

Americans what Role the United States Against the Islamic Republic of Iran

Hamidreza Kiasat¹, Hamed Mohagheghnia²

¹PhD Student in International Relations, Persian Gulf Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khorramshahr, Iran, ²Department of Political Science, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran

Abstract

This article analyzes the performance and policies of the United States of America in dealing with Islamic revolution of Iran from prior to the time of the revolution victory. In this regard, in the following of the formation and the emergence of the phenomenon of Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1978, the international community witnessed the wonder and flip in the minds of the great powers towards Iran. However, the Powers such as America as defenders and supporters of Pahlavi authoritarian system, despite factors such as leadership, extensive presence of people, ideology and dissatisfaction with the status quo, the Islamic Revolution finally came to fruition. Meanwhile is investigated the America's stance that from the beginning of the popular uprising, according to the faith in the power of the king not take it seriously and on the other hand insecurity of king of Soviet expansionism caused that established closer ties with America and even in 1966 to 1976 in the detention years that was vanished Iranian threat by the Soviet, was not reduced the king's desire to expand the economic and security ties with America. But in the years of financial capability of Iran's resulting from oil revenues increased to the necessity of closeness of the relationships with America. Shah foreign policy was unilaterally solidarity with the United States of America and America had chosen its ally in the region and supported him.

Key words: Revolution, The united states of america, Shah pahlavi

INTRODUCTION

Independent national policy (from the mid- 40s decade to 1978 revolution) which was considered the principles in fact, the principle of unity with the West was positive in nationalism, the difference was that, America's role was expanded in Iran. In other words, this policy was evolved stage of development from positive nationalism. United States of America that is one of the great powers in the twentieth century, seek hegemony in the region and in particular in Iran expanded its foreign policy to relations between the countries. America has always adopted a policy based collaboration survival against the Pahlavi regime. Meanwhile, United States of America with the formation of revolutionary in Iran to suppress this social phenomenon resorted to different strategies, eventually the

United States of America by observing the occurrence of the Islamic Revolution in 1978 based on Islamic- religion government, it made bipartisan conflict and ambiguity in their support of Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi. Finally, the United States of America reshaped its stance to union foreign policy and coalition politics of conflict and contradiction against Iran's Islamic Revolution.

REVOLUTION

To enter the present paper, first it is necessary to examine the meaning of the revolution; the word revolution have different definitions from scholars viewpoint, each of them is addressed to it in a certain type and Walter Liqueur in this regard writes that the most common concept of revolution means that trying to make a radical change in the system of government as well as new revolution means any fundamental change in the economy, culture and social context, this means that in every field of human behavior, but comprehensively can define the revolution as the revolutionary is a social phenomenon that leading to a fundamental change in the political, social and economic, cultural and ideological community in partnership with people with violence [1].

Access this article online



www.ijss-sn.com

Month of Submission : 06-2017
Month of Peer Review : 06-2017
Month of Acceptance : 07-2017
Month of Publishing : 07-2017

Corresponding Author: Hamed Mohagheghnia, Department of Political Science, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran.
E-mail: hrkiasar@yahoo.com

Causes and Affecting Factors in the Development of the Revolution

In the context of the Islamic Revolution analysis, several factors causing this situation, but if we want to summarize them in general categories, several factors play the most pivotal role. In general, the induction of the Islamic Revolution, we are facing with three pillars of leadership, ideology and people that revolutionary analysis should be based on these three pillars. In this sense, it should be stated that the nature of thought and Leader of Islamic Revolution focused in Shiite attitude framework.

Leadership

Leadership is one of the pillars of the Islamic Revolution development and involved as a coordinator and mobilization organizer and unity of the revolutionary forces. Social movement's theorists, have been divided leaders of the revolution into three categories.

