

Iran's Geo-Politics: the Implications of American Hegemony in the Middle East

BODUNDE David Oluwafemi

Afe-Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti-State, Nigeria

Abstract: After the Second World War there was intense rivalry on the control of the Middle- East affairs among the superpowers. However, America through diplomacy and persistence in the spreading of democracy made Middle- East its axis of political and economic influence. America made the shah of Iran to have political influence with a view to understanding the political terrain of the middle- East and to use him as an experiment for democracy in order to sustaining its hegemonic stability. Ostensibly, the Iranian revolution and the Iran/Iraq war had two dimensional effects on Iranian geo-politics. One, the revolution promoted democracy, two, and it weakened the power of Iran from having strong foothold to oppose American hegemony. Unknowingly to America, Iran has taken the advantage of the diffused political tension in the Middle East with the assistance of Russian technology and China's economic relations to flex muscle with America. It may also be viewed that in the face of Iran democratic advantage, economic development, technological curiosity in the area of nuclear weapon and the Middle East political instability, the Iran geo-political strategic relevance is becoming a serious issue to American Middle East dominance. This paper therefore intends to examine whether Iran geopolitics constitutes threat to the American hegemony in the Middle East.

I. INTRODUCTION

Though in International Relations there is no permanent friend or enemy, the cordial relations of America and Iran before and what we are witnessing now attest to it that Iran had been in American axis of influence and showcasing America hegemony in the Middle- East. Iran also with Nathan 1998 American support was very powerful dictating its Islamic and political philosophy in the Middle- East. However, America cannot compromise its ideology of democracy for Islamic oligarchy and autocracy. Diplomacy later dominated the relations by America tactically edging Shah of Iran out of political usurpation of power by introducing democracy where power can be effectively distributed with human rights in place. Followed later, was Iran/Iraq war, an attempt by America to cause a stalemate between the warring factions to enable America deep democracy and western values into the Middle- East politics (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/covrtunitedforeignregimechangeaction>). But as America was trying to be clever, Iran had got its own share of advantage from democracy in the area of political awareness, national sovereignty, power sharing and the essence of geopolitics.

The new world order that America professes may persist if there is no fundamental challenge; but the situation in the

Middle- East had challenged the new world order by turning the gulf into political instability, race for geo-strategic relevance, deviance to international rules and norms on nuclear issue. Tribal and political rivalry between Sunni and Shia and disagreement to yield to American settlement on the perennial gulf conflicts. Various issues may have come to play for Iran geopolitical supremacy nurtured ambition; Iran may be interested in Islamic republic which will uphold the sanctity of Islam against all odds which may likely attract Persian imperialism. These issues have become almost a national preoccupation: the question of Iran, its interests, its policies, its influence, its programs and its challenge to the United States. Some people might argue that this preoccupation is simply a reflection of an enemy-deprivation syndrome on the part of Israel. It could also be seen that Iran has become such a preoccupation because its existence is threatening and its influence is a challenge to American hegemony in the Middle-East. For whatever reason, it is clear that Iran must be a centerpiece of American policy considering its frivolous geopolitical ambition.

The current political situation dictates that Iran is actually emerging as the pivot of Middle East politics, certainly on the east and as a natural rival to Israel. Iran is a non-Arab, non-Arabic-speaking country coming from a religious-minority position, being Shia instead of Sunni. So these two major parties are emerging as rivals for political influence in the region. Those traditional Sunni states such as Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia are feeling very left out of this process. Iran former ties with America against terrorism in the Middle East had paved way for Iran strategic advantage in the following ways: when the United States immediately after 9/11 went into Afghanistan and got rid of the Taliban and terminated its government, America failed to realize that Taliban were the worst enemy of Iran to the Middle-East. Coming to Iraq which had earlier involved in persistence war with Iran, America went and dismantle the regime of Sad am Hussein in Iraq, getting rid of the government which was clearly Iran's worst enemy to the west and had fought an eight-year war with Iran. Then to the installation of a Shia government in Baghdad for the first time in history.

Curiously enough, and it doesn't get any attention, Iran has actually been proceeding at an extraordinarily slow pace in this whole process by causing political stalemate in the gulf region, harassing American soldier and not supporting American aim of achieving regional peace. These are the sum total of American miscalculations which are now paving way

for Iran geopolitical strategic philosophy in the gulf which needs American imperative counter strategy.

II. CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Conceptualizing Geo-Politics

Geo-politics explains the influence of political geography with nations acquiring power within its geographical sphere of influence. It is also the power to harness what is made for expansion. Again, geopolitics is the way a country's size, position influence its power and relationship with other countries 'political activities as influenced by the physical features of a country or areas of the world (Strauz Hupe, 1942 and Venier, 2010), Geopolitics is the study of the effects of geography (human and physical) on politics and international relations. While geopolitics usually refers to countries and relations between them, it may also focus on two other kinds of states: de facto independent states with limited international recognition and; relations between sub-national geopolitical entities, such as the federated states that make up a federation, confederation or a quasi-federal system.

At the level of international relations, geopolitics is a method of studying foreign policy to understand, explain and predict international political behavior through geographical variables. These include area studies, climate, topography, demography, natural resources, and applied science of the region being evaluated. Geopolitics focuses on political power linked to geographic space. In particular, territorial waters and land territory in correlation with diplomatic history (Christopher, 2000). Again, geopolitics includes relations between the interests of international political actors and interests focused within an area, a space, or a geographical element; relations which create a geopolitical system. It also takes other factors into consideration such as: Advantageous geographical position. Serviceable coastlines, abundant natural resources, and favorable climate, extent of territory, population large enough to defend its territory. Society with an aptitude for the sea and commercial enterprise; and Government with the influence and inclination to dominate the sea.

However, critical geopolitics deconstructs classical geopolitical theories, by showing their political ideological functions for great powers. Christopher, (2000) and other researchers opined that the term is currently being used to describe a broad spectrum of concepts, in a general sense used as "a synonym for international political relations", but more specifically "to imply the global structure of such relations", which builds on "early-twentieth-century term for a pseudoscience of political geography" and other pseudoscientific theories of historical and geographic determinism. He further posited that oil and international competition over oil and gas resources was one of the main foci of the geopolitics literature from World War and onward. From about 2010, a new branch of the literature emerged,

focusing on international power relations related to renewable energy.

Despite the word order the influence of geo politics is becoming apolitical and international issues that are shaking the world politics. It also emphasizes the influence of territorial imperativeness and conflict among the major powers. However, the threat that geopolitics may likely pose to the dynamism of world politics has to be addressed (Alfred, 1920).

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Hegemonic stability Theory is an important aspect of international relations. Various schools of thought and theories have emerged in an attempt to better understand hegemonic actors and their influence. Scholars and other experts on the systemic school such as Thomas (1990) defined hegemony "as a single power's possession of 'simultaneous superior economic efficiency in production, trade and finance.'" Furthermore, a hegemon's superior position is considered the logical consequence of superior geography, technological innovation, ideology, superior resources, and other factors.]In order for a nation-state to rise to the level of hegemon, there are some attributes it must or is more advantageous to have. First of all, it must have political strength, military force, and superior national power that is necessary for its ability to forge new international laws and organizations. In terms of military force, a standing defensive army is not enough. A superior navy, or air force is. This explains why many hegemonies have been geographically situated on peninsulas or islands.

Pen insularity and insularity provide added security, and, where naval power is necessary, the ability to project military forces. In some cases, hegemonies have not been insular or peninsular. The United States of America, for instance, has become a virtual island. It has two massive seaboard, and its neighbors are strong allies, and relatively reliable. Also, the modern invention of nuclear weapons, and the presence of a superior air force provide highly reliable security for the country, setting it apart from the rest of the world (Terry and Mike, 1991). Secondly, a hegemon must have a large and growing economy. Usually, unrivaled supremacy in at least one leading economic or technological sector is necessary. The first and second refers to a state having the attribute of the capability to enforce the rules of the system. Thirdly, a hegemon must have will to lead, and the will to establish a hegemonic regime, as well as the capability to lead and enforce the rules of the system. Finally, a hegemon must commit to the system, which needs to be perceived as mutually beneficial for other great powers and important state-actors.

