

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE IRAN OIL NATIONALIZATION MOVEMENT AND THE NUCLEAR ENERGY WITHIN ROUZHDEH AND KAPLUN'S THEORY

ALIREZA GOLSHANI^{1a} AND ALI JADIDI^b

^a The member of scientific group of Azad Islamic University of Shahreza

^b Graduate student in political science and the member of scientific group of Azad Islamic University of Anar

ABSTRACT

International system as one unity general which has the independent and distinctive entity from its founding units makes particular- behavioral constraints. The conservative entity of International system makes difficult changing in structure and hierarchy of power. In particular, big powers in the scale of the system which the structure of International system is shaped according to them, in order to maintain of existing conditions and regularity do not allow to emergence of other big powers that will cause to structural changes. Countries which has no ideological unity with International system and also pursue foreign, revolutionary or revisionist and indecent policy will encounter more structural constraints. The nationalization of the oil industry movement and Iran's nuclear energy programmed also pursue a revisionist strategy in a region and world-wide scale which face structural constraints. In this study, we want to answer this question that what strategy has been pursued vis-à-vis the nationalization of the oil industry and the nuclear file of Iran by important and international actors (United States, Russia and England)? We assume that Iran persist a revisionist strategy in own nationalization of the oil industry movement and nuclear energy programmed that face the disapproval westerns and structural constraints. The main- strategy of these three big powers is disapproval with the- nationalization of the oil industry and reaching of Iran to nuclear energy and big power severely oppose these two works. And the approach of big powers (United States, England, and Russia) about the nationalization of oil industry and the process of access to nuclear energy follows a unit pattern; United States and England are going to questioning and limiting Iran and Russia after getting concession and the provision of own benefits by Iran and at last, the resistance of Iran's society resulted in retreating of big powers in each both subject.

KEYWORDS: International system, the structure of International system, Power, the nationalization of the oil industry, nuclear energy.

International system is a climate which units of international politics act in such a way that behaviour, orientation, intentions, and purposes of the aforesaid units are influenced by this system. In the other word, the collection of external climate of countries is addressed as relations or international system that all of occurrences and happenings in this climate are shaped according to principles and rules govern of this climate and, consequently are understandable and explicable. The conservative entity of international system makes difficult change and evolution at the structure and hierarchy of power. The large powers in this system which are maker of structure of international system in order to maintenance current situation and regularity and stability in system don't allow to appearance of other large powers which will cause the structural changes. Politics such pressure, embargo, isolationism, military acts, and overthrow are cases that powerful countries consider for those who don't act

in the course of principles and laws of international system. Hence in current study we want analysis the nationalization of the oil industry and nuclear program of Iran.

Theoretical Framework of Study

International system is a situation which units of international politics act in such a way that behaviour, orientations, and purposes of the aforesaid units are influenced by this system. In the other word, the collection of external climate of countries is addressed as relations or international system that all of occurrences and happenings in this climate are shaped according to principles and rules govern of this climate and, therefore are understandable and explicable.

In opinion of newly realists, international system has been made out of one structure and interactor countries. The structure is a component of all over the system that provides a possibility of thinking and outlook toward

international system as one collection using of structuralism thought attain lack of central government that has been caused chaos in international system.(Waltz,1979,55-95)

In walt z theory , the structure of international system is the main factor for determining the governments behaviour , since it limits the probability of cooperation among governments and by making of arms race , causes war and insecurity and all of these have root in the origin of opposing with government in the international system and opposing government by making of self-assistance fanned insecurity .

The international system as a whole unit that has an independent identity and existence from own constituent units , make specific behavioral constraints. Due to the how of distribution of might at the international scale , the hierarchical is created that determine the set of each one of countries. The large powers in this system which are maker of structure of international system in order to maintenance current situation and regularity and stability in system don't allow to appearance of other large powers which will cause the structural changes . Therefore , the appearance of large powers at the international scale had always accompanied with war and harsh confrontation . creating a hegemony and uncontested power in regional scale which disrupts structure and function of international system by own supremacy , will encounter resistance and confrontation of conservative international system.(Waltz , 17,2007)

The confronting of conservative international system about Iran began after the nationalization o the oil industry and follow-up of Iran s nuclear program . At first , powers began different diplomacies and stances according to own national strategies and benefits in the international and regional scale and then the large powers treaded in order to control these two occurrences . the confrontational policy of powerful countries was not unexpected , because their universal and regional strategies has been remarkable.

Basically , Iarn s geopolitical structure is in a manner that can not be away from international changes . Therefore , Iran must adopt suitable policies given world powers and their policies and function of system govern international relations as these policies always take place independent and beneficial. We must adopt

suitable policies in the internal and external arena by right and realistic understanding of national power and targeted recognition of national benefits and knowledge about international ruling system.(Alexander , 1979,55)

Therefore , on account of entity of regime of Islamic Republic of Iran , orientation of independent foreign policy , superior and crucial geographical position and geopolitical and geostrategic importance o Middle East , it can be resulted that the conservative international system . whether, hegemonic and multiparty , in order to access of country to hegemonic situation in Middle East state will make and impose extreme structure constrains .

