

NUCLEARIZATION OF IRAN: A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Dr. Kinza Tasleem Chauhdry

Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, Lahore College for Women University, Lahore, Pakistan.

Abstract - Nuclear weapons and the weapons of mass destruction have triggered the arm race in the Middle Eastern region. The attainment of nuclear weapons of one state is highly influential to the others as these states are very close to each other. Iran has been struggling for the nuclear weapons from years, but these efforts are always curbed with the different regional circumstances which transformed this issue into the most controversial issue in the international arena. In this regard Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which was the example of the diplomatic negotiation between Iran and P5+1, was the landmark deal in the revival of the relations between United States and Iran. The consequent withdrawal of United States from the deal have devastating effects on the Iranian economy with the re-imposition of sanctions. This thesis seeks to shed light on the Iran strategy to support its devastating economy and to attract the investors again in his country with recognition of the Iranian activities after the U.S withdrawal from JCPOA. This article includes the impact of United States withdrawal on escalating regional destabilization i.e., returning of the Iranian nuclear program. This article figures out international theories to give reasoning to the pursuit of the Iranian nuclear weapons and to evaluate the nuclearizing status in the international arena.

Key Words: Nuclearization, Neo-Realism and Nuclear Optimism, JCPOA Regional Instability.

INTRODUCTION:

In contemporary times, there still exists the confusion that whether Iran would acquire nuclear weapons or not. United States who ended the thirty-five-year vacuum with the twenty months of intense negotiations, for ensuring the regional stability and stopping Iran for the attainment of nukes. U.S withdrew from Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action due to following assumptions: First, Iran used the nuclear negotiations for its own incentives and strengthening ties in the Middle Eastern region. Second, JCPOA deal benefitted Iran more than United States. The relation of this deal to the U.S and Iranian destabilizing activities have given the full end to the nuclear negotiations. This could be understood through the discussion of the possible regime motives which could be understood by the major school of thoughts prevailing in the International Relations. These models will let us understand better why the attainment of nuclear weapons is always an option for Iran.

NEO-REALISM AND THE NUCLEAR OPTIMISM:

To explain the foreign policy of a state and its behavior realist theory is the most supreme theory of international relations. According to the neo-realistic theory which was introduced by Kenneth Waltz in his 1979 book Theory of International Politics believe that Power is the main component in the society which is not as a whole attained by one actor in the society and is decentralized where there is no formal distribution. (Telhami, 8 Sep 2010) The states have their actions in collaboration with pursuit of their own survival in a pre-requisite of the achievement of other goals. (Pashakhanlou, July 23, 2009) All the realist family of the models including the classical realism, neo realism, offensive realism and neo classical realism maintains the vision that it is the self-interest of the nations to compete for the power and security. Classical realist argue that it is in the nature to acquire

power but neorealist contend that the international system is anarchic. Neo realism is applied to the Iranian nuclear program as it provides the reasons of the deterrence to acquire nuclear power. Increase in the power is directly proportional to the increase in the survival and sustainability of the state so the states develop themselves countering the other states in the region that is why basically states are never certain of the actions of the other states. This uncertainty in the behavior of the states is also known as security dilemma which initiates attainment and the proliferation of the weapons for the development of the notion of the deterrence. Now the weapons of mass destruction is considered as ultimate form of the security guarantee within the states and no state can prevent another state from the attainment of the measures regarding the security of the state and to maintain deterrence. (Tobin, 2019) Just for an instance when India acquired nuclear weapons in the May 1998, Pakistan had his priority of the attainment of nuclear weapons which was fulfilled shortly after three weeks. This maintained the stance of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) between both states which were also regional rivals. As the acquisition of the nuclear weapons provide the state both offensive and defensive security, the states can preserve itself from the threats and can use it for the self-defense and conduct its own aggression if it wishes.

THEORY OF NATIONAL INTEREST:

Neo-realism explains the theory of national interest which is directly proportional to the foreign policy of the state. It means with every move of state in the international arena, state tries for its own pursuit of benefit. Taking this point of the national interest theory into the consideration and looking at the Iranian defense interest, its strategic arguments, and the regional insecurities of Iran with respect to its nuclear program, development of nukes can be seen quite appealing for the development of its deterrence

capability. For an instance, the chemical use of Saddam having eight year war with Iran, sectarianism which isolated Iran from the Arab World and then the nuclear status of Israel which is considered as an enemy by Iran makes powerful incentive for Iran to figure its nuclear capabilities (Networks, 2018). When we look the Iranian nuclear program, the major threats to pursuit of its nuclear technology is not only attained by the United States but also the allies of the United States in the region such as Saudi Arabia, Europe and Israel (Rezaei, January 5,2017). So, the States in the pursuit of their own interest are backing and curbing the sustainability of the other. As if Iran would acquire weapons means power in the Middle East. This is also the main slogan of the Nuclear Optimists which consider the nuclear program with the reasoning of the security needs of the state.