- A) Intellectual leaders or ideologues
- B) The mobilization leadership or charismatic
- C) Policy making leadership or manager

Leadership may have one or two or all three of these characteristics. The ideal and evolved situation of leadership in the revolutions is sum of these two features in particular leader characteristic that more guarantees the integrity and durability of it in the consolidation phase as if the Imam Khomeini (RA) could also denounce the Pahlavi military organizations and explain the theory of velayat-e faqih and organize the mobilization of the masses against the monarchy and as a result, the ten-year period emerge in the form of leadership managers and policy makers and overcome the deep challenges ahead of the revolution, including war and make them into opportunities [2].

Iran's Islamic Revolution (1978)

Iran revolution of 1978 in February was performed with the participation of different categories of people, businessmen, political parties, intellectuals, students and Shia clergy in Iran against to the Pahlavi regime, and overthrown the country monarchy, and provided the area of the Islamic Republic, Islamic Shia cleric, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. Thoughts and Islamic figures, had a significant role in the anti-monarchy revolution and Imam Khomeini's called it with Islamic Revolution. This Revolution also knew by revolution of February 1978.

The period of leadership of Imam Khomeini (RA) can be divided into four different periods.

First period: Manifestation of Imam (Khomeini) as a political and religious leaders and obtained their acceptance by the people. This period began with the declaration against state and provincial forums law and peak of its

prosperity was in his famous speech on Ashura, Muharram and after it leads to the movement of 15 Khordad and Imam Khomeini was arrested and all of the riots finished with exile him to the Turkey.

Second period: consist of fifteen years of Fatrat period that finished it with the exile of Imam Khomeini to Turkey and with their departure from Najaf, in this period with the issuing statements and fatwas and doing presentations continued fighting with regime.

Third period: the leadership of Imam Khomeini, the revolution of mass protests in January 1978 to revolution victory.

Fourth period: Period in which revolutionary social and religious leaders as the head of government, had country's political responsibility that was the most critical and difficult period of the revolution and leadership. Imam Khomeini (Ra) during a year stabilization and strengthen the basis of Islamic system by multiple elections, including a referendum Islamic Republic, assembly of experts elections and Islamic consultative assembly, presidential elections and referendum on the constitution. Leadership in the revolution has several essential function that with no doubt the revolution will not happen without doing this specific task, the first special task was presentation and dissemination of ideology [3].

Another important task of leadership was compiling and presenting the ideology of the Revolution. Second, expression the domestic and international complex issues with simple words and well understandable and the third, guide the struggle and movement.

The Relations between Iran and America in the Second Period of the Cold War

Iran during the years 1953 to 1971 Hijri, was also affected by American policy about the Middle East and military and US economic and military assistance was implemented with more intensity than ones before it. The Iranian government had accepted America imperious attitude, and as a result of poor economic conditions of Iran, Iran's need for technical assistance and therefore Iran couldn't be indifferent to the recommendations of the Americans.

After Kennedy take over in America, he has been more openly intervened in Iran. One was the prime minister and others to carry out in land reform. Shah at the end of his reign stated that, that was the recommendation of Kennedy that issued a warrant prime minister of Ali Amini. However, the reason of Americans selection was implemented [4] reforms in Iran, more widespread corruption of Iran's ruling system. And in 1960 Hijri, the year that because

of corruption and economic failure and fraud in 20th parliamentary elections, and the Americans wanted to capture this explosion, adopted a policy of land reform to a person who hasless attributable to the royal family, to settle the situation. This action indicated that in the 50s decades, they had monitored the situation in Iran and developed in the country. After Amini take over, two leftist people and two people with national background entered into his cabinet and tried to look at measures to fight corruption and implement land reform. And because the king felt that if this trend continues, he could not have a place in government, and created situation for Amini to resign from his position. After Amin, Asadollah Alam became prime minister and implemented Shah Commands as the White Revolution, which led to opposition and uprising of 15 Khordad and its suppression.

From other Americans autocratic encounters after the reformation in Iran, put pressure on Iran to adoption of the law diplomatic immunity of American military advisors on 21 October 1964 Hijri, who later became famous as capitulation, this would have been a lot of opposition. One of the consequences of that speech of Imam Khomeini (Ra) was against the Shah and America in Qom and leading him to exile in Turkey. In addition, Prime Minister, Hassan Ali Mansour, who was a supporter of this plan, was assassinated by Islamic Coalition members. These events led to the political environment became critical, and this means awakening religious sentiments in society considered by Washington to the detriment of the US position on Iran. Documents show that the Iranian Foreign Ministry was alert about diplomatic immunity and knew the unreasonable law [5].