The History of the Nationalization Of The Oil Industry

Looking at negotiation related to Iran oil from time discovery and extraction shows that the south and north of Iran beside of imposition of losses of the first and second world war, was cursed with tankers war too .some stable factors in any oil conflict among large powers for acquisition of concession from Iran with every one of penetrable countries are observed such as the use of force on behalf of profitable large powers , active presence and opposition of large might of opponent and permanent weakness of Iran for supplying and or defense of own sources.(shall,1988)

The most important oil concessions which finally led to the nationalization of the oil industry are as follows respectively: 1-royter concession 2-proceeding letter 3-contract 1933 4-gas-golshaian contact

After occupation of Iran by England and Russia and then United states at the second world war , competition of colonialists about the benefits especially oil became excessive .The government of Iran after encountering with demands of oil companies of all three countries , declared that giving of any kind of concession must be postponed after the war ,because at that time and for war reason ,economic position of countries is not clear. Finally , the demand of all three countries was rejected. The plan of nationalization of oil industry for the first time was addressed by Mr rahimiyan ,deputy of Ghoochan in 14th Majles ,but basic involvements of government and Majles and political consideration leave unuttered the plan of nationalization of oil for a while time.(lesani,1978)

On the first day of Aban in 1328, twelve expert person gathered in the home of Dr. Mosaddegh and after some negotiation established "National Front" under surveillance of Dr. Mosaddegh. National front in the first act declared illegal the 16th elections by issue declaration. The national front had been constituted of different political actions benefiting different points of views which just their common characteristic was their belief about vindication of Iran rights from oil company. (Azimi, 1995)

Finally, oil commission accepted the plan of nationalization of oil industry throughout the country. After all, single article of nationalization of oil industry was addressed in the national parliament at Esfand 24th and was approved unanimously and finally, Majles confirm the nationalization of oil industry at Esfand 26th of 1329.

The Effect of Structure of International System On The Nationalization

Ending the world second war changed the structure of international system and set both powers the United States and Russia against each other. Although the United States as one appearing power at the world field and England as a declining emperor had common interests against Russia and Marxism, began a harsh competition with each other in some vital states of world. This competition that had different military, economic, and political aspects is an expression of basic principles of international system that the current structure gets into change only with appearance of one new power and declining of the former power.

Because the international system is dynamic, current order and organization don't have stability at one time frame and the international system due to world evolutions such as wars, technology development, and more important of all increasing public awareness is exposed to changes. Just as we encounter with balance of power, bipolar, and single-polypolar systems at the last century. The process of the nationalization of oil industry, that began from the plan of prohibition law of grant oil concession to abroad countries that was approved at meeting of 11th Azar 1323 and went on during the time when Mosaddegh held the reins of power, was done at the period when the world was being disintegrated.

The governing members at those times had prepared the field for the nationalization of oil industry.

At that time, the United Nations approved a law which every nation is the owner and ruler of the own underground and surface resources, means both sovereignty on resources and national sovereignty had been approved from international viewpoint. Therefore, there wasn't any resistance against the nationalization of oil industry. In such position, Dr. Mosaddegh as a clever expert exploited climate in some way.

- Another subject was the climate of nationalization at that time, labor unions in France and England nationalized their coal mines and another mines and nationalization became a custom and an ongoing phenomenon in western countries, of course, they must pay reparation.

- The other event was the nationalization of Mexico's oil and Mexico government had also paid its reparation. (Brzazainski, 1997, 23)

The strategy of important international system actors about the nationalization. Although the international system vice versa political domestic systems doesn't have a systematic mechanism and dominant strength, and it isn't a dominant legal strength on world order and the governments aren't required to adhere to one superior sovereignty, but there are political self-regulating mechanisms epitomized in the form of world order. Here, the behavior of governments as actors of international relations field is understandable. (Caws, Peter, 1991, 32)

Here we investigate the stands of effective countries at rule period of Mosaddegh at 1330 to 1332 years so that the role of abroad factor or the structure of international system in process decision makings of Iran foreign politics in this time was determined. In this direction, we examine the stands and functions of two main western powers, United States and England which were acting in climate of cooperation and reciprocal competition and also investigate the unity of Soviet that had appeared after the world war at vertex of earth hostile camp in a bipolar climate. (Wikipedia, 2006)

Three effective powers at the time of nationalization of oil were England, United States, and Soviet that England set at vertex (given monopoly that it had at Iran's oil resources), the United States that stability of oil issue and fight

against communism set in the vertex of their policies and it has had an important role at coup against Mosaddegh too, and Russia given the socialist and revolutionary mottos in world and each of them follows own interests at this time. Therefore, we will study politics and strategies of these three countries.

England Approach

Iran was not ever the colony of England directly, but due to geopolitical situation, having oil, and its strategic situation in vicinity with Russia has had a very vital significance. Although, Britain felt that must act in Iran for maintain India, oil company of Iran and England, and prevent of communism in the region.

Crisis of Iran-England relations by coming Dr. Mosaddegh to power and his incisive decision about administration nine-article law of nationalization of oil industry, reached a new stage. The nationalization of oil industry in Iran as one economic and policy big event had domestic and foreign expansive repercussion and it could leave the determinant and defining effects on the effort for decolonization in the colony and half-colony countries. In this respect, for prevent of it, some replacing plans addressed by England, United States, and international assemblies that most of those were not acceptable for opposition of Dr. Mosaddegh. (Azghandy 2009)

At the beginning of nationalization oil plan in Iran, England had a role for defeating it and preventing of nationalization of oil industry. But with happening of this movement, he tried to overthrow, and finally downfall of organizer of this movement that at last he attained his goals by happening of Mordad 28th coup.