According to the neorealist, “The distribution of the material capabilities among the states are the key factor for understanding world politics” (Mearsheimer, 1995). The states having more military power tend to make more use of it and as a result they have more tendency to convert the conflicts into war. The states are not having balance of power, so the weaker states are always having the threat of the nuclear weapons, they seek to form alliances with the stronger states and the nuclear powers are more likely to use by the stronger states for their own interest. The United States as the military power and its acquisition of the nuclear weapons made its way to project it as powerful nation and the arms control cooperation for their own interest in the nuclear deal is the preferable option for the U.S as the powerful states do not want the deterrence but the containment.

LIBERALISM AND THE NUCLEAR PESSIMISM:

Iran if having the weapons of the mass destruction, the realist expects that instead of providing it to the terrorist organizations, Iran will

strengthen its regime but the achievement of the nuclear weapons by the states which are considered as the rogue states and which have uncertainty for the use of the nuclear weapons should not be provided with the weapons which produce total destruction. As Iran is never considered to be the stabilizer of peace in the Middle East, the Iran's particular case of the revolution and then its proliferation in its neighboring states with the developed links with the terrorist organizations like Hezbollah and Hamas has given some major concerns to the international community. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are also the reason of threat. The major point of concern is that the states are the main cause of instability when they are cooperating with each other in the nuclear proliferation and technology causing the weapons of mass destruction as the substantial threat. For instance, North Korea and Iran had cooperated in the development of missile. Taking this into the consideration, the nuclear actions of the states constrained by the non-state actors and the agreement for the disarmament is beneficial in regard to all the states having nuclear weapons, this is the main motive of the Liberals. While the realism calls upon the self-help and the anarchic society, the liberals convey the importance of the non-state actors and international organization for the non-proliferation. The liberalist argue that the states are a part of community and they should help for the peace and stability in the world. As the number of the nuclearized states are only one fifth relating to the whole world and the states which have the ability to nuclearize are prevented for the global peace and security, it means that the agreements for the nuclear non-use and disarmament is controlling the world community from the destruction created by the nuclear weapons.

The main examples regarding the liberalism are the NPT which is holding its signatories through the verification and disarmament activities for the mutual gains. The goal of the NPT is significant because with every state nuclearizing will

ultimately increase the possibility of the use of the nuclear weapons. However, there are the Nuclear Pessimists that relate the nuclear program as the reason for the proliferation. If there would be the possible breakdown of the non-proliferation regimes giving no stone in the way of nuclear weapons and the world would be a hell place to live. After the 9/11, terrorism and the weapons of mass destruction are taken on one side and states show serious concern towards them. The neighbors of Iran with the nuclear Iran tend to be more towards the achievement of nuclear capability to maintain their national interest and their security with the deterrence. This will give a huge boost up to the nuclear proliferation. More and more states acquiring nuclear weapons will give them the opportunity to be used against their own motives by the states. The nuclear pessimist relates the nuclear weapon free zones which for instance have been created in the Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa and the South Pacific as the success to the nuclear disarmament. Even such type of the zone have not been established in the Middle East, but according to this initiative the Israel which is not the signatory of the Nuclear non-proliferation treaty should join it and with the collaboration of the Arab States, the Nuclear free zone could be established.

The Iran nuclear deal is the best example of the states and the international organizations providing the efforts for the wellbeing of the international community. (fadaie, 2018) In Liberal sight, the IAEA is the regime providing the securitization to the other states by leading to the cooperation and the international peace between Iran and rest of international system. The JCPOA in the line of the efforts have restricted the Iranian nuclear program on one hand and on the other maintained the relations between the United States and Iran which were going cold from the Iranian Revolution. So, the liberalist see the agreements fruitful with the mutual gains than the states fighting for the

deterrence. So according to the nuclear pessimists the states are being constrained by the legal instruments like the sanctions that could hold the proliferation of the weapons. This is the reason that the role of the sanctions has always been related to the nuclear program of Iran. The optimist was of the view that the sanctions would make Iran develop itself for the self-sufficiency and Iran should be recognized as the nuclear state by the international community, but the pessimist were of the view that sanctions should be imposed harder and harder that Iran could be dragged onto the negotiating table.