Mearsheimer (2001) outlines how the anarchic system that neorealist subscribe to creates power hungry states who will each attempt to install themselves as regional and global hegemonies. Fellow realists who argue that the hegemon supports the system so long as it is in their interests. The

system is created, shaped and maintained by coercion. The hegemon would begin to undermine the institution when it is not in their interests. With the decline of a hegemon, the system descends into instability. Other realists argue that the anarchic system does not actually give causal motivation to aid the creation of hegemons. Neoliberals argue that the hegemon wishes to maintain its dominant position without paying enforcement costs, so it creates a system in which it can credibly limit the returns to power (loser doesn't lose all) and credibly commit to neither dominate nor abandon them. This is done through institutions, which are sticky, hard to change, more convenient to continue using than to revamp. These institutions favor the hegemon, but provide protection and a stable world order for the rest of the world. The more open this world-order, the less likely that there will be a challenger.

With the decline of the hegemon, institutions don't automatically die, because they were constructed in a way that benefited all stakeholders; instead, they take on a life of their own. The classical liberal interpretation is motivated by 'enlightened self-interest; the hegemon takes on the costs because it is good for all actors thereby creating stability in the system which is also in the interests of all actors.(Snidal,1985).

The American And Iran Pre-Conflict Relationship: Diplomacy at play

Before the World Wars, Great Britain clearly dominated the Middle East affairs with mandate on Palestine and Iraq, a protectorate over Egypt, a crown colony in Cyprus with the assumed position in the area of the Persian Gulf and the Arab peninsula. The World War I opened a new era in the Middle East for one of the world great revolution. Ottoman Empire went through partition, Great Britain and France pressed their claims at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, Jews set forth their claim on Palestine, Armenia's and Kurds for independence state so also Arabs to independence and unity. After the World War I Iraq gained independence under Britain in 1930. The issue of Jewish national home in Palestine remained unresolved under British mandate and meanwhile Zionist pressures were concentrated on the United States which was thought would be the determining influence.

Because of the loss in the imperial role which Britain and France had sustained in the Middle East after the 2nd world war, the Middle East mandate fell on America. The two superpowers which emerged after World War II with basic interests in the Middle East which came into competition and possible confirmation were the United State and Soviet Union. Middle East undoubtedly became the central of power struggle between U.S and Russia because of the Middle East attraction of its geographical and strategic consideration. The issue of cold war between U.S and Russia transversed to the Middle East affairs. Russia failed to seek the control of the Middle East due to American strategic intelligence based on propaganda against communism and more also communism

was not suitable to people still living under semi feudal conditions. With intense intelligence and economic strategy U.S was able to break soviet communism and this ushered in U.S as the unipolar champion of the world politics with direct military domination within the region. American now continued the application of his strategic intelligence to dominate the Middle- East with the foreign policy strategy that was suitable to achieve total dominance.

This ushered in American hegemonic activities in the Middle-East after the Second World War in which America embarked on co-operative security in which it participated and perhaps led alliances and international organizations in order to reach its national security goals. Moreover, America had to apply its policy strategy of primacy which it used to outsmart Russia, France, Britain and Iran out of the political supremacy of the Middle- East. American primacy therefore holds that United States should pursue ultimate hegemony and dominate the Middle- East system, economically, politically with the advocacy of democracy and militarily effort to ward off any aggression and facilitate regime change. The foreign policy grand strategy was informed by the American political agendas in the Middle- East with Iran inclusive. The first U.S agenda in the Middle- East was the extermination of communism and Russia dominance. America had been increasingly skeptical about Russia and its communist ideology in the Middle- East with desperate effort of Soviet reformation.

America saw soviet reformation economically and politically in retaining its place as a Middle- East superpower as much dangerous to America. Next was the economic agenda to control the resources of Middle -East. Within the Middle -East axis America seriously cherished oil for their industrial consumption. Iraq, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia were blessed with oil. Therefore economy remained paramount to America in the Middle -East. Again American political role in the previous political affairs of Iran was a proactive effect in teaching Iran the philosophy of hegemony and political resistance against rival powers .Stretching from the North Africa, Afghanistan to the Middle- East presented complex series of problems that warranted America's Strategic policy and exercise of power primarily over the Gulf sheikdoms of Saudi Arabia and the Shah of Iran.

