

INVESTIGATING THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF IRAN IN 1953 TO 1978

H. Sohrabi^{1*}, A. Mollaali², F. Askaritybi³

^{1,2}Social Determinants of Health Research Center, Yasuj University of Medical Sciences, Yasuj, Iran

³Teacher Training Department of Boyerahmad County, Yasuj, Iran

Published online: 01 January 2018

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of the United States in internal developments in Iran through a descriptive and analytical method based on the theoretical framework of Wallerstein's global system theory and Imam Khomeini's anti-Semitism theory. According to the theory of these two United States authorities during the years before the Islamic Revolution, during the period from 1953 to 1978, the real case of colonialism and the role of the center of the country has been in the exploitation of the surrounding countries, including Iran.

Based on the findings of this research, the post-coup period of 19 August 1953 to 11 February 1979 is one of the most important historical stages in Iran's foreign policy, in which foreign policy has changed in complete turning from a negative balance to dependence and subjugation. At this point in time, the United States' behavioral pattern in Iran's internal affairs was a comprehensive interventionist intervention in support of the Pahlavi regime.

Author Correspondence, e-mail: dr.sohrabi1393@gmail.com

doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jfas.v10i1.26>



This interventionist pattern, through strategies that strengthened the puppet regime in Iran, included the support and support of the coup d'état of August 19, the imposition of military coup d'état by Ardeshir Zahedi, the return of the Shah to the country after the coup, the suppression of the Shah's regime against groups and popular parties, Supporting the Western-style reforms in the name of the White Revolution, suppressing the June 5 uprising, and the power of the Bakhtiar civilian government and the possible order for a bloody coup during the fall of Bakhtiar. The Islamic Revolution of Iran, based on the theory of Imam Khomeini's anti-Semitism as the most important internal change in Iran and the world, has contributed to the collapse of the US regime in Iran, with religious teachings. Imam Khomeini, in light of the success of this pattern, advocates the oppressors of the world to follow it.

Key Words: USA, Islamic Revolution, World Arrogance

INTRODUCTION

After the 19 August 1953 coup and the arrival of Fazlullah Zahedi as prime minister, intentional changes took place in Iran's foreign policy; the negative balance of policy of Dr. Mossadegh was forgotten, and Iran once again faced the competition of foreign powers for multiple concessions the peak was observed in the consortium contract. The 19 August coup is almost the beginning of a public opening of the United States to Iran as an interfering power that will eventually take Britain's place in Iran and become a decisive and effective force in Iran's foreign policy. From this period onwards, the study of Iran's foreign relations is not possible without mentioning the role of the United States. Another feature of Iran's foreign policy during this period is that Iran's foreign policy after the collapse of the government of Dr. Mosaddeq is a monopoly in the hands of the Shah, and the king dominates the Foreign Ministry and is more in line with the intentions and ambitions of the Americans has it.

The most important issue that occurred at this time for the Pahlavi government after the 19 August 1953 coup was the lack of legitimacy of Mohammad Reza Shah's government after the coup and returning to power. The lack of internal legitimacy of the Shah of Iran had led to foreign aid to compensate for it. The Shah chose the path to salvation as a powerful foreign sponsor, most of who came to the third world dictatorship, among which the support of the king for himself and his government was the United States government.

What is considered in terms of the nature of the subject in this study was the role of US policy towards Iran and the transformation of Shah's regime into a sovereign state and the struggle and suppression of social and popular movements. In fact, the work of this study is to show that such a strong support and comprehensive support not only did not bring political legitimacy to the coup d'état and authoritarian government of Mohammad Reza Shah, but also led to the degeneration of the legitimacy of the Pahlavi regime. The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of the United States in the internal developments of Iran and use the theoretical framework of the theory of the world system of Wallerstein and Imam Khomeini's anti-Semitism theory by descriptive and analytical method, seeking to answer the question of what the United States did during the years 1953 to 1978. Has there been an approach to internal developments in Iran?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF RESEARCH

The theoretical framework of this research is a combination of Imam Khomeini's theory of the global system and the theory of the moon and around Immanuel Wallerstein with an emphasis on Imam Khomeini's anti-Semitism theory. In Wallerstein's view, a slaughtering system in the west of the sixteenth century was formed, gradually integrating the entire world into the nineteenth century. This system is divided into three parts based on a division of unity and unity of work: the center, the periphery and the half-periphery. According to Wallerstein, the countries of the mid-periphery are exploited and exploit the periphery and center of the periphery (Saei '36- 37 , 2000). In his view, the outrageous political structure governing international relations is the foundation of competition for the capitalist system (Wallerstein, 1967: 21).

