
Nuclear Program of Iran and Perception of West

————— Sajida Begum

————— Naudir Bakht

Atomic program of Iran was started in the mid-1950s, however it stayed lazy for a few years after the Iranian Islamic insurgency, and it was before long renewed. Repeating Iran's stand in regards to its interest atomic innovation, its administration assured to west about peaceful atomic program. As indicated by the west, the focal issue isn't atomic innovation, yet rather Iran's conduct as a progressive state, with desire that crash into the interests of its neighbors and the West. Nuclear program of Iran was propelled in 1953, conflictingly with the assistance of the US as a component of the Atoms for Peace Program. Atomic program of Iran isn't without its problems, because western countries sanctioned on Iran's nuclear program. The study examines the European and Russian position on Iran's atomic desire and additionally the International Atomic Energy Agency's endeavors to reach a compromise that would fulfill the worldwide network's worries and Tehran's demands.

Historical background of Iran's Atomic mission

The historical backdrop of Iran's mission for atomic innovation returns to the mid-1950s. "In 1957, Iran consented to an arrangement with the United States for participation in inquire about on the tranquil employments of atomic vitality. Shortly, Iran set up a Nuclear Research Center at Tehran University and acquired a little research reactor. Iran was among the first countries to sign and ratify the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT). However, it was just in the mid-1970s that Iran started to discussion of the need to create atomic power plants to deliver power and to spare its oil and gas saves for modern objectives and fare. At the time, Iran

looked to the United States and Europe for required reactors, know-how, and fuel". That time; Iran was a nearby western partner and the Shah's atomic desire did not produce solid uneasiness, in spite of the fact that there was some doubt that he may in the end need to get atomic weapons. Later on, the primary chief of Iran's nuclear vitality association, Dr. Akbar admired, the Carter organization had built up a few worries about Iran's designs. The first Iranian nuclear power plant was established in 1978 by a German company, the Craftwork Union. Iran also connected "EURODIF". Each of these goals was abandoned after the disturbing war between Iran and Iraq. It was in the mid-1970s that Iran began to talk about the need to build nuclear power plants to keep oil and gas tariffs for mechanical targets and freight under control and set aside. At that time Iran saw the United States and Europe for the reactors, the know-how and the necessary fuels. Because Iran was a Western partner at the time, the Shah's nuclear targets are not very worrying. He rejected the path with which, over time, he might need vulnerability to obtain nuclear weapons. Later, according to the head of the Iranian affiliate, Dr. Akbar Etemad, the Carter Association developed tension on the Iranian contours and urged the Shah to send it to Washington in 1977 to return it.

(Hunter, 2010)

The Iranian nuclear program changed in 2002 only on a fundamental theme in its relations with the United States and other Western countries. On August 14, 2002, the PMOI stated that it had installed a Natanz nuclear bomb officer and a liberal water reactor at Arak. Change in these working environments does not mean that the NPT has been hurt. It is also logical that the IAEA, and perhaps the information associations of Western countries, including the United States, have studied Iran's exercises. However, the way in which Iran has not officially trained the IAEA in these exercises has led them to obviously think they were suspects. As some reports show, the IAEA Authority has told the writers that it would be great if we had already been informed of the choice to bring together these work environments. In 2009, according to the report, the Director General of the IAEA saw this and several signs of Iran's joint efforts with the union. He noted that "Iran has worked together to improve safeguard measures at the FEP [fuel enrichment plant] in Natanz. (Hunter , 2010)

