to defend itself. Lewis (2015) argues that this contributed to a changed public opinion and increased Iran's support to continue its nuclear program. [24] The sanctions imposed make the country's economy unsustainable, hence preventing rapid advancements. However, the debate is still contentious, as both regimes could potentially have hidden intentions. Michael (2006) shares a comprehensive report on the nature of public opinion among the Iranian citizenry based on the government's action to establish nuclear-development initiatives. [25] The author highlights that a significant number of Iranians are impressed and happy about the operation of the state in promoting the development of nuclear energy and technology (Michael, 2006). [25] Indeed, the Iranian public opinion inclines favorably to the government's plan on atomic development. Nancy (2015) captures exciting feedback from the communities in Iran. [26] She submits that a large proportion of Iranians feel that the government's nuclear policy is favorable and compelling based on the foundation that the nuclear program will enhance the nation's security preparedness. Moreover, Nancy (2015) agrees that the atomic strategy will help place Iran at a globally recognizable position in geopolitical and economic stardom. [26] In essence, a deep sense of pride and belonging is expressed by the citizens on nuclear development (Nancy, 2015). [26]

6. Conclusion

Iran's nuclear ambition is both motivated by its internal intension to be recognize as a powerful state as well as the external pressure which provoked it to pursues national security.

“As long as some of us choose to rely on nuclear weapons, we continue to risk that these same weapons will become increasingly attractive to others.” The Nobel prize speech presented by Mohamed Elberadei shed lights on the current Iran nuclear situation. Nuclear weapons will inevitably derive more nuclear weapons, when some countries insist on the security provided by nuclear weapons, others will follow the same path. The Iranian nuclear issue and its determination to possess nuclear capabilities will not change in short term. In fact, almost all regional powers in their pursuit of historical glory and contemporary influence would follow the same logic to develop nuclear weapons. Therefore, whether Iran would eventually step beyond the nuclear threshold or not, depends largely on the future confrontation between Iran and U.S. along with the western world. Iran's rise in the middle east will inevitably change the geopolitical balance in the region, and such momentum will continue as long as the pressure from the external persist and its people continue to favor Iran's nuclear development.

The impact of the Iran and U.S. interactions do not confine between them, it will undoubtedly put the Middle East in danger and disturb the regional power balance. Such impact could also extend outside the regional and become a global issue and direct affect the world's energy economy. Thus, it is important for U.S. to realize that current Iranian nuclear problem is closely related to the U.S. actions and the result in the end will depends on how the western world and U.S. react to Iran's nuclear development. From the experience of North Korea and Iran, the U.S should

understand if the pressure putted on Iran continue to increase, it would inevitably force Iran to the extreme end. Instead, by improving relations with Iran and share understanding will help to ease the conflict and maybe, solve the current stalemate.

References

- [1] Balan, G. (2013). *The Latest United States Sanctions Against Iran: What Role to the WTO Security Exceptions?* *Journal of Conflict & Security Law*, 18(3), 365-393. Retrieved May 7, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/26296265
- [2] Mousavian, S. H. (2006). *Iran and the west: The path to nuclear deadlock.* *Global Dialogue*, 8(1), 69-79. Retrieved
- [3] Mansour, I. (2008). *Iran and instability in the middle east.* *International Journal*, 63(4), 941-964. Retrieved from <http://myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/login?qurl=https%3A%2F%2Fsearch.proquest.com%2Fdocview%2F220865861%3Faccountid%3D14771>
- [4] Wendt, Alexander (1992), *Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics,* *International Organization* 46(2): 391–425.
- [5] Keohane, Robert O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- [6] Hansen, Lene (2012), *Reconstructing desecuritisation: The normative-political in the Copenhagen School and directions for how to apply it,* *Review of International Studies* 38: 525–546.
- [7] Williams, Michael C. (2003), *Words, images, enemies: Securitization and international politics,* *International Studies Quarterly* 47(4): 511–531.
- [8] Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde (1998), *Security: A new framework for analysis* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).
- [9] Norris, Robert S. and Hans M. Kristensen (2010), *Global nuclear weapons inventories, 1945–2010,* *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 66(4): 77–83.
- [10] Waltz, Kenneth N. (2012), *Why Iran should get the bomb: Nuclear balancing would mean stability,* *Foreign Affairs* 91(4): 2–5.
- [11] Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979), *Theory of International Relations* (New York: McGraw Hill).
- [12] Müller, Harald (2010), *Between power and justice: Current problems and perspectives of the NPT regime,* *Strategic Analysis* 34(2): 189–201.
- [13] Bahgat, Gawdat (2015), *Prospects for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East,* *International Relations and Security Network (ISN)*, June 15, <http://www.css.ethz.ch/content/specialinterest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/en/services/digital-library/articles/article.html/191392>.
- [14] Moshirzadeh, H. (2007). *Discursive Foundations of Iran's Nuclear Policy.* *Security Dialogue*, 38(4), 521–543. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010607084999>
- [15] Pashakhanlou, A. H. (2017). *Realism and fear in international relations.* In *Realism and Fear in International Relations* (pp. 1-21). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- [16] Powell, R. (2015). *Nuclear brinkmanship, limited war, and military power.* *International Organization*, 589-626.
- [17] Farzanegan, M.R., (2013). *Effects of International Financial-and-Energy-Sanctions on Iran's Informal Economy.* *SAIS Review of International-Affairs* 33(1), 13-36. DOI:10.1353/sais.2013.0008.
- [18] Cheraghali, A.M. *Impacts of international sanctions on the Iranian pharmaceutical market.* *DARUJ Pharm Sci* 21, 64 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1186/2008-2231-21-64>
- [19] Majidpour, M. (2015). *The Unintended Consequences of US-led Sanctions on Iranian Industries.* *Iranian Studies*, 46(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00210862.2012.740897>
- [20] The World Bank (2019). *The Islamic Republic of Iran.* The World Bank. Retrieved from <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/iran/overview>.
- [21] Mehta, R. N., & Whittlark, R. E. (2016). *Unpacking the Iranian Nuclear Deal: Nuclear Latency and US Foreign Policy.* *The Washington Quarterly*, 39(4), 45-61.
- [22] BBC News (2019). *Six Charts that Show-How-hard-US Sanctions have hit Iran.* Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-48119109>
- [23] Sanger, D. E., & Mazzetti, M. (2016). *The US had a cyberattack plan if Iran's nuclear dispute led to conflict.* *The New York Times*, 16.
- [24] Levis, P. (2015). *Iran and Nuclear Restraint.* Research Paper. Middle North Africa Program and International Security Department, 7.
- [25] Michael Herzog. *Iranian Public Opinion-on-the-Nuclear Program: A Potential-Asset for the-International Community.* *The Washington Institute for Near East policy.* June 2006. <https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/uploads/Documents/pubs/PolicyFocus56.pdf>

[26] Nancy Gallagher, Ebrahim Mohseni, Clay Ramsay, "Iranian Opinion on the Nuclear Agreement," *CISSM Publication*, September 2015. <https://cissm.umd.edu/sites/default/files/2019-07/CISSMPA%20Iranian%20Public%20Opinion%20on%20the%20Nuclear%20Agreement%20090915%20FINAL-LR.pdf>