Relations between Iran and America in 1996 Hijri shamsi is different with the past decade because the increasing oil prices had raised the Iranian government power. 1973 oil crisis suddenly had along huge money for Iran. On the other hand, the requirements of Iran's national interests was presence in the Persian Gulf, because English forces left the Persian Gulf, on the other hand American government because of breaking in Vietnam did not presence direct military in different regions of the world. Therefore, in the interests of the king who wants to become a regional leader, required that America's profit reach a common point. According to Nixon doctrine, regional security had been entrusted to the friendly countries in that region.

Replacing the Iranian troops for Persian Gulf security instead of English and American forces, American was one of the objectives of this doctrine. Also increasing the oil prices, raised Iran's ability to buy weapons for increasing military strength, so Iran not only had no need to America loans, but also become the lender countries and economic

aid to the other countries on the region and America's friends. One of the things that Ardeshir Zahedi in his massive parties, was insisted on earning prestige in the past, Iran had donations from America, but now we can say with pride that, total international financial obligations of Iran to developed countries or developing countries as well as international organizations has over the 7/11 billion dollars [6].

On the other hand, due to the strategic needs of Iran to America, increasing the Iran's financial strength and from the requirements of military factories the requirement of military and civilian manufacturers of America to Iran as a good market, king was in a position that does not burden the behavior that imposed against Iranian government in 1961s decade from Americans, but introduces themselves as regional counterparts in the Middle East. On the other hand, Ardeshir Zahedi advertising and widespread influence in America placed him in an important position. With reference to the Zahedi ambassador reporting period can be said that holding an extravagant party in two or three times a week in embassy or various clubs with the aim of advancing the interests of Iran.

But unfortunately, we said that, Shah Policy was unrealistic and repressive policies and establish a system depends on the person of the king. In other words, relations between Iran and America in the last decade of the Shah was strongly influenced by personal and friendly relationships with American officials and influential people in American and because Shah had powerful illusion, in various media sometimes took Sovereign position towards America. But this illusion of power in addition to America can be observed in statements such as "toward the great civilization 'or in next year's Iran will become the fifth power of the world,'" [7].

In general, it can be said that relations between Iran and America between the Pahlavi regimes was very close and extensive. Regardless of economic cooperation at the state level, many authorities that were court depends on the creation of private companies and participation with the US to a wide range paid to the economic activities with the US. In the political context, Iran had been followed almost all positions of America at the regional and international scenes, in the cultural field even Pahlavi government policies in the field of secularization or archaism had been followed the researchers and scholars or research centers in America. King almost had numerous trips to America and the presence of the royal family members in cooperation with intelligence agencies specially to hold training courses for intelligence community experts or military security employees - all shows the permanent presence of America in Iran during this period.

The Confusion and Ambiguity of America's Policy toward the Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1978

As mentioned in the previous chapter, variety of factors occurrence the acceleration the Islamic Revolution, but the first sparks of the revolution flared up after the events of 1963 Hijri, when Ettela'at newspaper on 17 January 1977 Hijri was published insulting article against Imam Khomeini (Ra).

Protests and demonstrations of seminarians and Qom people against the publication of this paper on 9 January has been suppressed by the police. This event, was the beginning of the movement of Iranian Muslim people against domestic tyranny and foreign imperialism and its successive led to other events that got expanded to the uprising.

First, America by arguing that the king have control of the situation, were not expressed a clear stance towards events. However, America was not aware of the current situation in Iran. Sullivan, America's ambassador in Tehran, in the months of escalating crisis in Iran, namely July and August 1978 Hijri, in cold blood was on vacation. Secondly, as the evidence shows that, the reports that was prepared for the White House was quotes about events instead of interpretation and analysis of them [8].