Theoretical frameworks

It is the contention of this volume that no single theory of international relations realist, neorealist (structural realist), or constructivist can fully explain the behavior of states and less so the intricacies of their foreign policies. The realist theory, which emphasizes the pursuit of power as the main motivation behind state behavior, fails to pay adequate attention to ideational and institutional factors, such as the role of

key agents' identities and interests in determining state behavior. The constructivists emphasize the role of ideas and the identities and interests of purposive actors, which they claim are shaped by shared ideas, in deciding state behavior. However, the constructivists' overemphasis on ideational dynamics behind state behavior tends to ignore the fact that often ideas are used to serve purposes determined by power calculations. In short, both theories tend to ignore the close relationship between power and idea dynamics in state behavior. Furthermore, the structure of international system as argued by the New realists specially the facts that even today international system is characterized by a lack of an efficient mechanism to prevent conflict, settle disputes, and ensure peace and, hence, is in a state of anarchy, clearly affects states' behavior. It also sets certain boundaries for state behavior, overstepping of which often involves costs, especially to less powerful states. This means that in pursuance of their ambitions and goals, whether determined by power considerations or ideas, states have to consider structural factors. This also means that, in analyzing states external behavior, structural factors should be taken into account. (Waltz, 1979)

Iran's Nuclear Program and Sanctions

So, it is actuality assessed that "lifting sanctions against the country could reduce the world price of crude petroleum by 10%". "This reduction would salt away the US approximately \$80 billion per annum. Besides, the American companies that are functioning abroad will get much benefit by the opening of Iranian market foreign investment. While those who are against this deal assert that if the sanctions are raised up, the situation might permit Iran to build up nuclear weapons, which could cause oil prices to double (Demas, 2013). The US has its interests - Iran is a profitable market. Iranians require a lot of infrastructure for rebuilding that could produce billions of dollars for US and UK oil companies". (Maclean, 2013). "Inevitably the US-Iran relations are connected to the energy interests and security of the global community. Over 20% of world oil supply is carried out daily through the Strait. If the previous uptight relations were to soar between the US and Iran, Iran could strike back by trying to seal or interrupt traffic in the Strait of Hormuz. This, in turn, might end in an armed conflict between the US and Iran, which certainly will engage the Middle Eastern Region as a Whole". (Khalid & Safdar, 2016).

Organized within 33 years of common antagonism subsequently revolution, "this deal specifically addresses the central problem of mistrust between the West and Iran. The American President Obama is of the view point that it is Iran that has to bear out to the world that its nuclear program is going to be nonviolent and passive. Iran has already mastered the critical technology of uranium enrichment but has not gone beyond 20% grade while making a bomb requires 90% of uranium enrichment but for that, Iran would have to break out of UN controls which it has

shown no sign of doing. However US officials noted that this decision was reversible depending on Iran's compliance and that sanctions imposed on the oil and banking sector would not be affected at this stage". (Geran & Warrick, 2013).

"Iran's enriched uranium stockpile would increase the time-frame necessary to produce enough material for one bomb to six months or more. The P5+1 state would also like Iran to abandon the unfinished Arak reactor, which represents a long term proliferation threat, but Iran will likely resist such an outcome. One compromise might be to convert Arak to a more proliferation resistant light water reactor, or agree to verifiably remove the spent fuel for disposal by a third country possibly Russia to prevent it from becoming a source of plutonium. To secure a final phase agreement, the P5+1 will need to further scale back the oil and financial sanctions that are devastating Iran's economy, which will require action by the European Union states and Congressional approval of revised sanctions legislation. Negotiating an agreement along these lines will be difficult. Implementing those steps will be even harder". (Kimball, 2013)

Iranian procurement of atomic weapons is probably going to serve its interests principally in hindering the utilization of military power against the administration and growing its impact in the area instead of as a military instrument. All things considered, the math of hazard in starting and directing traditional clashes amongst Iran and the United States and different states in the area would change if Iran somehow managed to get atomic weapons. This could prompt more restriction on Iran's part; however it could likewise urge an ability to raise a traditional clash and conceivably utilize its atomic weapons. (David & Lowell, 2008)