CRITICISM ON THE LIBERALISM AND NUCLEAR NEED:

Basically the nuclear arm race which was being started soon after the attainment of the nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty was being negotiated whose main objective was the prevention of the spread of the nuclear weapons (nuclear disarmament) , using nuclear weapons for the peaceful purposes i.e. nuclear energy. As the nuclear proliferation treaty still prevails in the society but the nuclear threat that is perceived by the states is there because this treaty lets the countries who maintained to have nuclear power before January 1, 1967 as Nuclear weapon states and granted the right to possess nuclear weapons to these states. The agreements like the nuclear proliferation treaty abandons the states to acquire nuclear weapons in the globe where they themselves have the ability of the attainment of the nuclear weapons. This only prevents the other states to maintain the deterrence and the hold of the nuclear weapons, instead the extended deterrence is being provided through the protection of the allies. The states in order to be effective, should play with the strategic interdependence. No regional player would be able to confront the global player without the possession of the nuclear weapons as the stronger states want to maintain the distance so that the weaker states might not involve in the quest for the

regional hegemony. For example even Israel is refrained from officially declaring itself as a nuclear power, it is believed that it achieved the nuclear status in the 1960s so seeing from the realist perspective of the balance of power logic, the nuclear status of Iran should be acceptable but under the provisions of the Nonproliferation treaty, the perceived threat from the Israel is as it is and Iran is refrained from the attainment of the nuclear status.

(Kroenig, April 2003) Matthew Kroenig who is an American political scientist and the national security strategist, he had a view along with the neo-realistic thought that the states have the nonproliferation policy to showcase their own power and hegemony. The nuclear proliferation is one of the biggest challenges faced by international peace and security. The process of the attainment of the nuclear weapons is more destructive and threat to peace than the states which have the mutually assured destruction situation. The struggles of the states to attain the nuclear weapon make more destruction than the situation in which both the states have attained the nuclear capability as both know that waging a war will give them the same in return. The nuclear terror has given more harm to the global peace and security than the nuclear weapons itself. If there would be bipolar Middle East, it might be more stable than the nuclear monopoly prevailing in the society. Rather than having the threat of weapons of mass destruction of Israel, if Iran will be nuclearized, it will induce stability. So according to the realist perspective, there should be a scenario of balance of power between Iran and Israel to have peace in the international community. The monopoly of the United States in leveraging the Israel with nuclear weapons and not letting Iran to nuclearize is of the concern.

Every state in this global world is different, the internal environment of the states can never be the same. The states with the democracies or the states with the regime types have different type of the proliferation threat and same is the

domestic politics of the state. For example, the ups and downs in the Iranian nuclear program manages the fact that the political shifts have the great impact on the program. As by the President Khatami's conciliatory nuclear policies who was in the favor of the Iranian program which could only be used for the peaceful purposes and the President Ahmadinejad's non-compliance and the escalation of the program by resisting the UNSC and its resolutions. He maintained to use the Anti-American sentiments in the people for its right to accelerate the nuclear program.

With the United States withdrawal from the JCPOA and the sanction revival on the Iran maintains that the state personal interests lead them to the agreements rather than the global peace. The main motive behind the states is always their own personal interest rather than the disarmament. The national interest of the state is always on the highest priority and states never compromise on their benefits. The states which are not the signatory of the NPT like the Israel and maintaining the regional power status.

CONSTRUCTIVISM THEORY AND THE NUCLEAR PESSIMISTS:

Constructivism theory which relates the main factors shaping the international politics with the persuasive ideas, values, culture, and social identities gives contradictory dimension from the realist perspective to the Iranian nuclear program. They include that the ideological motives take the most significant factor of the Iranian nuclear ambition. The expansion of the influence and regional dominance is what Iran is craving for. The Iranian acts are based on the Islamist Ideology and the president shape and inform the foreign policy. The Islamic regime which strongly opposes the western domination in the distribution of the power. The Iranian hatred towards the West as the "Great Satan" and the American support of its allies countering the Iran especially Israel has further intensified the

nuclear issue. (Ashley, Aug 18, 2012) Regarding the Iran with the strict inspections from the International Atomic Energy Agency and the sanctions of the western nations and the immunity of the Israel regarding the IAEA and the sanctions showed the double standards of the west in the wake of its strategic supremacy.