England could not oppose the origin of "nationalization" movement, they had also nationalized own resources. In addition, from the point of view of international laws, the origin of "nationalization" is totally legal since that the rate of damage or the same fair amount was being paid, but the desire of England government was this that Iran pretend that nationalized the oil industry, but the real control would be at the England industry, for example; England companies must decide about the rate and time of the oil production in receiving country. (Abrahamian, 8; 1384)

Because of consecutive economic and judicial failure of England and the defeat in using

from international circles and being futile policy and economic weapons against Iran, England government administrated its last strategy means resorting to confidential policy acts and plan of overthrow and by England diplomats resident of Iran and wide web from soldiers, politicians, and merchants began a extensive acts for making strike and opposition and producing disharmony among national front heads and the members of Mosaddegh's cabinet. (gazyorooky, 2000)

The Englands want to do all of own effort in order to preventing of the nationalization of oil industry. Their first goal was preservation of energy resources for themselves and their second goal was fight against humane movements which fear the spread of them severely. The next step of humane movement was the nationalization of Suez Canal that of course this work was done and following the nationalization of oil industry, Suez Canal was nationalized too.

The United States approach

Basic focus of United States policy about Iran after the second world war was which Iran would be an independent and stable country in the Middle East, since inconstancy of Iran resulted to communism infiltration in Iran. It is very important for United States that Iran would stay an independent country.

The relations between Iran and United States in the period of Mosaddegh premiership severely was influenced by oil conflict of Iran and England. But it is appeared that Mosaddegh's incorrect analysis from the setting of Iran at foreign policy of United States, cold war, and inability in understanding of deep relations between England and United States caused to he was extremely optimistic to United States for opposition economic and political problem at 1332-1330 years. Dr. Mosaddegh not only was not useful for absorption of Americans and making distant between America and England but left irreparable losses.

It is appeared that Mosaddegh had an opinion about economic support of United States more than political support of them and imagined that finally will be able to overcome economic problems due to oil incomes decrease by support of America aids. (hamraz, 2006)

In fact, policy of the United States about national movement can be divided to three periods:

1-Supporting from Iran's legal rights to breaking the England's oil monopoly.

2- Friendly mediation for solving England and Iran disagreement.

3-be in favor of England and participation in overthrow of national government.(mahdavi ,hooshang , 2002)

The United States had three strategies about the nationalization at three stages which was caused by the situation of international system and the interests of this country. In the following graph were observed United States stages and strategies that will deal to explaining of each one.

The First Stage

After the second world war, the United States was infiltrating in Iran gradually and also finding a strategic setting against Iran at foreign policy. Although The United States had more expansive oil resources in Venezuela and Saudi Arabia at this time, but wasn't unaware of the importance of increasing these resources or own future economic.

At this years, international situation demanded that Washington support the national movement, in fact, goal of United States from adoption of such strategy was to obtain some benefits from Iran oil and to expand own infiltration in Iran. Mosaddegh deemed own government a reformist, nationalist, and dependent to oil that this strategy was along Washington goals in region particularly collateral with Doctor Yen Troman (support of reformist and national governments which were an obstacle against communistic motto.(kaem, 2004)

Irreconcilability of people and insistence of Mosaddegh about the nationalization of oil industry and his opposition with any kind of substitution plans for the nationalization of oil industry law resulting in failure of the mediation policy of United States. (Azgandi .1997) along with suggestion of England and ministry of foreign affairs of America for cooperation of Americans in the new oil consortium, abandoned own policy impartial between Mosaddegh and London. According to Eden's saying: Britain bought American agreement about in fight against Mosaddegh's government.(Eden 202:1960) such a strategy on Iran and England behalf was a factor for failure of the mediation policy of United States. The duality about assessments continued to later

on month until changing United States democratic government and starting of working of Aiznahavar, supporting from Dr. Mosaddegh government became very less. The U

nited states at the beginning showed anxious toward results of any kind probable military action from England against Iran in strategic region of Middle East; because could be a pretext for military agitation of soviet.

Third Stage

Until Troman and democrat government were involved, the effort of Britain at this route didn't arrive at a complete conclusion. The democrats government didn't accept any kind of use of military pressure against Mosaddegh. At that time that power in England was on hand Churchill who was at greedy party, at first because of presidency of Teroman (from democratic party) in United States, this both countries didn't reach an agreement to performance of coup and the United States only was satisfied with "the Teroman fourth law" in order to control the communism risk in Iran. But the change of sovereignty in United States and coming to power of Republicans under Aiznahavar's leadership caused apparent changes toward Mosaddegh's government, because Republicans leaned military and wrathful solution. It is worthy to note that at the current region threats similar to the periods before coup coincided with sovereignty of republicans in the United States and ipsilateral and harmonious process with it in England.

The new government of United States, unlike the former government of United States, didn't show much fear for overthrowing of the government of the other countries and didn't also reject from cooperation with another companies.