Iran's point of view on her nuclear program

Iran has enough oil for an additional 75 years and feels its esteemed oil must be utilized for higher esteem products, and not just to create vitality. In light of money related requirements, the staggering expense of 40 billion dollars represses Iran from bringing the abundance ability up in its oil industry, not to mention remuneration for the influence plants. Iran trusts that worries are communicated about atomic weapons multiplication exclusively to hinder Iran's procurement of Nuclear Technology. As indicated by Iran that its outright ideal to tranquil atomic innovation has been the subject of 'the most wide and concentrated battle of dismissal, obstruction, mediation and disinformation' and that the universal network has been liable to 'inclination, politicized and inefficient data' about the Iranian atomic program and exercises. Iran says it won't suspend its advancement program since 'it would be additionally denied from its unavoidable appropriate to take a shot at the atomic fuel cycle, with the point of creating required fills for inquire about

reactors and atomic power. (Washington D.C: The National Academies Press, 2009)

Iran has contended that its experience demonstrates outside offices and fuel supplies are a questionable wellspring of supply for atomic fuel. Iran additionally declares that after the Revolution, the American government in spite of the agreement and its legitimate commitments prevented an American organization from discounting more than 2 million dollars compensated by Iran earlier the Islamic Revolt. Iran had, hence, made it obvious to the EU-3 and later the P5+1 that if the last looked for an entire end of Iran's atomic fuel cycle exercises, there would be no arrangements. The Europe guaranteed they were not looking for such an end, just an affirmation that Iran's atomic program would not be re-directed towards military finishes. (Mousavian, 2006)

Perhaps the best explanation of whether a nuclear program is intended for peaceful purposes or not, is provided by Ali Akbar Salehi, "We do not think a nuclear Iran would be stronger. We did not use chemical weapons against Iraq. Secondly, we do not feel any real threat from our neighbors, Pakistan and the Persian Gulf; we have no particular problems with them, or with Afghanistan. The only powerful country is Russia in the north, and no matter how many nuclear weapons we had we could not match Russia. Israel, our next neighbor, we do not consider an entity by itself but as part of the US, facing Israel means facing the US. We cannot match the US. We do not have strategic differences with our neighbors, including Turkey". (Mohammadally, 1979).

With the dismantling of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, concerns of nuclear confrontation have shifted to other nations, primarily those of the Third World. In the Middle East, Israel has long been embroiled in conflict with its neighbors, making it one of the most unstable regions in the world. Pakistan-India and China-India have serious territorial disputes, which frequently erupt over claims of possession of Kashmir and the Himalayan foothills. The US and the West consider these states 'volatile nations' and are concerned because they possess nuclear weapons. They expect that an atomic gadget in the hands of 'a silly, battle ready despot in Syria, Pakistan, or other Third World states' could be utilized to debilitate neighboring foes, the US or one of its partners. They are likewise worried about the likelihood of atomic gadget falling under the control of psychological militants, who could explode or utilize it as a type of coercion. However, this self-righteousness double standard ridicules the assertions of the US and the West. This double standard was clearly evinced during dialogue with Iran and South Korea and the ensuing outcome. (Gul, 2012)

UN Security Council Resolutions

The UNSC passed seven consecutive resolutions against Iran without any proof from IAEA corroborating Iran's pursuance of a nuclear weapons program, the resolutions against Iran stand to date:

1st Resolution 1696, In July, 31 2006, demanded Iran to hang its "uranium enrichment" actions.

2nd Resolution 1737, Dated 23 Dec. 2006, Sanctions were imposed on Iran after its refusal to swing its improvement events by suspending Nuclear Cooperation, challenging Iran's assistance with the (IAEA), and subzero the resources of people and administrations accompanying with Iran's nuclear and missile program. UNSC built up a council to screen the execution of the authorizations. These assents were principally authorized on the exchange of atomic and ballistic rocket advancements yet because of the worries communicated by China and Russia, were lighter than those looked for by the US. In light of these goals, the IAEA detailed that Iran had allowed investigations under its shields understanding despite the fact that it had not suspended its advancement related exercises.