STRUCTURAL REALISM ON THE IRANIAN NUCLEAR DEAL:

The Structural realism says that the structural constraints define the behavior of the major actors. Analyzing it in lieu of structural realism, it is seen that it is not in the favor of the United States to have a multilateral deal with Iran which in return easing the economic sanctions are giving the benefits to the trading with competitors of the United States (Glaser, 1995). The deal which will only delay the Iranian nuclear program can empower it in the other ways which is likely that Iran will strengthen its relative power regionally. Structural Realism says that the states in the pursuit of their interest find their relative gains to achieve. The states are having the cooperation instead of the competition because it includes the conditions which contain their own self-help and resolving their issues relating to their integrity. As in the signing of the JCPOA deal, the constraint was beneficial for the both sides because the threat of the arms race and their future was uncertain making the cooperation more rational. On the other side, having not much idea of the capabilities of the adversary is more destructive as the actions are uncertain. So, the cooperation in the deal makes more sense.

THEORIES THAT INFLUENCED THE IRANIAN POLICY PREFERENCES

REGARDING JCPOA:

The internal politics and the domestic circumstances is the sole maker of the state's foreign policy and their actions in the international

arena can be figured by analyzing these domestic regimes (Mohebali, 2016). In Iran, the supreme leader is the most authoritative and powerful person, but the decision must be taken with the consent of the decision making body and different factions. All these factions promote the Islamic government, but the difference is in their ideas shaping the structure of the government. There are factions which can influence the decision making and the structural building in the Iranian government.

TRADITIONAL CONSERVATIVE FACTION OR THE PRINCIPALIST:

This faction believes that the decisions of the government should be taken with the full following of the Islamic laws and Shariah. They want free economy (self-sufficient) where the centralized economic interventions are fully minimalized, and they idealize the preaching of Islam and Quran in every mode of conduct. In the foreign policy, they want to have relations with the West but not United States as they consider United States as the enemy of their regime (Pollak, 2014). They have the same perceptions about Israel and have strong resentment to the United States till it has good relations with Israel. These Principals' constitute the majority of the Assembly of Experts as well as non-elective institutions such as the Guardians and the Judiciary. It is generally thought that Principalist under the deal which will get the Iran out of the sanctions will pursue Rohani for the much harder expansionist policy, aggressive regional approach and the more repressive domestic policies. The behavior of this faction is very rigid, and they are hard core followers of their supreme leader.

One more point which the principalist raise is the fear that the agreement is being done with the West and this conciliation could cause the collapse of the regime. As the Khamanei views regarding the West on the 21 March 2009 were

clear and straightforward about the intentions of the West regarding Iran that they hate America, and the Islamic republic wants death to America. Among the leaders of the principalist thought are the Ali Larjani and Ali Khameni.

THE REFORMIST OR THE PRAGMATICS:

The seeking of the reform for the maintenance of the Iranian regime is categorized under the reformist faction. The interaction with the global world for its own benefits believing that an open approach can bring more international influence rather than expansionism through the state proxies and anti-state actors. For its own benefit the agreement with the United States has no issue but they will always see United States as a competitor. The reformist are criticized by the conservatives and are sidelined for the Iranian Green Movement with millions of the Iranian protestors on the streets against the election of the Ahmadinejad.

BEFORE THE DEAL:

(Nader, 2015) As the deal concluded lifted the sanctions, Rouhani had the upper hand in the Iran's regional decision making as he had succeeded in the elimination of those sanctions that were harming the regime and the country the most. This main achievement eventually increased Rouhani support in the population. The population who have the right for the elimination of the government, street protest and in fact many of the leaders came to power themselves through a people's revolution will see Rouhani as their savior. As a principalist, the Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei has the notion of the untrustworthiness towards the West and projecting that people with the lack of experience believe that negotiating with America will ease tensions but, it will make things worse. Despite

of his thought Khameni played a prominent role in the JCPOA in 2015 and remaining party to the agreement after the U.S withdrawal.