In addition, CIA officials in Iran have been in contact with certain stratum of people (often wealthy people and people belonging to upper classes) and could not be aware of depth events. Above all, in the revolution of Iran, more Americans think about solving the Arab-Israeli issues and Sadat and Begin negotiations were at the David Camp. On the one hand, the US State Department official's being busy with new agreement of limiting strategic weapons "Salt 2" with the Soviet Union and at the other hand, new regulation of relations with China, Had been on the America's Foreign Ministry agenda [9].

The Iranian affairs were transferred to the second and third authority. In conclusion, despite the skepticism of some experts considered that the Tehran regime was in danger, CIA and Pentagon officials were too optimistic about the situation in Iran and the Shah's ability to overcome the crisis. The reports were prepared in the summer of 1978, the current crisis in Iran was considered temporary. CIA reported that: "Iran not only is not in terms of revolution, but also does not have the pre-revolutionary conditions." Another report from the American defense department, which was published beginning of 1978 Hijri, categorically predicted that Shah will in power at least another ten years.

Underestimate the importance and neglecting America to the internal situation in Iran, America has been adopted

an ambiguous policy towards the crisis. On the one hand, King felt increasingly isolated from reality and an inability to make decisions and he was used to accept the dictated policies of an America, and had frequently meetings with the ambassadors of America and the UK, constantly explicit stance demand from their Governments but they except generalization and verbal support from King, were not to offer practical solutions to him. King asked, just tell me what to Washington? And to answer these questions was very difficult for Sullivan. Because Washington had not the same answer to this question because people like Brzezinski was advocated of coercion and violence but some person adherent of restraint and patience.

This duality and ambiguity of the positions of the United States of America against the events, caused further serious crisis and has caused that the White House did not take it seriously and could not adopt a clear-cut stance toward it. But perhaps the most important factor in this situation, lack of understanding of the true nature of the Iranian people and the role of religion in it.

Increasing protests and riots and the inability of the Shah's regime in overcoming the crisis, caused that America's government began to take it seriously. On the other hand, Carter concern has been raised about developments and Brzezinski encourage to impressment, America would change their attitude towards the developments in Iran that it was obvious declaration of martial law in Tehran on 7 September 1978 and the killing of Muslims in the Jaleh square; That America's had an important role on it.

Hospitality Support of America from Shah during Islamic Revolution Current of Iran (1357 SH (Solar Hijri))

With creating crisis in Iran situation which was added to its domain every day, America did not see ambiguity and confusion permissible and it adopted and implemented its policy on the basis of comprehensive support of Mohammad Reza Shah and keep him on power throne that "formation of special committee to investigate Iran situation "and encouraging the king to declare martial law was one of the first symptoms.

During this period, all tries of America included overcoming the crisis by keeping the Shah in power and encouraging and stimulating him to deal decisively with the revolutionaries. Because America knew Shah as the most important component for protecting its benefits not only in Iran but also in the region. In addition, the America was worry about Iran developments trend and unknown future and saw Shah supporting as the most cost-effective way that he has been always the servant of America in the 25 last years [10].

American officials have repeatedly supported literally and virtually Shah and his actions for keeping his throne in various occasions. Therefore, America's policy in front of Iran developments in this period was maintaining of Shah and unconditional supporting of him. Also, in terms of regional point of view, Shah Collapse was not in favor of America.

Brzezinski believed that the Shah collapse in addition to other consequences will result in Iraq that has the support of the Soviet Union, will become a power of region.

On the other hand, the rest of America's allies in the region especially Arab leaders of the southern coast of Persian Gulf carefully attended America reactions to the Iran crisis and if America did not support Shah, they would in doubt sincere friendship of America and undoubtedly, it would finish to detriment of United States.

Continuation and expansion of objections, protests and strikes on the one hand and government inefficiency in suppressing dissenters and revolutionaries on the other hand, led to that America thought to other cures accompanied by Shah supporting policy. Such cures included offering negotiation with dissenters and privilege them and supporting independent acts of other militaries. By revealing disabilities of military government, Washington's concern increased about developments of Iran situation. Specially, Iranian knew America as Shah Supporter and Shah as America satellite [11].