3rd Resolution 1747, dated "24 Mar. 2007, added to the list of Iranian entities under sanction, while welcoming the proposal made by the five permanent members of the Security Council and Germany to resolve the issues related to Iran's nuclear program".

4th Resolution 1803, dated 3 March 2008, further imposed sanctions on additional people and entities, by imposing transportable limitations on approved persons and banning "exports of nuclear and missile-related", dual-use goods to.

5th Resolution 1835, dated 27 Sep 2008, "reaffirmed the preceding four resolutions".

6th Resolution 1929, dated 9 June 2010, imposed a wide-ranging arms restriction on Iran and banned "Iran from any activity related to ballistic missiles, authorized the inspection and subsequent seizure of shipments violating these restrictions, and extended the asset freeze to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) and the Islamic Republic of Iran Shipping Lines" (IRISL).

7th Resolution 1984, dated 8 June 2011, prolonged the command of the Experts recognized by "Resolution 1929 for a further 12 months".

Perception of west on Iran's Nuclear program

Israel

Israel is, along these lines, the greatest rival of Iran's atomic program announcing it to be weapon arranged. Israel is accepted to have the Middle East is just atomic store. Iran's remain on the Palestine and Lebanon issues have made Israel have questions about Iran's starter into Nuclearization. The Israeli authorities incorporate Iran's atomic program as an existential threat to Israel, and Israeli pioneers say "all alternatives remain open" in the Tehran administration. The danger contradicts what the Jews of Europe saw before the Holocaust. In early June 2008, Israeli Vice-

President Shaul Mofaz made more unexpected dangers at Iran's nuclear offices when he said that if Iran continues its nuclear weapons program, we will attack it.

Iran's use of terrorism against Israel, therefore, is motivated by specific political and military calculations rather than ideological instinct or pure hatred, as some analysts and policymakers, including Netanyahu, claim. (Bergman, 2009). This has an essential bearing on Iran's conduct toward Israel in the event that it gets atomic weapons. This isn't to propose that Iran and Hizballah will become far off; local patterns may even improve participation between the two, as seen by Hizballah's affirmed part in the besieging of Israeli voyagers in Bulgaria. Besides, an atomic outfitted Iran might be enticed to give further developed weaponry to Hizballah's military. Up to this point, Iran has not given Hizballah its best weaponry. Despite the fact that Hizballah is known to work Iranian-provided ballistic rockets that can achieve any point in Israel. (Khoury, 2012), the Iranian government has not given the association compound or natural weapons, which it is equipped for creating. It tends to be contended that an atomic furnished Iran could be encouraged to furnish Hizballah with deadlier weapons, including atomic weapons or innovation; notwithstanding, different elements are probably going to shape Iran's choices on this matter. Israeli security elites have a few squeezing worries concerning Iran's procurement of atomic weapons capacities. In particular, Israeli pioneers point out that nuclear weapons can be a cover that Iran and its partners are likely to encourage, to conclude more local agreements with Iran and to dissolve them. impact and broaden the territorial multiplication that would further limit the chances of Israeli activities. The main concern that the Iranian bomb relates to Iran and its partners to act more forcefully against Israel is often communicated in the case of Hezbollah. Today Israeli researchers believe that Hezbollah limits its activities against Israel because of the fear of an Israeli counter-offensive in Beirut. In any case, as a military expert points out, if Iran had atomic capacity, Iran would probably be unacceptable to Lebanon and would therefore be prepared to limit Hezbollah's activities.