Finally, the United States and Britain adopted an ipsilateral policy vis-à-vis the nationalization of oil industry in Iran. The United States look at this issue with the threat of communism, whereas Britain had approaches about the solution of oil crisis and at last, the United States and England could overthrow the Mosaddegh's national government and reached somewhat to own willingness.

Approach Soviet

Russia strategy toward the nationalization was ambiguous and complex and somewhat dependent on international and cannot be recognized a clear approach, but since affected by international and domestic relations and Mosaddegh accepted the establishment of cabinet by the support of people, and the laws of foreign policy changed basically, soviet finished antigovernment propaganda and administrated cautious policy, patience and wait toward Iran and Mosaddegh government. (Azgandi, 1998) soviet government never was pleased with mosaddegh's policy; therefore didn't show any to national and anticolonization movement of the people of Iran. The people of Iran were dissatisfied from the function of Tudeh party which were the agent of administration of soviet policies. (steemel, 203:1378)

Only soviet publications supported this movement. the publications of soviet supported from Iran via impression of news related to Mosaddegh's and Ayatollah Kashani campaign for the nationalization of oil industry and people demonstration in support from government effort for excluding dominance of Englishmen. maybe dissatisfying of strength treaty of sadchikf would be one of factors in state of mosco's politician behavior toward Mosaddegh government.

In campaign of the nationalization of oil, at first the united states supported the national movement of Iran and England wanted to resolved own differences and reach an agreement by peaceful ways. this say also had been stated at the meetings of Mosaddegh and American politicians. Creating gap in the national movement and influence of some communistic agents dependent on Soviet at it, gradually erupted doubts at Americans in order to supporting of national movement and at last risk feeling about the influence of communism to Iran and current worry about the fate oil resources of Iran with together England efforts to change the united states approach toward the nationalization of oil industry movement, obliged America to the change of stand about this subject. (Beel, 1992)

The Effect of The International System structure On Becoming Nuclear Of Iran

Becoming nuclear of Iran considered as one of important international issues that despite

the efforts of main powers in the scale of international system to stop of it, was able to continue own route. because of crises management has various aspects at different structures of international system and continuity of one crisis at one structure with another structure do under different laws. this study want to answer this question that what influence has the current structure of international had on continuity of iran's nuclear crisis? for answer to this question must be addressed that the current structure of international system and agents correlated to it is one of major reasons of continuity of Iran's nuclear crisis that at this system the power level of members is high.

Kont waltz as the most important theoretician of neorealistic approach, the international system set analysis level and believed that the structure of the international system determine kind and laws of performance. (Ghovam, 2004) one of this laws is the management laws of the international crises that change in moving from one structure to another structure. according to samoel hantington's theory, the current international system is a complex system, a "single-multipolar" which one superpower and several major power are in it. at such system in order to settlement of international key problems, is not sufficient acting from an available superpower. But it is needed to perform a kind of coalition among the major powers too (vaezy, 2007) so that the capability of crisis management was delivered according to it. multilateral negotiations about nuclear program of south korea and 5+1 negotiations about nuclear program of Iran are operational samples of this kind of crisis management.

International structures with own unique features make the laws of performance in the international system. At this study, existence of the major powers together with one superpower, gaining significance of the international organizations and institutions, difference of opinion between major powers, and making crisis are some features of the current international structure that was counted as a device for moving of iran's nuclear crisis, but advancement of iran's nuclear file also has some domestic reasons. the most important these reasons was people supports from nuclear activities formed due to equalizing of it with national desire and interests.

The approach of important actors of international system toward becoming nuclear of Iran

The United States approach

The United States' clash method about nuclear program of Islamic Republic of Iran has been affected by numerous factors both before 2003 year and after that time. The main reasons of America's negative deployment can be explained in the shape of five cases. The first factor is Iran's complication at foreign policy of the United States. This means that the United States could not adopt a cohesive policy vis-à-vis Iran during three past decades. The United States' approach was somewhat changed about Iran with coming different presidents in America, but decision making system in America has not achieved to a consensus about clash method with Iran. (Maloney, 2004:38)

Some people say that the complicated behavior of Iran's leaders is the most important factor to creating this complication. A few of experts talk about the existence of a recognition crisis at decision making system of the foreign policy of America about Iran. The lack of correct understanding of Islamic Iran's nature is one of the main reasons of the recognition crisis that this is a barrier for adopting one cohesive and constant policy by America toward Iran. There is a close relation between the safe approach of America about nuclear subject and its general approach toward Iran and we look at the response of America toward Iran's nuclear subject in any way, can not separate the nuclear file from Iran's general subject. The United States can not solve the nuclear issue of Iran at long-term, unless he generally disposes Iran's issue at own foreign policy. (Ghahramanpour, 2008) September event of 2001 as the second factor has many effects on America's safe approach about Iran's nuclear issue that three cases of outcomes of this event have much relation with Iran's nuclear file. The first case is the plan of nuclear terrorism by America. Bush government after 11 September intended to magnification of the nuclear terrorism risk. The magnification of this risk is for American officials want to show the international environment as a dangerous environment that in order to confronting such environment must adopt stronger policies, therefore it isn't accidental that Bush considers the Iran's support of international terrorism as one of opposition reasons of America

with Iran's nuclear activities. (Ghahramanpour, 2008)