From late of November, trips of political and military authorities and characters to Iran has started that each of them provided reports indicated Shah weakness and his disabilities to show intensive reaction and being futility of hopping to his regime vitality [12].

These reports indicated being unreal of previous reports, made "CIA" Carter angry. When Carter Stopped unconditional supporting of Shah in 16 Azar 1357 Sun Hijri (SH), first doubts to Shah surviving was found and Caret said: "We prefer that Shah Stays on power enthroned but Iranian people finally decide. In Day of 1357 SH, Shapoor Bakhtiar was appointed as minister.

create instability in country and prevent the victory of Islamic Revolution. Following of Shah exiting from Iran on 17 January 1978 SH, Carter supported Bakhtiar for establishment and maintenance of regularity and ordered to general HUYSER to support Bakhtiar. Brzezinski said: on January 19, commands were sent to Huyser and Sullivan contained following cases:

1. America's position has not changed and we will support Bakhtiar's effort for stability settlement within the legal framework;
2. Military Support is needed in this case and army must continue to support Bakhtiar.
3. To support the existing government, internal regularity and stability maintenance, protection Iran safety and deal with other problems that may arise in the future is necessary;
4. Position of Bakhtiar government make Army and non-Communist forces who protect principles laws co-working necessary.
5. Any attempt to expand Bakhtiar government should be toward to thinking direction of government to West and the unity of army [13].

Other plans and policies of america against islamic revolution

As mentioned before, first policy of United States that was on the basis of authoritatively and rigidity against dissenters through unconditional supporting of Mohammad Reza Shah, lost its effect in this period. More rigidity may have negative effect and results in internal war in Iran which in this case, America scared leftist groups who had organization and forms to take leadership in their hands and courses Soviet intrusions.

On the other hand, America rigidity against Iran developments was possible to result in direct military intrusion of this country in Iran that this was ruled out for two reasons: First, Brezhnev warning and possibility of Soviet intrusions found more dangerous dimension that might lead to direct confrontation of superpowers.

Second, memory of fruitless Vietnam War was not removed from the Americans minds and fear of another failure, did not allow military intervention to Americans. So America sought other plans against Iran developments. In the middle of this period, George Boole, former assistance of United States Deputy Secretary of State, was tasked with studying Iran situation and provide solutions. According to this plan that was supposed to staunchest fans of Imam Khomeini, elements of national front and Shah Fans participate in it, it was not accepted by Carter and knew it unpractical with some reasons. On the other hand, some political figures in United States demanded direct contact with America and communication between army and dissenters to quietly transfer power. One of these characters was Cyrus Vance, Secretary of State and another was Sullivan, America's ambassador to Iran.

This thought was presented in the form of Vance transitional government plan. According to this plan,

Shah should form a transitional government and leave the country and America supports this country in order to maintain regularity in Iran. But this plan had fate of George Ball plan and was not practical [14].

In parallel to presented plans and scenarios by the US authorities, America decided that a national unity government formed of moderate dissenters of regime comes to power. Therefore they decided to reinforce moderates against religious people. They tried in political dimension to magnify national front and people attributed to it and enclose Islamic movement in their aspirations. On the other hand, they tried to penetrate in some influential conservative figures in the religious and spiritual ties with the Shah to set them in front of Imam Khomeini and extremist religious people and create competition and balance among revolutionary forces. It must be reminded that trips plans of Shah to America were provided in Tehran and before his departure and Sullivan asked for announcing Shah Plans by America president and Shah left Iran to Aswan in Egypt on 16 January 1978 SH after appointed Bakhtiar and the Parliament.

Mohammad Reza Shah had hoped in his mind such as one day like 18 January 1953 SH, coup happens and he again return to Iran So by this dream, he first went to Morocco to stay near of Tran.

But the events happened the day after his escape and also decisive victory of the revolution disappointed not only him, but also all of these potential allies.