According to Israel, the US wants to coerce Iran to verifiably stop uranium enrichment, irrespective of whether there is evidence of Iran using its nuclear program to develop weapons. "But political leaders, and even some Iran analysts within Israel's strategic community both inside and outside government, take seriously Iran's ideological hostility toward Israel and the prospect of it leading to nuclear use. Israeli leaders have responded to Iran's anti-Israel ideology with its own symbolic rhetoric drawing on the Holocaust, reminding the Israeli population of Israel's responsibility to ensure the survival of the Jewish people, and reinforcing Israel's strategic doctrine of self-reliance". (Asher, 2005)

United States

However, at the time, the U.S. government believed in Iran's responsibility for the attacks. A U.S. federal court even speculated that the Ayatullah Khamenei had

endorsed the attacks. Moreover, a number of arguments could be made in support of possible Iranian involvement: Iranian hard-liners might have wanted to stop any future Iranian overtures to the United States similar to the Conoco deal; to make it impossible for the United States to act positively toward Iran; and to embarrass the Saudis by demonstrating their vulnerability. Furthermore, some members of the group fled to Iran; elements in Iran and Al Qaeda might have cooperated on the attack; and the perpetrators were Shia. Irrespective of the identity and connections of the perpetrators, the reflexive U.S. reaction was to blame Iran, and consequently Rafsanjani's presidency came to an end without any breakthrough in U.S.-Iranian relations. (Hunter, 2010)

More ever to endeavoring to augment its impact by fortify Hezbollah, Iran will about keep on expanding its relations with Syria. The Syrian trusts that Iran bolster help counter both the U.S. nearness in Iraq and the risk presented by Israel. Neither Iran nor Syria endorses of the U.S. military nearness in Iraq, and both are sure of that they advantage from the United States' nonstop troubles there. In any case, Iran and Syria both with trust that the America will be compelled to leave the locale at last. Because of shared interests, the Iranian-Syrian association will conceivably keep on growing later on and medium terms.

Europe

Europe accepts the global dominance of the US military and the economy and therefore does not agree with the US on critical issues. The diplomatic efforts of the EU-3 and the P5 + 1 ("China, France, Russia, Great Britain and the United States plus Germany") were started on behalf of the United States, but not to bring the desired result. The course of action offered by the P5 + 1, Iran dependent on external foe that Iran was able to handle.³⁸ In February 2008, Pierre Vimont, the French delegate in the United States, the United States, called for a multifaceted approach. in relation to the Iran district and the fact that the nuclear issue broke wide, unambiguous support among Iranians.³⁹ on July 27, 2010 British Prime Minister Cameron, Iran was hurling uranium for every cent to 20, with no other basis than to transport a bomb. If Iran's nuclear program is quiet, is there a valid justification for Iran, will the IAEA not be able to watch? For what reason does Iran continue to weaken Israel through destruction? These comments were made the day after the introduction of sanctions by the European Union, which Iran refused the supply of equipment, transport and organizations. In the mid-1950s and mid-1960s, nationality meetings increased in the Middle East and Asia. (Keddie, Nikki R. & Gasiorowski)

In 1960s to 1970s, these patterns proceeded up till 1979s upset particularly "when Iranian interests coordinated well with American outside approach). Accordingly, Shah began feeling confined in this situation. This circumstance caused much pressure for USSR and in this manner Iran instantly joined the Baghdad Pact in

1955, a star western barrier cooperation between Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and the United Kingdom, keeping in mind the end goal to put a beware of the spread of socialist and advance peace in the Middle East". (Zabih, Sepher).

In 1990s, Iran was censured by the US for supporting worry and mental mistreatment on the earth. Iran and its delegate, Hezbollah, were viewed as accountable for a 1992 assault on the "Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires", Argentina, and a snare on a Jewish social request focus their two years at some point later in 1994. Until 1995, Iran stayed under routine in aftereffect of supporting misgiving, fear mongering and it was considered to search for after the Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). Bill Clinton expanded US sanctions against Iran. He bound all American association with the Iranian oil industry. In 1997, all American excitement for Iran was blocked and moreover what little US exchange stayed with the nation. Clinton in addition requested that particular nations do in like way. (Jones, 2013).