The focus on Middle East region is another outcome related to 11 September event about Iran's nuclear file. During this time, the United States tried to change the Middle East to own intended inhibitive hub. After 11 September, the officials of Bush government consider the most important of America's enemy not only Russia, but they regard the governments and groups which want to beat the interests of America and its allies in order to blackmailing (Woolf, 2006:5). The reasons of opposition of America with Iran's nuclear program must understand given Iran and America situation in region. Iran is one of countries who have numerous effects on success or failure of America's policies. In this direction, try of America for imputing Iran's nuclear activities with nuclear bomb, terroristic groups, and magnification this subject in the scale of international is done by media devices in order to fulfillment of campaign approach via increasing of Iran's power at the national and international scale. (The Center of Strategic Researches, 2006)

The evolution at inhibitive is the last outcome of 11 September related to Iran's nuclear issue. After 11 September, the symmetric inhibitive was changed to asymmetrical that at one side of that set a nuclear and powerful government and at the other side of it set a terroristic group without the special land. Bush government for reaction to this situation adopted the preventive action policy in task order of America national security that it has emphasized on necessity of use of inhibitive actions against terrorists and in subordinated governments who intend to accessing nuclear weapons. Intention of the United States at the Iran's nuclear actions was caused at this new attitude that on the basis of it, must be confronted enemies before changing them from potential to actual enemies. (Ghahramanpour, 2008)

The other reason of the United States for opposing Iran's nuclear program must be searched in the general arms control policy of the United States. In the general statement, the United States is the opposition of proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world and at this case, there isn't much difference at the first stages. The evolutions outcome on America weapons control policy after cold war is passage of non-proliferation policy to

anti-proliferation policy.(marli and lodgaard ,8:2004).

It is supposed that a few countries tend to having nuclear weapon at the non-proliferation policy and can be prevented this task with several actions in the non-proliferation regime framework . But anti-proliferation set in the direction of policy of preventive war. At this direction , America actions in front of Iran s nuclear program is a mixture of traditional non-proliferation actions and anti-proliferation actions . the most important anti-proliferation actions of America in front of Iran consist of: declaring of being unusual of Iran s file in the governors council of agency at 2003 year , cooperation with UN for convincing of Iran to suspension of own nuclear activities and establishment 5+1 group to increasing of politic and economic pressure on Iran . from the most important anti-proliferation activities of America in front Islamic Republic of Iran can be alluded to cases like effort for expansion of America nuclear program to small countries margin Persian Gulf , the effort for nuclear espionage from Iran s nuclear program an effort for of material with binary application to Iran .the final goal of America from adopting this actions against Iran is convincing of Iran for abandon own nuclear activities .(ghahramanpour , 1999)

One of another factors of America pressure on Iran is Jew powerful one in America which is worry of increasing the power of Iran and endangering better situation of Zionist Regime in the Middle East. The nuclear program of Iran , more than every country will influenced the Zionist regime . there are two very important interpretations at the Zionist s regime power structure toward Iran : the first attitude regards Iran as ideologic enemy which is desirous of physical extinction of Zionist regime and the second attitude considers Iran as a complicated country which is a function of own national interests and maintaining of politic system considerations (kalavsoon and sokoleski ,1384). The increase of Iran s power in region will be the cause of being strong of opponents of Zionist regime and Palestinian resistance movements that this matter isn't profitable for Zionist regime . In addition , the increasing of Iran s power vis-à-vis access to sensitive technology of combustion cycle can drag the American officials , the matter that Zionist regime is afraid of it (ghahramanpour ,

2009).therefore ; Zionist regime tries very much in order to prevent from being nuclear of Iran by infiltration in decision making system of America.

The fear because of emergence of Iran as a regional is the last effective factor on security attitude of America toward Iran s nuclear program .after the cold war, the most threats against the national security of America has been in the scale of region and the united states needs to presence at the strategic states of world like The Middle East in order to strengthen own position in the international system. Some of governments also try for changing into regional hegemony and Iran is one of them (ghahramanpour, 2008). Because there isn't presence possibility of the regional hegemonic in the system based on hegemonic stability , therefore America has tried to prevent from changing of Iran to a powerful country (Larijani, 2005).

Russia Approach

The understanding of real approach of Russia in front of the nuclear file of Iran demands recognition and careful assessment of Iran setting in its foreign policy and goals and the interaction method of Russia with another powers especially America about nuclear programs of Iran . From Russia standpoint , the nuclear program of Iran including strategic , technology , and economic aspects and at general framework , Russia relationships with Islamic republic of Iran definite as a special aspect . The important pivots of these relationships are:

_prevention from infiltration of powers who are out of the region to this strategic region especially the United States of America

_attracting support of Iran from Russia policies in region , specially in central Asia and Caucasus ;this matter have a special significance in north Caucasus and Chechnestan .

_ attracting Iran s cooperation for important strategic cooperation like north-south highway which make possible access of Russia to Persia golf and to the Indian subcontinent by it.

_use of Iran demands in order to access developed technology given embargo of America and on the whole west countries.

_use of Iran as a lever and an important device for strategic haggling in Russia pragmatist diplomacy in front of America and west countries .the nuclear cooperation of Russia with Iran beside the important economic interests , has caused to benefit an important setting at the international policy for Iran.