AFTER THE DEAL:

The election of the Rouhani was related to the major shift in the policies of the Iran in contrast to the President Ahmadinejad and Khamenei. Rouhani is the third president winning the presidential victory with the massive votes and these votes were gathered obviously because of his conciliatory policies towards the other countries. Rouhani is known as the moderate reformist and in contrast to the Khamenei see the Iranian relations on the zero sum terms with its rival parties. Hardliners who were against the Iranian concessions in the Iran nuclear deal were unable to persuade the Iran's Supreme leader but the consequent U.S withdrawal from JCPOA, people have lost trust in the policies and approaches of Rouhani maintains the extreme political pressure for Rouhani. The control which was thought to be shifted in the president's hands and the assumptions of the increase in the president's credibility was toppled badly with the U.S withdrawal as the government was seen incapable to reverse the systematic corruption in the government and the state related networks allowing the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Cops even greater influence.

As particularly after the US withdrawal from the JCPOA there was not a rapid change even the Iran conferred with the stricter type of sanctions that were more crippling towards their regime (Moheballi, 2016) . Taking this condition of the country, Rouhani will be tempting to shift the policies towards the principalist who see the regional developments such as the Islamic State's emergence significant for sustainability in the Middle East.

The attainment of nuclear status of any state is obviously an issue for the neighboring state as well as the world community. So is the Iranian nuclear issue, which has significantly increased the tensions in the Middle East. The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action marks a change in the number of factors not only on the Iranian policies towards regional dynamics but also the changing policies of the international arena towards Iran. This deal with the United States made threat of nuclear proliferation away from the region to maintain a peace in the international arena. As before the deal, Middle Eastern region was heightened with the issues of insurgency, civil war, conflict and sectarianism.

The nuclear threat was being contained with the strategic threat relating to the expansionism of the Iran was getting under consideration. Some states considered it positive step and others took it as a threat to their regional hegemony. The impact of Iran deal could be seen closely in Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey and Syria as these countries play a major role in the MENA development. Post deal flourishing Iranian economy also resulted in the subsequent increase in the Iranian military spending. As an instance from 2015 the military budget was \$ 10.59 B, 6.95% increase from 2014 and to 2016 there was 15.82% increase from 2015, with more increase in 2017 with 13.59% increase from 2016. As an effect of the withdrawal from nuclear deal, in 2018 the military spending got 5.29% decline from 2017. The increase in the military spending, rebuilding its military forces and modernizing its equipment shows that the deal with constraining effect on the nuclear program of Iran was also responsible to let Iran work for its securitization in the region. (Katzman, July 20,2018) The Iranians despite of the U.S withdrawal from the agreement wanted the remaining parties to remain in the agreement and the parties were willing for the continued support so the European Union came up with the efforts to preserve the accord which constituted of the increase in the economic relations, ensuring the continued trade of

Iranian oil and banking transactions. But all the efforts by the European Union after the U.S withdrawal were not fruitful.

IRANIAN STRATEGY:

(Mousavian, 2012) With regards to the Iranian relations with the United States, there could exist three possibilities which could be connected to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action:

- The United States have the policy of domination and control. The main motive of United States is the overthrowing of the regime and installing it with the capitalist one like the one that existed under the Shah.
- There should be resistance against the United States effort of regime change. The negotiation with the United States is of no use.
- There should be effective cooperation between the two countries having the same interest in the region.

The points maintain the perception that Iranian strategy is uncertain. If the Iranian interest is related it may build the possible negotiation otherwise it will counter the U.S strategies for hold of the region. United States interest in the region is countered by two things:

- Iranian development of the nuclear weapons
- War with the Iran

That is why United States engages itself in the activities to isolate Iran from the rest of the world.

MAXIMUM RESISTANCE:

The reaction to the U.S maximum strategy Iranian tried to inflict with the United States allies (Gulf of Oman tanker attacks: What we know, 2019) For instance on May 12-13 2019 two Saudi, one Emirati and a Norwegian ship were destroyed and in June 2019 two Saudi tankers in the Gulf of Oman were targeted. Behind this was the strategy to pressurized Trump for the reduction of the sanctions. Even the Iranian regional allies were involved in hostilities in the region. There were reports regarding the Iranian attack on the U.S personals and installations. (Iraq: Rocket lands near US embassy inside Baghdad's Green Zone, 2020) For instance May 19, 2019 firing of the rocket in the green zone near U.S embassy in Baghdad and the attack on the Saudi infrastructure in September 2019. (Two Major Saudi Oil Installations Hit by Drone Strike, and U.S. Blames Iran, 2019) In both of the incidents United States blamed the responsibility on the Iranians.