The Shah of Iran from 1953-1979 acted as pentagon C.I.A surrogate to police the region through political influence. However, Iraq was used to set up Iran to war in order to decrease the power potential of the Shah of Iran in which U.S provided military assistance to Iraq against Iran. Jervis (2010).The U.S intelligence supported the Shah of Iran for 25 years, selling him military equipment valued more than 20billion dollars between1972-1978 alone. The Shah had the brutal secret police called Savakis with the worst human rights records in the world. In 1953 the C.I.A worked with U.K to overthrow the elected government in Iran headed by Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadegh who had attempted to nationalize Iraq petroleum. A C.I.A sponsored coup was led

by C.I.A operative Kermit Roosevelt (Jr) (Grandson of President Theodore Roosevelt) with the help of British Intelligence, the C.I.A planned, founded and implanted operation Ajax. (Zbigniew, 1997)

The C.I.A made propaganda to create successful environment for the coup through Iranian provocateur by bombing homes and the press. The coup failed and the shah fled the country but with the help of shite the Shah returned. However the 1979 Iranian Revolution finally collapsed Ayatollah Khomeini's regime and finally set Iran into political stalemate in order to allow American further its diplomacy and hegemony in the Middle-East. It had made the C.I.A expanded their reach to other countries based on their record in Iran. The U.S also extended its close tie strategic intelligence with Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. It fully supported both governments despite the total absence of democratic institution and their pervasive human rights violations. In 2001 Bush government organized the C.I.A to undertake Black operation against Iran to topple its government. The black operation will involve propaganda, and dis information campaign to disrupt the economy, manipulate its currency and international transactions and the regime change doctrine was targeted on Iran and other.

The C.I.A had secret operation with Iran (PEJAK) Party for a Free Life in Kurdistan and People's Mujahedeen of Iran (PMOI) with a view to toppling the government. One of the ironies of the current political situation is that Iran is actually emerging as the pivot of Middle- East politics, certainly on the eastern side of what we think of as the Middle East, and as a natural rival to Israel. Iran is a non-Arab, non-Arabic-speaking country coming from a religious-minority position, being Shia instead of Sunni. So these two major parties are emerging as rivals for political influence in the region. Those traditional Sunni states such as Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia are feeling very left out of this process.

Iran ties with America to ward of terrorism in the Middle-East had later paved way for Iran strategic advantage in the following ways: when the United States immediately after 9/11 went into Afghanistan and got rid of the Taliban and terminated its government scarcely did America realize that it was paving way for Iran hegemony(Ikenberry,2002). Taliban, among other things, were the worst enemy of Iran to the east. Then, after the assignment, America turned around and went into Iraq, getting rid of the government of Saddam Hussein, which was clearly Iran's worst enemy to the west in which both entered into war for eight-years. After that, America influenced the installation of a Shia government in Baghdad for the first time in history (Covarubbias, 2015). Curiously enough, and it doesn't get any attention, Iran has actually been proceeding at an extraordinarily slow pace in this whole process by later seizing these strategic advantages, causing political stalemate in the gulf region, harassing American soldiers and not supporting American aim of achieving regional peace. These are favorable strategic dispositions

which America had set down for Iran geo political dominance in the Middle-East and to challenge American primacy.

Iran Geo-Political Bellicosity against American Hegemony: Factors Responsible Taking American Advantage

It is very important to consider the factors that responsible for Iran geo politics, areas of Iran threat to American hegemony and the possible implication for American geo political relevance in the Middle-East. In the America war against terrorism, Iran had unknowingly for the future advantage taking part in the episode by supporting America to topple the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. After the strength of Afghanistan had been weakened with the antecedent political instability, Iran now took it as a base to strengthen its power. Again, in the Iraq war, the Shia ascendancy in Baghdad was sized by Iran to influence the politics of the Iraq between the Shia and the Sunni. Moreover, the installation of democracy by America had further widened the knowledge of Iran on what it takes for a nation to acquire power, to exercise it and to sustain it against all odds.