Also, the discussion of arrogance and suppression is one of Imam Khomeini's emphasis on the world system. He believes that the wealth and power of the mercenaries are due to the plunder of the property of the impoverished, and until the rebellious powers of the world fail, it is impossible for humans to achieve the peace, inheritance of the earth and achieve their divine rights. This theory has many similarities with the theory of the moon and around Wallerstein. Wallerstein argued about the periphery and the periphery and the center.

The Imam considered the example of arrogance in the era of the United States government. Imam Khomeini considered the Imperial government to be a military, dependent on foreign and arrogant powers, and at the head of them the United States of America, and he struggled with

colonial domination, because he believed that Islam was the victim of the dependence of the Islamic society on alien power. Imam Khomeini's emphasis on independence and interruption of the roots of affiliation expresses the anti-colonial and dominant nature of the Islamic Movement of Iran. He considered the cause of the collapse of the Pahlavi regime not to rely on the power of the nation and on reliance on foreigners, and he had struggled with the kingdom of the king to allow foreigners and foreign colonial agents to interfere in the internal affairs of the Islamic state, To degenerate, and to plunder the human and material capital of the country (Sahifeh Imam, 1994: 178-177).

Imam says about this feature: "America, which is the enemy of all religions, even Christianity, does not have a religion at all and does not want its own interests, even the interests of Americans; it wants the interests of the American government" (Sahifeh Imam, 1995: 194).

Imam says: "They want to take our tanks; they want us to destroy everything and keep us in a backward and poor state. What can u do they have learned that they have to separate these "(Sahifeh Imam, 1999: 252). In the view of Imam this goal, the goal today is not global arrogance, but since many years ago, this goal has been the goal of arrogance. In this context, he says:

Our infection is based on it and it is not an infectious one that we have just found. It has a very old history, from which when they arrived to Iran, to the east, and studied in the east, then they realized that A fat snake is East, with tanks and mines, and they have to take this to whatever it is and do not allow its people to use it (Sahifeh Imam, 1999: 182-181). In this regard, "Mark C. Gazirovsky, while emphasizing the relationship between the Pahlavi regime and the United States and the close ties between the CIA and SAVAK, condemns it as a major factor in the legitimacy of the government, and believes that the Islamic Revolution of Iran, while confronting American domination, has removed one of the United States provided major allies in the Middle East (Gazirovsky, 1992: 346).

In a summing-up view, these two leaders are opposed to the growth of deprived and deprived countries. This feature can also be considered as their goal and strategy. The most important weapon of the superpower is the neglect and ignorance of the people. If people in the Third World are well aware of the loss of their interests and reserves, and their intellectual, scientific and industrial growth is accompanied by enthusiasm, they will not remain a way to plunder their

interests, and hence disconnecting from the most important solutions to this dependence. It is believed that they are at the head of the overthrow of arrogant states.

HISTORY OF IRAN-US RELATIONS

The beginning of the Cold War was accompanied by the emergence of two major US and Soviet world powers. The Second World War outraged the United States for centuries of isolationism. A series of events intensified the political and ideological differences between the two powers, creating a climate of suspicion and horror, dating back to 1947, known as the Cold War era. The cold war was a period of savagery, ruthlessness, and expressions of arrogant ideas. The jihad between the two modes of capitalism and communism was in fact a competition and competition in expanding power and influence in the world between the United States and the Soviet Union. Unlike international obligations, after the end of the Second World War, the Soviet military forces refused to evacuate Iranian soil and set up a puppet government in Azerbaijan in order to create a puppet government. Finally, due to the pressure of global thoughts and the policies of Truman's persistence and aggression, Russian forces they were forced to evacuate Iran. At that time, Truman was president of the United States. Truman expresses his concern about the actions of Russia in Azerbaijan, which he believed was practical and in order to dominate the northern part of Iran. He said, "If we look at this move, which is simultaneously threatening the communist coup in Greece, we will see a massive assault on the oil-rich Middle East and Mediterranean seaports." (George Lanjafsky, 1994: 11), Since then, US foreign policy has been focusing on the importance of Iran and the fear of rival dominance over Iran's oil-rich resources. Like other international powers, the United States has stepped in to seek out the Persian Gulf facilities, especially its oil.

The first US commercial and maritime contract in the region was signed with Oman in 1832, and the discovery of oil in Bahrain led to American influence in the Persian Gulf region. Following Bahrain's oil loan, since 1932, relations between the United States and Bahrain began, and after that, following the discovery of oil in the Saudi hills, the American companies were opened to the region and the Aramco Oil Company to explore, produce and Saudi oil was exported. The Arab-American oil company Aramco is comprised of four oilfields of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, Standard Oil Company of California, Texaco and Exxon Mobil. Then, in 1934, American companies acquired the Kuwaiti oil franchise, and in 1954, after the Iranian coup on 19

August 1953, they also won the Iranian oil concession with the formation of a consortium (Yergin, 1997: 697). In this period, Truman's doctrine is "an ideological struggle with communism." With the resignation of its responsibilities in Greece and Turkey, the United Kingdom handed over the leadership of the Western world to the United States.