Regional hegemon in Middle East

Diverse countries from Middle East have demonstrated their slants of dread and questions on the off chance that the endorsements on Iran are either lifted up or given help which along these lines hurt their security central focuses and economies. As shown by them, the Obama affiliation has been gotten in a multifaceted session of generally administrative issues (Demas, 2013) Saudi Arabia has emerged for the creepy US standard remote method in the region regarding Iran, Syria and Palestine. Saudi Arabia has also been tense in the past of the close relations between the United States and Iran in the 1970s, at the heart of the Shah era. Saudi Arabia and the smaller Gulf states are completely in the same position vis-à-vis the US and Iran. It is strange to think that if the United States undermines Iran with military attacks on Iranian nuclear companies, the Gulf States believe that Iranian retaliation will be against them. At a time when the United States is showing an increase in the intensity of talks with Iran, they are tense that Washington will sweep Teheran as a neighbor from the oppressors. "As the United States proceeds on the Iranian front, it is fundamental for the Obama Administration that it might guarantee Saudi Arabia about changelessness of American key objectives in the Gulf. Yet neither the overblown expectations nor embellished suspicions of other actors should divert the Administration from its cautious but promising outreach to Iran". (Gause, 2013).

Geneva deal

"This deal has taken place in the backdrop of the surreptitious diplomacy (held in Oman) between Iranian officials and a senior Obama administration official, Deputy Secretary of State William Burns. There had been five meetings since March 2013, implying the first contacts came three months before the Iranian Presidential elections of 2013. It has not yet been made clear which Iranian officials had taken part in the talks". (Geran & Warrick, 2013). On 24, Nov 2013 "the P5+1, i-e; Iran

along with the six world powers, 5 of which are permanent members of UN Security Council” (“US, France, Britain, China and Russia”) later on Germany “settled a temporary agreement that meant at cutting back Iranian nuclear program for the 6 months. Though in conversation Iran will be given preliminary sanctions release, signing the start of a game-changing settlement that would trim down the peril of a wider Middle East warfare”.(Hafeezi&Pawlak, 2013).Iran has pledged to limit the uranium upgrade to 5 percent, which can fuel the reactor, for a period of six months. In addition, it is extremely weak that its pile of uranium has improved to 20%, which can provide useful jobs. Tehran moves in the same direction to stop the progress of her liberal plutonium reactor in Arak, which could pave the way for an atomic bomb in a year's time. Iran has consistently ensured that its nuclear program is fundamentally a major problem. As a final consequence of the Iranian pressure, other than tedious investigations by the UN auditor, the IAEA, about \$ 7 billion should be released, including gold and surplus metals, as well as additional parts. Likewise, \$ 4 billion of Iranian oil from configuration changes is unlimited. (Borger &Dehghan, 2013).

“The agreement runs for six months while negotiations continue on a comprehensive final deal. But both sides were able to declare victory, while US and Iranian officials stressed that today’s agreement was only a first step” (Geran& Warrick, 2013).

Regardless of how the policy is to be aggregated in half a year, Iran has been reaffirmed by 26 US Congressmen demonstrating the 2013 nuclear weapons-free Iran Act. In the announcements made by Abbas Araqchi, the Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister, we weigh the conditions and Iran will be the precondition for the new guarantees imposed on 19 affiliates and people. It is against the soul of the Geneva Agreement.

(Dahl & Croft, 2013).