Geo-Strategy Movement against America

Moreover, the influence of other powers which Iran is aligns with forms another formidable factor. Russia and China had gained political and economic preeminence in the Middle-East and become a factor to reckon with in backing Iran geo-politics in the Middle-East against American policy. Again, the weakening of other major contending powers such as Iraq, Afghanistan and Syria had made Iran intensify effort to see that those regions are ungovernable for America to its own advantage and geopolitical power. Furthermore, Iran is seriously strategizing for the Middle- East regional cooperation; its geostrategic philosophy is to tackle regional problem, insecurity and connectivity for economic growth. Again to deter threat by fighting ISIS in Iraq and Syria with military coalition with Russia. To further its geopolitics ambition within the ambit of Middle –East, Iran took a leading role in Geneva Peace Talk and Astana Process on Syrian crisis. Moreover, the United States foreign policy like that of other nations is shaped largely by geographical and historical considerations, by its political and social system, economic strength and military power. United State foreign policy is the sum total of the aspirations and reactions of the American people in relation to world affairs as they are channeled through the executive branch of the government and the congress. In the present dispensation, America foreign policy with the change of time in the Middle-East is un necessarily fluid and becoming a conscious decision of one man or of the one group of men. This can be seen from President Trump unilateral withdrawal from Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action(JCPOA) on ISIS and Iran nuclear weapons and follow his withdrawal from Syria thereby leaving the gulf for Iran and its foreign supporters to weaken its base in the for Iran usurpation of power. This may actually strengthen Iran geo politics which may later affect American hegemony if care is not taken(Yara et al,2018).

The Iran Perceived Threat

On Iran perceived threat to America and the Middle-East in general the political situation in the Middle-East calls for American concern on the threat issues pervaded in the region against America in particular on the various activities in the war torn areas of the Middle-East by Iran. America alleged that Iran has embarked on causing violence in Syria and Iraq through its Revolutionary Guard. Again, it continued to target American facilities in the Green Zone, U.S Embassy in Baghdad and its Consulate General. Another threat is Iran running a state within a state by forming parallel government with harassment of the American forces in the region for their influence in Iraq government (Gilpin, 1988). Presently, the greatest fundamental threat is Iran nuclear weapons project in defiance to American sanction and security council order. On the Iran geo politics and its implication for American may pose a serious concern to America foreign policy in the Middle East. Iran may cause political instability in order to make the axis ungovernable for America, the example of what is now manifesting in American withdrawal from Syria. Again, the battle line had been drawn giving way to constant face-off between America and Iran on who is to control the Middle-East affairs (Mohammad, 2018). Iran is seriously causing political instability in the region which may hinder the American economic interest. (Robert, 1987).

Again the possibility of Islamic republic in which Iran will be the leader may not be doubted if America decides to leave Middle-East faith for Iran to decide. The Zionist right to exist and Palestinian confrontation may likely shake the American foreign policy if Iran eventually succeeded in its regional cooperation move. Added to all these factors, it is undeniable that Iran is a threat to American Middle-East hegemony due to accusations leveled against Iran that is frustrating American effort to maintain peace by causing chaos in Syria and Iraq with its revolutionary Guard. Iran also targeting U.S facilities at Green zone, its embassy in Baghdad and Consulate General, running a state within a state with its paramount interest of supporting Shia oligarchy and harassing the American forces for their role in Iraq affairs. Another pre-eminent threat to U.S national security in the Middle-East also lies on economic influence which assumed a more intelligence role and activities to promote its success in countering rival international business such as China by securing a deal for American companies.

Iran is seriously causing political instability in the region which may hinder the American economic interest American government is seriously concerned on Iran effort in achieving its geo political ambition at the detriment of American primacy in the Middle-East from which America may convince that Iran with its geo-political rivalry may hinder the flow of oil in the Gulf of which may have adverse effect on American economy (Overland, 2015).

The Iran Nuclear Enterprise

Another recent fundamental issue is its nuclear weapons enterprise that is sending an unprecedented threat signal to American and Israel with the slogan on the missile 'DEATH OF ISRAEL'. Iran dangerous nuclear weapons enterprise, may no doubt lead to balance of terror between Iran and America and even Israel. It is also an advantage for Iran to exercise its power of terror militarily on the Middle-East nations that do not possess it. Another pre-eminent threat to U.S national security in the Middle-East also lies on economic influence which assumed a more intelligence role and activities to promote its success in countering rival international business such as China by securing a deal for American companies. At the same time Iran nuclear weapons is sending its fundamental hostility to America in its 'DEATH TO AMERICA' slogan. This may likely portend that American hegemony, the Middle-East support for its foreign policy philosophy, its culture and values are all dead in the Middle East affairs. This is the tragedy of great power politics as written by Mearsheimer (2001).