Moreover, IAEA reported on the Iranian breaches to the deal in November 2019 when The Iran started to enrich its uranium enrichment to 4.5% and in May 2018, when Iran breached by saying that Iran will enrich uranium more than 300 kilogram limit. IAEA also once concluded that Iran has been installing the advanced type of centrifuges. The Fordow site was being accumulated for the Uranium enrichment. This showed that Iranian activities were accelerated after the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

FLOURISHING ITS PROXY NETWORK:

Financial sanctions on Iran will obviously weaken the economy but not the Iranian proxy network. As the Iranian proxies are not completely dependent economically on Iran but they are dependent for the securitization with the arms and ammunition. Iran over the years had helped these proxies building their own defense industries and supported them in the building of the weaponry and military equipment.

WAS UNITED STATES STEP OF ENDING THE NUCLEAR DEAL “A BAD IDEA”

Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action was a win-win deal if see the foundation of the deal. The main motive of the deal was being fulfilled but these are the reasons to understand why ending the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action was not a good id

- The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is one of the most comprehensive agreements ever achieved with the potential to block all the possible pathways of the development of nuclear weapon. Getting out of this deal will only harm United States as Iran will gain legitimacy to increase its weapon production and there would be no room for the reopening of the negotiations on the Iranian nuclear issue between Iran and the world powers.
- In the Presidency era of Obama, the nuclear deal was negotiated because of the European and American sanctions against Iran. In the international arena, it was taken as the containment policy for the international peace and security but now the main motive of the American Strategy is in front of the world community and most importantly President Trump lacks the quality of being trusted and is not believed for the credible economic and diplomatic engagement. This behavior of the President Trump will ultimately isolate the America. This isolation will not give the better results in the bargain of the Iranian agreement as without the support of the European Union the sanctions will not give the striking effect.
- As in the case of the containment of North Korea, United States wants a unilateral agreement with the North Korea giving up its Nuclear Program. Having the negotiations

totally failed regarding the JCPOA, the diplomatic talks with North Korea has become harder. United States in the case of any agreement will not be trusted for not backing off.

- Sanctions have lost their importance as their importance have been overshadowed by their maximum use and as the Tehran is still sustaining the sanctions imposed by the United States, it will give the clear message that sanctions will not help them attain the agreement of their choice. As the states were more indulged to maintain the status quo in the region rather than joining the United States in the acts of punishing Iran. Moreover, the sanctions were not producing the desired effect as Iran was not returning to the negotiating table.
- Ending the diplomatic terms mentions the war option for United States. It is mentioned by the American and the Israeli officials that if war would be raged against the Iranian nuclear facilities, the conflict will spread across the region which will result into total disaster. Moreover, this will be ineffective in containing the Iranian nuclear program.
- United States is biggest supporter of the non- proliferation regime and the JCPOA being the biggest establishments on the non-proliferation. Getting out of the deal without taking the other signatory allies on board was seen aggressively by the allies of United States in the region.
- A dialogue between the Iran, Saudi Arabia and the other GCC countries could encourage them to adopt reconciliatory approaches in managing their regional relations. There is extreme difficulty in the renegotiation of the agreement to encompass not only the nuclear issue but also the Iranian Ballistic missile issue as the hostilities between both the countries have escalated. The reason behind is there have been many occasions of the direct and indirect requested negotiations encouraged by Japan, some of the Gulf States

and several European countries but there has been no presidential meeting occurred. The U.S sanctions imposed on foreign minister of Iran which it considers not worth negotiating have complicated the situation as it has been stated by the Iranian officials that they will not encourage any agreement with United States. The U.S policies regarding the renegotiation of agreement are hard as they demand the complete dismantling of the Iranian nuclear program with Iranian no advancement in the missile development. U.S wants Iran to take off all its forces from Syria and end to the support of the armed factions which makes things non-negotiable.