The Stands and policy of Russia in front of Iran nuclear issue can be examined from the viewpoint of two technical and political way that albeit related to each other. Although the beginning of Russia meddling in the nuclear program of Iran that return to construction contract of Bushehr power plant at 1995 year ,was together with technical and economic goals but these goals was not perfectly acquitted of political motivation .as dull and gloomy relations of Iran and the united states of America due to Washington sensitiveness about Iran s nuclear activities , the geopolitics importance of Iran for Mosco also together with economic and technical motivation didn't allow that don't reply the increasing enthusiasm of Iran for access to nuclear energy and propel Tehran to west opponent of this country . Although increasing of the united states pressures after meeting of Algeer , vice-president of America and the prim minister of Russia , Victor charnomerdin , Mosco agreed with stoppage of issue weapons to Iran . but in November of 1998 year , with trip of Adamef , the current ministry of nuclear energy of Russia to Tehran and during visit Bushehr project signed specialized cooperation convention of Russia with Iran and it was agreed that would complete this program until 2003 year .of course Mosco has not done to this contract until now.

In many of experts opinion , Russia approach about nuclear issue of Iran was such as a two edged sword that from one side America and west countries call to opposition , negotiation , and haggling and on the other hand , this approach hereby had scorer negotiation and transaction with Iran . therefore ; given repeated delays of Russia for finishing the construction of Bushehr power plant by economic and technical pretexts , cooperation of mosco at ratifications of resolutions like 1696 resolution dated 31 January 2006 ,1737 resolution dated 23 December 2006 , 1747 resolution dated 24 march 2007 , 1803 resolution dated 3 march 2008 , 1835 resolution dated 27 September 2008 , has not been flawed the Iran and Russia relations and ,furthermore ; Mosco could

not do pointable haggling in difference Field with America and west countries .

The EU Approach

The Middle East region has a special significance in Europe security approach about Iran s nuclear issue . geographical neighborhood and strategic situation of the middle east , provision of most part of Europe oil , provision of stability and security of region , existence of world s big religions in the middle east and domestic evolution of this region like political Islam , ethnic and religious differences are the most reasons of significance of the middle east for Europe (khoshandam , 2008)Europe is administrating strategies such as supporting international regime mechanisms of fight against expansion of these weapons in the middle east , prevention of access America unally regimes at this region to every kind programs related to massacre weapons and security , economic , and political individual and strong relations with all countries of the region in order to reach to nuclear non-proliferation goals in reaction to tendencies of the middle east countries for access to massacre weapons .(Khoshandam , 2008)

Together with significance of the middle east and Europe reaction toward expansion of massacre weapons at this region , the most important strategies of Europe EU in fight with expansion of massacre weapons after 11 September event is summarized in two strategies :first ,more security Europe :security strategy of the EU(2002) ,and second , fight strategy with expansion of massacre weapons of the EU (2003)(khoshandam. 2007)

The EU about the middle east , emphasizes on obligating of region countries and the other world region on to principals and goals of international regime of control and anti-proliferation . Europe considers the entity of Iran s nuclear programs in the direction of access to nuclear weapons and believe if Iran reach to nuclear weapon , the access to this weapon will change to a principle . from the point of view of Europe and given current equations in the middle east , a nuclear Iran can be dangerous more than the nuclear power of Pakistan , Zionist regime , and or India(Khoshandam , 2008)

The EU had different reasons for entry to Iran s nuclear crisis. This union tried to revive the Europe setting in the international power hierarchy . the stages of administrating of the strategy of EU about

nuclear crisis management of Iran is in the direction of troubles and new security techniques and special look of EU to maintain the control and non-proliferation of massacre weapons international regime generally at three analyzable stages ; the first step was the stage before formal entry of EU to solution and management of nuclear crisis of Islamic Republic of Iran. At this time , three Europe countries (France , England , and Germany)began the negotiation with Iran. These countries requested Iran to stopping of nuclear activities that at last resulted in short-time suspension . the second step was the active entry stage of the Europe union to management of Iran s nuclear crisis . The outcome of Europe presence at this crisis was Broksell (23 February 2004)and pares Convention (15 November 2004). At this stage , EU for administrating own strategy , delivered justifications by combination of economic facilities of Europe related to three countries and cooperative and multilateral solutions , but this approach resulted in failure by ending of suspension of Iran s nuclear activities and finally , Iran s nuclear file was refered to the United Nation s Security Council (khoshandam , 2008).

Third stage is the performance of marginal role from EU together with America approach for the solution of nuclear crisis . The behavioral pattern of Europe and America at this stage is considerable encountering Iran s nuclear crisis at complementarity framework of strategic behaviour . It is appeared that at the next stage of crisis which is about Iran s nuclear activity , there is a n undeniable convergence between Europe

union and America . This convergence that is about opposition the full fuel cycle in Iran ,will change to a participation point.(the center of strategic researches.2006)

The EU at the beginning of addressing Iran s nuclear issue at 2003 year , tried to influence sharp strategy of America clashing Iran s nuclear file that was based on forestallive move .but at the processing of Iran s nuclear crisis , it is appeared that Europe was influenced by America rather than America was influenced by Europe. But this equation has changed after reference Iran s nuclear file to security council and after that , Europe strategy has been accompaniment and coordinated with America strategy(khoshandam , 2008)according to stated talk at this part , it can be reached to this result which attitude of security west countries in front of Iran s nuclear program in the period of after cold war has influenced security perception of west countries in front of Iran ; therefore the third stage of this study is approved that Iran s nuclear program has considered at such shape of west attitude to international security .at the other word , the effect of foreign factors on west security attitude in front of Iran s nuclear issue and the presence of security motivation because of sovereignty of anti- government structure of international system on relations among west governments with Iran present a neorealistic analysis about the nature of west security strategies that can together with structural analysis clear system-analysis entity and west mentality toward Iran and its nuclear issue.