It was natural that this is the start of future hard days for the Shah of Iran and his associates. These days started with exit forcing of Malak Hasan to Shah and continued by announcing other countries to not be ready for accepting Shah.

As during days people of Iran were preparing for Islamic Republic establishment and while Brazil, Australia and even England officially announced that not let Mohammad Reza enter their country, the Shah of Iran in desperation and helplessness peak accompanied his family and associates went to Baja in Central America on 29 March 1979 SH.

CONCLUSION

This research sought to answer this question to examine the history of America's close relationship with Iran and why they could not stop Iran's Islamic Revolution and

what was the America's position against the revolution and before the answer first, should be noted that, America with the formation of the Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1978 Hijri, got confused and ambiguity of this country policy toward Iran during the Islamic Revolution in 1978. Underestimate the importance and neglecting America to the internal situation in Iran, America has been adopted an ambiguous policy towards the crisis.

On the one hand, King felt increasingly isolated from reality and an inability to make decisions and he was used to accept the dictated policies of an America, was caused the frequently meetings with the ambassadors of America and the UK, constantly explicit stance demand from their Governments but they except generalization and verbal support from King, were not to offer practical solutions to him. King asked, just tell me what to Washington? And to answer these questions was very difficult for Sullivan. Because Washington had not the same answer to this question because people like Brzezinski was advocated of coercion and violence but some person adherent of restraint and patience.

This duality and ambiguity of the positions of the United States of America against the events, caused further serious crisis and has caused that the White House did not take it seriously and could not adopt a clear-cut stance toward it.

The second position that America's have adopted for Islamic Revolution that: America's full support of king against the Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1978 Hijri.

With the crisis situation in Iran which steadily increased, America did not allow the ambiguity and confusion and had adopted and implemented its policy on the basis of comprehensive support of the Shah and keep him in power, forming a "special committee to investigate the situation in Iran" and Persuade the king to declare martial law was one of the first sign. During this period, America was trying to overcome the crisis by keeping the Shah in power and encouraged him to deal decisively with the revolutionaries. Thus, America's policy against developments in Iran, in this period was maintaining the king and unconditional support of him. In terms of regional, the fall of the Shah was not in favor of America.

Continuation and expansion of objections, protests and strikes on the one hand, and inefficiency in the government crackdown on dissidents and revolutionaries on the other hand, has led to America with policy of Shah, to think another way to prevent the crisis.

They offered to negotiate with the opposition and concession to them and other independent support of military action. At the time, the conference was holding on 14 January 1978 Hijri by presence heads of the four largest countries, namely the United States of America, Britain, France and Germany. This conference by the Zhyskardstn Valery initiative, French President, the British Prime Minister James Callaghan, Helmut Schmidt, chancellor of Germany and Jimmy Carter and Zbigniew Brzezinski, national security adviser and president of the United States was held in Guadeloupe in Caribbean sea.

Leaders of the four countries from the West were frightened to the empowerment of Communists pro-Soviet in Afghanistan and South Yemen and feared that the deteriorating situation in Iran has caused the rise of the pro-Soviet regime in the country and then the interests of the West seriously was threatened. Accordingly, the conference began on 14 January 1978. The situation in Iran, was the central debates of this conference and especially that on the eve of the conference, representatives from the governments of France, “ Michel Poniatowski “ United States of America “Jamizbal” Britain and Germany went to Iran, to be closely monitored the situation and were prepare the report in this field.

Lack of awareness about Iran crisis and incorrect analysis of its developments, was the most important features of the Carter administration. America’s intelligence agency - the CIA and the Defense Intelligence analysis - until the last moment being uninformed.

As mentioned, besides the misinformation and false analysis, bipartisan in America’s administration due to its inconsistent response to the developments in Iran.

America on the eve of the Islamic Revolution in Iran were trying its efforts to prevent the revolution to the extent that (Due to having good memories of the 28 August 1953 coup) once again, with some wishful thinking following the suppression of the Iranian people national aspirations by organizing a military coup. America’s National Security Council by sending General HUYSER again tried to organized coup like 28 August. But the waves of Islamic Revolution led to the America’s failure in this issue.