Regional STABILITY OR INSTABILITY:

This article identifies that Iran is the challenge to the United States interest in the Middle East and its containment is the United States main security policy. Both the states have contained the effect of the other by advancing their allies in the region through the settlement of large amounts of weapons, increasing their security with the insurance of their military presence. In this regard Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action has benefitted United States by stretching the Iranian nuclear breakout time. Delaying with the Iranian nuclear program have interlinked in several factors most importantly on the regional dynamics as seen in the regional implications of the deal. This research signifies that this deal was in favor of the United States interest in the region as it has reshaped the policies between the states. But after the U.S withdrawal from the deal the pace on which these states are going is taking them more towards the escalation and regional conflict. Whether it is the relation between Israel and Iran or the Iran and Saudi Arabia, the one thing which is common is that both the states countering Iranian regime in the region have the alliance with the United States. The proxy war dynamics with each

country involved to get its own interest out of it has made this region a battleground. United States withdrawal from the deal have built a scenario with the volatile situation in which there is a rising competition between the regional actors. This competition involves arms race and this arms race mixed with the regional politics have escalated tensions in a way, where the diplomacy has failed. In this context, we see the Iranian continuing struggles in the Syria and Lebanon to securitize itself and the maintenance of its presence in the Yemen countering the possible Saudi intervention. U.S and Iranian tensions have maintained a huge new peak when the commander of Iran's IRGC and one of the military commanders were killed in U.S air strike in Baghdad. The countries were found on the brink of warfare as the Iranian backed groups in Iraq were being targeted. Remaining in the deal was in the United States interest because as despite of the JCPOA there were sanctions by United States and European Union countering the Iranian terrorist activities. For Instance, with implementation of JCPOA, European Union had an embargo on the Iranian arms and missile technology. In the result of U.S maximum pressure strategy, Iran and Iran linked forces have seized commercial ships, destruction of Saudi infrastructure, rocket, and missile attacks on the U.S embassy in Iraq with the activities like downing the U.S aerial vehicle and warships. Iran has shown that it will not abide by the provisions of the deal after the murder of Soleimani. Iranian support for the armed factions has facilitated the Iranians to cause damage to the U.S allies in region for instance attack on the Saudi Aramco. This has shut the doors for the future negotiations between the countries.

Trump's withdrawal from the deal was the strategic mistake because the military forces against the Iran will have consequences as there will be absence of the Congressional authorization. The military forces of United States which were authorized for the countering

of the terrorist activities and were being deployed in Afghanistan, Yemen, and Iraq. The presence of the forces had benefit for the United States to counter the Iranian forces and the maintenance of presence in the region. Basically, what the withdrawal from JCPOA has done is the dilemma which involves Iran on resuming its missile and nuclear programs while the United States is not able to encourage Iran to abandon its nuclear program and come to the Bargaining table. The withdrawal created the ambiguity among the states to have the nuclear capability as well. Saudi Arabia and Israel are the regional competitors of Iran, and this could have created the domino effect in the region. Settling the nonproliferation regimes, the policies of President Trump regarding the JCPOA was the bad idea indeed because it missed the cooperation opportunities with Iran with the unnecessarily implementing the forces for the isolation of Iran and the decertification which sets upon the classical application of the Realism as United States for their own interest and dominance was targeting Iran for its behavior in the Middle East not for the curtailment of the terrorism. It is being estimated from the sanctions that were being implemented before JCPOA they effected the economy, but they didn't affect the Iranian enrichment capability and there was increase in the Iranian enrichment from 5 % to 20 %. The increase in the stockpile was from few hundred kilograms to over 8000 kg and its number of centrifuges from 3000 to 22000. There was the development of more advanced centrifuges from IR1 to IR8 which is at least 20 times faster with the fortified enrichment facility at Fordow and Trump with the withdrawal and imposition of sanctions is again repeating the same mistake. As Iran has intentions for the advancement of its nuclear capabilities.

Decertification of the deal have also destabilized the Middle Eastern region with a perception that this decertification of the deal has

legitimized the Iranian emergence as the nuclear power and the pace the sanctions are acting on the Iran is not helping United States to get its interest at all (Waseem Ishaque, 2017). From the Iranian perspective, Iran wanted to remain in the deal. The reason behind this is the effect which JCPOA has produced in the regional level. As by the implementation of this agreement, the president of Iran have secured it's one more term in the office. Iran out of the deal means there will be opposition against Rouhani. The Hardliners especially the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Cops (IRGC) with the moderates and reformists will standup against Rouhani and simply the outcome will be the more radicalized Iran. Iran with a radical foreign policy will intend to transform its missile defense system, making more inter-wined relations with the regional allies of Iran with the accelerating struggles for gaining power in the region. In this regard we see that the Iranian securitizing foreign policy have gradually increased. In this regard the U.S partner countries and U.N officials have been trying consistently for the de-escalation of tensions so that they can avoid escalation to war. Most significant step is that the European Countries are refusing to join the U.S maximum pressure strategy and UK, France and Germany were still urged for the new JCPOA deal. As in August 2019, French President Macron made a step for the negotiation between the Iran and United States but on September 14, 2019, the attacks in Saudi Arabia have made the Supreme Leader to state that there will be no U.S Iran talks. In this regard if we see both the states should act upon those measures which will contain the effect of the other not give escalation, which is uncertain as through the actions of both countries giving tensions in Persian Gulf. The much needed is another JCPOA, which can put a full stop to these provocations.