This table shows the behavior of three countries (America , Russia , and England)about the nationalization of oil industry and Iran s nuclear program.

Row	country	The oil nationalization	Nuclear program
1	America	-the first stage ,supporting Mosaddegh -the second stage, mediation -the third stage, overthrow of Mosaddegh	-before revolution: supporting of Nuclear program -after revolution: opposition with Nuclear program
2	Russia	-vague and affected by policy the international system -overthrow of Mosaddegh	-vague, equivocal and affected by policy the international system -the inaccessibility of Iran to cycle of nuclear fuel

3	England	-the first stage , prevention of oil nationalization -the second stage, effort for overthrow of Mosaddegh	-before revolution: supporting of Nuclear program -after revolution: opposition with Nuclear program
---	---------	--	---

Unitary Pattern in the Nationalization Of Oil Industry And Nuclear Energy

1-the subject of these two files is connected energy that both have the important role and position in the stable improvement of Iran .it means that as the nationalization was effective in the economic growth , the nationalization of new energies within the international agreements also is effective in reaching multilateral aims of twenty –year outlook document and country reverence .

2- The importance of both subject is such that that the highest –ranking official of country announces the own aim to speech during election in security council.

3-the political considerations are superior to technical-legal considerations in both file.

4- Both file profit by democratic support , namely there is a kind of harsh cohesion between society and government (after province travels of president and the enlightening of public ideas from positive achievement of one nuclear Iran , making a nuclear tide) in both the nationalization of oil industry and the nationalization of nuclear knowledge .

5-Superpowers with expansion of foreign threats in both files plan to leading domestic climate toward tension and unrest by bringing of agents of fifth column and expansion of untrusting. For example , after the nationalization of oil industry , the England planed to providing the necessary position for expansion of unrest and all over strikes by helping of penetrative agents and leading to political mendacious circumstances and the United States is going to increase the tribal – ethnic divergences and the trade –academic tensions in current situation .

6- the opposition of Soviet (Russia) and United States with the nationalization of oil industry and nuclear energy ; namely these two powers were against the nationalization of oil industry during Mossaddegh s premiership and increasing their share from the oil resources of Iran was always as a conflict subject among them. About nuclear knowledge and according to Realism ideology , Russia also was opposition of making one

powerful nuclear Iran in the own south contiguousness and Russia was more serious than the United States in this area and the Russians manage this climate in a manner that a chain resolution was ratified by gradual pressure because the existence a intermediate state , increase the haggling power of Russia in order to getting synchronic concession from Iran and West .

7- We see resistance and unity of Iran nation in these two events .

8-the failure of big powers , England and United States was seen in these two events

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Finally Exploitation and sale of Irans oil by England resulted in establishing of the nationalization of oil industry movement at the end of 30th century .Mosaddegh government and people in the cover of oil coup were desirous of opposition foreign colonial powers such as England. the stablishment of the united nation and compilation some laws in it like freedom right was effective in determining of people fate and desire of world people specially people of Iran .it is evident that this attitude and attention to social situation of the nationalization of oil industry are a plan appeared one obvious and rational necessity .England and America became afraid by expanding and deepening of sequal of national coup in Iran and infiltration of it in region particularly Egypt and Iraq , because they was severly afraid of endangering their interests in the middle east and for the reason of it were intended to make some limitations for this coup . one of political analysts (abrahamian) express that the oil companies of America hoped that nationalization of oil in Iran encounter failure .the nationalization of oil in Iran wasn't only effective on England interests but overshadow strategic interests of the united states and oil companies of America in the other countries , too.

Brief Looking at the evolutions and created processes during after the second world war , it can be found that the main actors at

international system have a strategic unity about Iran's national coup. These countries have determined their own political goals and strategic behavior in front of countries like Iran. Distribution of powers was also formed by one way at this period that made possible the cooperation of these countries with each other, at this time, were shaped cooperative hubs that their main goal was the limiting of new actors and finally, these powers intended to oppose the oil nationalization in the other countries specially Iran and disagreed with it.

On the other side, forming a one-multipolar system also make lateral behavioral limitations that resulted in many difficult for accessing of Iran to better situation and status. In such a way, at the one-multipolar system, the big powers don't easily allow to forming a national power. because at this system, international regularity is effect of cooperation and participation of big powers which have ability and power relatively equal, in addition of this regularity, this system is conservative, this means the big powers are satisfied with current regularity and situation and regards it as provider of own interests. At a result, it is natural that opposite with appearing of new powers that intend to change distribution pattern of power. For this reason, the important international actors (England, America, and soviet) are the opposite of accessing Iran to nuclear energy and disagree with it.