After the Islamic Revolution, was determined decisive moment for the America and for this same this government with new method, techniques, and even change the strategy followed return their past power and influence So by turning embassies into the US Spy Den and creating conspiracy against the new system and involved with the opponents of the revolution began its activities.

In one of the CIA documents that obtained of the America in Tehran Embassy pointed out that: “This revolution and its consequences destroyed our position, dispersed our people and turned our stable organization and methods to nothing.” In the following we are mentioned some of the most important of America’s hostile actions in the early years of the Islamic Revolution.

1. Canceling the arms deals.
2. Pressure on Iran through the UN Security Council and International Court of Justice in The Hague:

On 13 December 1979, fifteen members of the Security Council under pressure from America have published Resolution of No. 457 in Condemnation of America Embassy in Tehran.

Referral of the hostage issue to the International Court of Justice in The Hague was other actions of America against Iran. The Court also voted against Iran on 15 December and 15 judges of this court with votes condemned the Islamic Republic of Iran for America Embassy.

On 31 October 1979, UN Security Council under pressure of America approved the Resolution 461 on the issue of economic sanctions against Iran.

3. Support the so-called moderate groups.

Hypocrites from the first years after the revolution as part of the domestic mercenaries’of America in Iran with guidance by the Americans to start armed struggle against the Islamic Republic of Iran. These mercenaries in addition to the bombing of different cities and the assassination of government officials and ordinary people in the streets, during the war was an enemy fifth columns, and collected all kinds of military, political, economic and social information within the country and placed in the hands of America and Iraq and Instead of this has been received money and facilities from “CIA”.

REFERENCES

1. Arendt, H. (1995). *Revolution*, translation of Ezatollah Foadvand, Chapar publication, Tehran.
2. Eivazi, M.R (2009). *Iran’s Islamic Revolution and its origins*, Third Edition, PNU publication, the Office of Publication, Tehran.
3. Faraghi, Abdul Wahhab (1999), “Introduction on the roots of the Islamic Revolution in IT articles”, publication of representatives institute of the Supreme leader in Tehran University.
4. Lajvardi, H, (2004),” *Memories of Dr. Ali Amini*”, first edit, Tehran.
5. Mohamadi, M, (1998), “*Analysis of the Islamic Revolution*”, third edition, Amir Kabir Publications of Tehran.
6. Velayati, AA, (2005),”*A century of relation between Iran and America in the past century and the effect of world evolutions on this relation*”, first edit, publications of Tehran’s Young Thought Center.
7. Velayati, AA, (2005),”*A century of relation between Iran and America in the past century and the effect of world evolutions on this relation*”, first edit, publications of Tehran’s Young Thought Center.
8. Rubin, B. (1984). *The power struggle in Iran*, translated by Mahmoud Mushrefi, Ashtiani Publication, first edition, Tehran.

9. Rubin, B. (1984). The power struggle in Iran, translated by Mahmoud Mushrefi, Ashtiani Publication, first edition, Tehran.
10. Shawcross, W. (1990). The last trip of the Shah, translated by Abdolreza Houshang Mahdavi, first edition, Alborz publication, Tehran.
11. Zhyskardstn, V. (1989). Power and Life: Memoirs of a President, translation of Mahmoud Toloei, Peik-e-Tarjome-va nashr Publication, Tehran.
12. Bakhshayeshi Ardestani, A. (2000). The principles of the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran, second edition, Avay-e- noor publication, Tehran.
13. Kadivar, J. (1993). Dream Islamic Revolution of Iran and America, Etelaat publication, Tehran.
14. Hashemi Rafsanjani, A.A (2004). Records and memories of the 1978 and 1979 and victory of the revolution, Education revolution department Publications, Tehran.

How to cite this article: Kiasat H, Mohagheghnia H. Americans what Role the United States Against the Islamic Republic of Iran. Int J Sci Stud 2017;5(4):74-81.

Source of Support: Nil, **Conflict of Interest:** None declared.