REFERENCES

- Annalisa, P. M. (2016). *Iran After the deal: A road Ahead*. ISPI.
 - Abtahi, H. (2014). *Introductory Note to the Joint Plan Of Action on Iran's Nuclear Program*. Cambridge University Press .
 - Chubin, S. (2010). *Iran Nuclear Ambitions*. Carnegie Endowment for Interantional Peace.
 - Entessar, K. L. (November 15, 2019). *Trump and Iran: From Containment to Confrontation*. Lexington Books
 - Mousavian, S. H. (2012). *The Iranian Nuclear Crisis : A Memoir*. Carnegie Endowment.
 - Pollak, K. (2014). *Unthinkable: Iran, Bomb and American Strategy*. New York: Simon & Schuster paperbacks.
 - Rezaei, F. (January 5,2017). *Iran's Nuclear Program: A Study in Proliferation and Rollback*. palgrave.
 - Yaakov Katz, Y. H. (2012). *Israel Vs Iran: The Shadow War*. Potomac Books.
- Asculai, E. B. (Jan 13, 2019). *The JCPoA, Three Years On*. Institute for National Security.
- Ashley, S. P. (Aug 18, 2012). *Iranian Nuclear Program: Realist vs. Constructivist Models*. Princeton University.
 - Emily B.Landau, M. L. (March 1, 2018). *Iran in a changing strategic environment*. Institute for National Security Studies .
 - Esfandiary, D. (n.d.). The impact of Iran Nuclear deal on International Politics in the Middle East. *Centre For Science and Security Studies*, 3.
 - Goldenberg, I. (2015). After the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. *CNAS.org*, 114.
 - Hoell, M. (December 2018). *If the JCPoA Collapses: Implications for Nuclear Non Proliferation and International Security*. European Leadership Network.
 - Huang, X. (July 2016). *The Iranian Nucleaar Issue and Regional Security: Dilemmas, Responses and the Future*. Sabbatical Leave Report.
 - Juneau, T. (2019). The Enduring Constraints on Iran Power after the Nuclear Deal. *olitical Science Quaterly volume 134 no 1*.
 - Katzman, K. (2020). Iran Sanctions. *Congressional Research Service*, 107.
 - Katzman, K. (2020). U.S-Iran Conflict and implications for U.S Policy. *Congressional Research Service*, 25.

- Katzman, P. k. (July 20,2018). *Iran Nuclear Agreement and U.S Exit*. Congressional Research Service.
- Kher, P. K. (December 29,2009). *Iran's Nuclear Program :Status*. Congressional research service.
- Kroenig, G. a. (April 2003). Nuclear Posture, Non proliferation policy, and the spread of Nuclear weapons. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 398-401.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (1995). A Realist Reply. *The MIT Press*, 12 pages.
- Moheballi, P. (2016, April). *Iranian Hardliners vs Reformist: The future of the JCPOA*. Retrieved from Research gate: [esearchgate.net/publication/301689237_Iranian_Hardliners_vs_Reformists_The_Future_of_the_JCPOA](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301689237_Iranian_Hardliners_vs_Reformists_The_Future_of_the_JCPOA)
- Phillips, J. (2016). The Dangerous regional implications of Iran Nuclear Agreement. *Backgrounder*, 16.
- Quitting the Iran Nuclear Deal: 'A Serious Mistake'. (June 2018). *Arms Control Today Vol.48, No 5, 1*.
- Mousavian, M. (2017). Building on Iran Nuclear Deal for International Peace and Security. *Journal for peace and Nuclear Disarmament*, 25.
- Tehsin, D. M. (2017). *Iran Nuclear Deal : Implications for the Middle East and Possibility of regional security forum*. Islamabad Ppolicy Research Institute.
- Telhami, S. (8 Sep 2010). Kenneth Waltz, neorealism and foreign policy. *Security Studies*, 158-170.