Situation panorama of Iran at twenty-year outlook program of Iran has been drawn as a politic and economic power in the region. We need to making a peaceful and confident environment on inside and making of trust and détente in international arena for reaching goals of this program. The prerequisite of détente and making of trust policy is realistic recognition of Iran's setting and role in the national field and international system. this recognition also don't access without awareness of the structure of international system. It must be accept that passage through meanness of west countries is a difficult task for accessing of Iran to nuclear knowledge. the bitter experience can and must be light of future course. The prevention of repetition of failure of oil nationalization movement demand to avoiding the repetition of past mistakes. and we must know that disunion in inside of the country and union at the international system is the cause of withdrawal and failure at the international big plays. As, disunion

at inside and union in and the system international was caused coup and all o Mosaddegh at the time of Mosaddegh government.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamian, Y. 2001. The nationalization of oil, coup, and distrust wall". Aftab magazine, 13 no.
- Abrahamian, Y. 2007. "Iran between two revolution". Translated by Golmohammadi Ahmad, Tehran: Ney Publisher.
- Ambarouz, A. 1984. Hegemonical process of the date of foreign policy of America". translated by Tabandeh Ahmad, Tehran: Akhgar publisher.
- Ahmadi, H. 1997. Structuralism in the theory of international relations from Walestain to Walter", the magazine of Law and politics sciences school, no. 37, summer.
- Akhavan zanjani, D. 1995. the structure of international society and national security", economic-political information, ninth year, no. 91-92.
- Azgandi, A. 1999. The foreign relations of Iran 1320-1357", Tehran: Ghoomes publisher.
- Estampale, D. 1999. inside of Iran revolution", translated by Shojaie Manoochehr, Tehran: Rasa publisher.
- Eslami, M. 1996. from government sovereignty to world governorship", The Quarterly of researches of United Nation, the first year, no. 1, Spring.
- Akbari, A. 2004. nuclear strength of Iran", Edition of Iran's nuclear file, moderation, and expansion, Esfand.
- Khoshandam, B. 2007. The management of Iran's nuclear crisis from stand of EU and choices of Islamic Republic of Iran", Disarming research, The first year no. 1 Spring.
- Khoshandam, B. 2008. EU approach about nuclear issue of Islamic Republic of Iran in the approach of big powers about nuclear issue of Iran", Tehran: the center of strategic research.

- Doerti , J .and Faltograph , R. 1995. "Contradictory theory in the international relations" , translated by Tayyeb Alireza, Tehran :ghoomes publisher .
- Dehshiri , M. 2007. "the comparative study of stands of the united states and England in front of Islamic Republic of Iran", Europe book , no. 5, Tehran: the cultural institute of modern Abrar .
- Zoghi , E. 2005. "political behavior of America in front of the movement of nationalization of oil industry of Iran", Tehran : Documents center and diplomacy history .
- Ghavam ,A. 2004. "The principle of foreign policy and international policy", Tehran :Samt publishers.
- Ghahramanpour , R. 2008. "America approach about nuclear program of Islamic Republic of Iran", in the big powers approach about nuclear issue of Iran , Tehran : the center of strategic researches .
- Klavson ,P. and Sokolosky , H. 2005. "Alertness for Iran on the threshold becoming nuclear", Did Digital library ,recycle code :bk00020063511561615 , at :www.did.ir
- Kozehgar kalchi , V. 2008. "looking at south ostia crisis and storming Russia to Georgia", political amd economic information , year 22 – no. 11 and 12 ,Mordad and Shahrivar.
- Larijani ,A. 2005. "Nuclear policy of Iran , challenges , and solutions ". Diplomatic citizen,no.76,Azar.
- The center of strategic researches. 2006. "nuclear diplomacy , 678 days crisis management ", Tehran :the center of strategic researches .
- Mosavi ,R. 2007. "Russia and perseverance of interests in the Middle East ", diplomatic citizen , no.18.
- Vaezi ,M. 2007. "Geopolitic crisis in central Asia and Caucasus", Tehran :The office of political and international researches .
- Alexander. Y and. Nanes. 1980. "A, the United States and Iran: A documentary History", Maryland: University Publications of America.
- Brzazainski, Zbigniew, 1997. "Gran Chess Board: American Dip;omacy and Its Geopolitical Implatve. Basic Book.
- Caws, Peter. 1991."Structuralism: New Art of the Intelligible, Humanities Press International, New Jersey and London, Accond Printing.
- Maloney, Suzanne. 2004. "Iran: Time for a new Approach, the Report of an Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, New York: Council of Foreign Relations Press.
- Waltz, Kenneh N. 2000. "Structural Realism after the cold war", International Security, Vol. No, 1, Summer.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. "Theory of International Polities; Mass Addison- wesley.
- Wikipedia. (2006). "Colition Against Iraq. At: http://en.Wikipedia.Org/wiki/u.sled_coalition_aginst.
- Wohlforth William C. 1999. "The Stability of a Unipolar World, International Security. Vol 24, No. 1, Summer.
- Woolf, Amy F. 2006. "U.S. Nuclear Weapons: Changes in Policy and Force Structure Congressional Research Service, Washington: Congressional Research Service, August.