Conclusion

Iran, which is a signatory of the NPT, is undermined with sanctions for compression peaceful atomic energy for vitality reason; a few nations that have declined to sign the NPT and have furnished themselves with atomic weapons are hailed as 'dependable' countries. Some of them have even gone to war, not at all like Iran, and

keep on engaging in glaring war-mongering. For Iran, not creating atomic weapons or weapons of mass decimation is a religious commitment, a reality authenticated by the Supreme Leader's pronouncement against atomic weapons. Tehran understands that an atomic equipped Iran will prompt an atomic race in the locale and that could have revolting repercussions for peace. That is the means by which capable countries act. As discussed earlier, a hallmark of Iran's revolutionary ideology has been striving for independence and self-sufficiency, notably in scientific and technological areas, because such self-sufficiency is necessary for political independence. Given this outlook, during Ahmadinejad's presidency Iran's nuclear program was declared to be essential for its overall scientific and technological development. Recalling past occasions, when great powers had prevented Iran from acquiring technology and even building railways and steel mills, Ahmadinejad characterized Western opposition to Iran's nuclear program as "technological apartheid.

Notes and References

- Arian, A., & Arian, A. (2005). *Politics in Israel: The second republic*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. p.34.
- Gul, A. Ahmad, (2012) *Iran's Pursuit of Peaceful Nuclear Technology Pakistan Horizon*, Vol. 65, No. 1 (January 2012), pp. 35-52
- Hunter, S. (2010). *Iran's Foreign Policy in the Post-Soviet Era: Resisting the New International Order*. London: Praeger Press.
- Keddie, Nikki R. & Gasiorowski. (Eds.). (1990). *Neither East Nor West: Islam, the Soviet Union, and the United States*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. P. 1.
- Khalid, I., & Safdar, I. (2016). *Iran's Nuclear Agreement: Rethinking Pakistan's Middle East Policy*. *Research Journal of South Asian Studies*, 31(1), 347-366.
- Mohammadally, S. (1979). *Pakistan - Iran Relation (1947-1979)*. *Pakistan Institute of International Affairs*, 32(4), 51-63.
- Nuclear and Radiation Studies Board, *Internationalization of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle: Goals, Strategies, and Challenges* (Washington D.C: The National Academies Press, 2009)
- Ronen Bergman, "Letter from Tel Aviv: Netanyahu's Iranian Dilemma," *Foreign Affairs*, June 10, 2009.
- Mousavian, S. H. (2006). *Iran and the West: the path to nuclear deadlock*. *Global Dialogue*, 8(1/2), 69
- Waltz, Kenneth N. *Theory of International Relations*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1979.
- Zabih, S. (1982). *Islam since the Revolution*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University. P. 168.
- Ali, Lubna Abid. (2008, July). *Post-Revolutionary Iran: Foreign Policy*. *Research Society of Pakistan: University of the Punjab, Lahore*. Pp 118-119.
- Bakhash, Shaul. (2009, September). *The US and Iran in Historical Perspective* Vol. 14 (26). <https://www.fpri.org/article/2009/09/the-u-s-and-iran-in-historical-perspective/> retrieved 1308-2018.
- Gause, F. Gregory III. (2013, October 14). *Will Nuclear Talks with Iran Provoke a Crisis in U.S. Saudi Ties*. Retrieved from <http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/iran-at-saban/posts/2013/10/14-saudi-iran-rivalry-nuclear-deal>
- Demas, Nicholas. (2013, October 21). *How Improved U.S.-Iran Relations Could Rock the Middle East*. Retrieved from <http://www.policymic.com/articles/68813/how-improved-u-s--iran-relations-could-rock-the-middle-east>
- Geran, Anne & Warrick, Joby. (2013, November 23). *Iran, World Powers Reach Historic Nuclear Deal*. *Washington Post*.
- Hafeezi, Parisa & Pawlak, Justyna. (2013, November 24). *Breakthrough Deal Curbs Iran's Nuclear Activity*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/24/us-iran-nuclear-idUSBRE9AI0CV20131124>
- Borger, Julian & Dehghan, Saeed Kamali. (2013, November 25). *The Guardian*.
- Dahl, Fredrik & Croft, Adrian. (2013, December 13). *Iran Angry Over U.S. Sanctions, Nuclear Talks Interrupted*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/12/13/us-iran-nuclear-sanctions-idUSBRE9BC0CY20131213>