Surprisingly, American withdrawal in Syria may not be unconnected with Iranian activities with the support of its surrogates and external factor such as Russia but it is not the best for America considering Iran Middle-East imperialistic ambition and its hegemonic challenge against America and its foreign policy. Moving further, the promotion of the relationship of America with Israel in area of nuclear power, sharing intelligence and maintaining Israel's stability in Palestine with a view to achieving preeminence and dominance in the Middle-East has a far reaching effect on Iran strategy. These had also energized Iran to break the military and political superiority of Israel by embarking on nuclear weapons in order to make it strategically relevance for balance of power and terror.

Any Implication for American Hegemony?

There is no doubt that the present Middle-East crises has assumed a new dimension which may likely pave way for Iran attempt to assume geo political rivalry at the expense of political instability and the American changing position on its foreign policy towards the Middle-East affairs. Again, it may seem as if this will allow Iran to cause political stalemate, frustrate American move in resolving conflict in the region. The Iran ambition to install Shia oligarchy and establish Islamic republic may also be a no more hidden agenda. Moreover, its nuclear enterprise backed by Russia is a potent factor for balance of terror against America and Israel. Though the Middle-East axis continues to fear its move to unite the Arabs against the west especially America, there must be a serious move against this by America because of the consequence against Israel and American geopolitics in the Middle-East.

Furthermore, in considering the current Middle-East political issues and the power play between America and Iran such as: the influence of Russia and China in the political theatre, the unresolved issue of Iran nuclear weapons, unrestrained Iran

threat against American soldiers and diplomatic official and the unilateral withdrawal of American President Trump from the theatre of the conflict may also convince someone to come into conclusion that Iran is geo politically relevant and constitute a rivalry to the American hegemony in the Middle – East. In as much it may not be doubtful that Iran is politically relevant in the Middle-East, there may be disagreement that its activity or ambition can override American hegemony in the Middle –East. There are fragmentation of tribes in the Middle- East axis comprising of the Shia, Sunni and Kurdish with individuals looking searching for ways to achieve dominance and relevance. So, for Iran to successfully achieve this hegemony among all odds may be an impossible task. Again the Kurdistan agitation for its own independence in the Middle -East in which other nations count as threat to economic ,political and territorial impossibility on the excuse of altering the geographical boundary of the Middle -East region.

This is a factor of impediment and common front against Iran ambition to oust American hegemony. Moving further, the Iran foreign policy is at variance with other Middle -East nation’s policies especially with Afghanistan, Iraq, Yemen and Saudi Arabia. The foreign policy of every nation guides its sovereignty and to submit such to the hand of other rival nation for alliance solidarity against America may be difficult. Again, Iran came from the Shia minority and to now exercise its hegemony over majority and dominant tribes from the Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Yemen, Israel, Palestine and the agitating Kurdish is not far from doubt. It may be true that Iran is pursuing regional integration in its own agenda without hegemonic ambition but lack of mutual trust against such Iran ambition is paramount among the Arab’s nations which may not allow Iran hegemonic rival against America to materialize. Among the qualities of being a hegemon can be seen in; viable military capability, economic resources, ability to reward and sanction, political integrity highly respected and subjected to from the subjects; all these undoubtedly are possessed by America but which Iran is far away accomplishing.

Coming to the alliance which America had created with Israel, Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Egypt in area of economic, military and diplomatic relations to now break such American hegemony will take Iran much time, energy and efforts. As regard Iran nuclear weapons, it takes the combined effort of America and Israel to destroy the nuclear base and cause a regime change in Iran by coup d’état through intelligence provocateurs. It was done in Iran revolution that ousts Ayatollah Khomeini. Again nuclear weapons is an instrument for balance of terror and strategic relevance, it cannot be arbitrarily used by Iran against any nation because of the danger of mutual assured destruction and “Sore loser scenario” in which the gain of using it will be equal to the loss sustained .The new approach entails that Iran regional player has no the capacity of becoming a hegemonic power as the regional politics will not allow any player such a

possibility. Again, any of the regional players are incapable to win any game alone or impose their ideals on the regional political-security order.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this respect, Iran’s announced strategy for maintaining a genuine regional balance of power is defined as, enhancing “efficient states in a stronger region”, instead of becoming “the strongest state in a weak region.” From this perspective, being a “superior power”, in a weak region is neither an honor nor a real solution for solving the regional problems. Moreover, it’s ambition in becoming a powerful state in the region significantly relates to becoming a powerful country from inside, as well as the creation of a stabilized region’. It must be borne in mind therefore, that only a stabilized region, a competent government with increased domestic legitimacy with the possibility of becoming an ideal model country outside of national borders and absorbing the others’ respects is fit as a regional hegemon in which Iran has not got the credibility against America in the Middle -East.

REFERENCE

- [1] Alfred T M(1920) *The Problem of Asia and the Effects upon International Politics*, (Washington and London: Kennikat Press, 1920, p 25-27, 167-8, 172).
- [2] Christopher L G (2000) "The Geopolitical Image: Imperialism, Anarchism, and the Hypothesis of Culture in the Formation of Geopolitics", *Modernism/modernity*, Volume 5, Number 3, September 1998, pp. 49–70 et*The Fiction of Geopolitics: Afterimages of Culture*, from Wilkie Collins to Alfred Hitchcock. Stanford. Stanford University Press, 2000, pp. 35–36.
- [3] Covarubbias, J (2015) "The United States - Reluctant Sheriff or Potential Hegemon?". *American Diplomacy*. Retrieved 7 April 2015. Thomas J. McCormick.(1990) "World Systems," *Journal of American History* (June, 1990) 77, 128.
- [4] Gilpin, R (1988). "The Theory of Hegemonic War". *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*. 18 (4): 591–613. doi:10.2307/204816. ISSN 1530-9169. JSTOR 204816 – via JSTOR.
- [5] Gogwilt, C (2000). *The Fiction of Geopolitics*. Stanford University Press. p. 1. ISBN 978-0804737319. Retrieved 2016-02-24.
- [6] Ikenberry J (2002)*American Grand Strategy in the age of terror*(ed)DanaH.A(2001)*Survival*,the (IISS) the International Instituteforstrategicstudies vol43,nos4,winter2001 UK Oxford University Press.
- [7] JervisR,(2010)*Why Intelligence fail: lesson from Iranian revolution and Iraq war* ,Ithaca and London cornel university press
- [8] Mearsheimer, John, J.(2001)*The Tragedy of Great Power Politics'* W. W. Norton & Company, NYC 2001:1-366
- [9] Mohammad J Z,(2018) “Towards a new security model in the Middle East,” *The New Arab*, 20 March 2018, <https://www.alaraby.co.uk/english/comment/2018/3/21/towards-a-new-security-model-in-the-middle-east>
- [10] NathanM ,(1989)*Spying for America: “The history of US Intelligence”*, New York, Paragon House.
- [11] Overland, I (2015). "Future Petroleum Geopolitics: Consequences of Climate Policy and Unconventional Oil and Gas": 3517–3544. doi:10.1002/9781118991978.hces203 – via Researchgate.
- [12] Snidal, D. (1985). The limits of hegemonic stability theory. *International Organization*, 39, pp 579-614.
- [13] StrauzH ,(1942)*Geopolitics:The struggle for space and power”*,NewYork,G.P.Duttman sons
- [14] Terry B and Mike S(1991). *“Hegemony, Long Waves, and Major Wars: A Time Series Analysis of Systemic Dynamics, 1496-1967,”* *International Studies Quarterly* (1991) 35, 124.

- [15] Thomas J. M(1990)"World Systems," Journal of American History (June, 1990) 77, 128.
- [16] USAForeignRegimeChange(
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/covrtunitedforeignregimechangeaction>
).
- [17] Venier, P. (2010), "Main Theoretical Currents in Geopolitical Thought in the Twentieth Century", L'Espace Politique, vol. 12, no 3, 2010.
- [18] Yara B, Jonathan L and Warren S (2018) "Trump seeks to revive 'Arab NATO' to confront Iran, Reuters, July 27, 2018. See also: CJ Werlemen, "Trump's "Arab NATO" idea is doomed to fail," Middle East Eye, 8 August 2018.
- [19] Zbigniew B, (1997)."*The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*", Perseus Books, New York, p. 31.