Truman undertook this doctrine, the fight against communism and for the sake of strengthening military power. All units of the military, including land, air and navy, were concentrated in the Pentagon's Defense Department. The national security advisers came under the direct supervision of the presidency, the CIA's spy machine was established. In 1949, Truman began his four-time program to accelerate US technical and financial assistance to the newly developed regions of the world. Under this program, experts and experts in the fields of agriculture, culture, public health, housing, and many other areas for assistance Technical staffed in various countries across Asia-Africa and Latin America. Marshall's plan to help the war-torn Europe in improving economic conditions, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) with Europe, all of these organizations and programs to support politics. A definite foreigner who was called the Cold War and to confront the Soviet Union D was (Nooraee, 1971: 128-126). After World War II, US aid to countries that plan was made based on the Marshall Plan in the development of American influence played a leading role in the region. And on this basis, the long-term domination of the United States in the region was provided.

Eisenhower's policy that the United States is committed to helping the Middle Eastern countries threaten the Soviet Union unconditionally leads to more American and Saudi relations, and in 1957, US military aid came to Saudi Arabia worth \$ 180 million. Also, in 1947, he sold some weapons to Iran and sent a number of advisers to strengthen the Iranian police. Iran and Saudi Arabia were considered by Iran as two pillars of the regional strategy of the United States, and the responsibility for security was the responsibility of Iran and, secondly, was the responsibility of Saudi Arabia, and there was a joint effort among them, in addition to the initiative of the United States and the countries of Turkey, Iran and Pakistan formed a security belt on the southern border of the Soviet Union under the name "Sento" within the framework of the Soviet blocking barrier, and assistance was provided by the United States (Hafezinia, 2003: 104).

During the Eisenhower presidency, which lasted from 1953 to 1961, the issue of the Middle East continued to dominate the thoughts of his president and his main advisers. It has been shown that some general issues are of a permanent nature and require constant care, in particular: the risk of

Soviet influence The Middle East, the security of oil reserves, and the tensions between the Arabs and the Israelis. The Eisenhower government must confront these concerns with four separate events in the Middle East. The oil crisis in Iran, the Suez crisis, which led to the second Arab-Israeli war. The Civil War and the Revolution in Iraq A concern worried about the threat of an international communist force forced the US president to take over the leadership of Baghdad's pact.

In addition, the choice of Eisenhower coincided with the work of Jamal Abdul Nasser, who not only led Egypt to a revolutionary socialism, but created a powerful pan-Arab movement that involved the entire Arab world and its relations with the superpowers of the work Forgive The oil crisis in Iran ended with a coup against Mosaddeq, which, according to the Americans, provided a platform for Soviet influence, (George Lenczowski, 1994: 45-44). One of Eisenhower's Middle East policy features was that, regardless of the sources of the Middle East crisis, he evaluated each one in the light of Soviet-American relations. He, as the former military commander, deeply believed that the Middle East had overestimated strategic value for The West, and considered any move of the Soviet Union to expand its influence in the region as a further step in the Soviet expansion, which was identified with the capture of Eastern Europe and Asia.

US STRATEGY IN IRAN IN 1953-1977

One of the fundamental issues after World War II was the spread of communism and the communist and communist groups in the Asian and African countries, which became a major issue for the capitalist world, especially the United States. The two major political parties, Republicans and Democrats, pursued their own policies to fight the spread of communism. The strategy of the Democratic Party was that nationalist and nationalist parties are serious obstacles to the rise of communism in the Third World. For this reason, their policy was to strengthen nationalist governments in these countries. But the republicans believed that nationalist parties were largely good for the sake of gaining communists.

Accordingly, the tendency of the party in the most influential countries of the United States has been towards the formation of dictators and non-national and non-democratic governments. In the relations between the United States and England, and after the Republicans in the United States, the British have been able to draw the attention of the new Republican government, led by General Eisenhower, to restoring the dictatorship in Iran, in an exponential tribute to the "danger

of communism." Coming: Winston Churchill, who at the time of his wartime ministry led to the coup of 1299 and the rise of Reza Khan to power. At the same time as the American Communist Movement (McCarthyism) and Stalin's death in the Soviet Union, the international conditions required for a coup against Dr. Mosaddeq And the national movement was provided, because the new administration of the United States, the government of Mossadegh, set the stage for the climb of the Commune "(Amini, 1998: 71). That's why General Eisenhower and his secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, and CIA director Alain Dulles, responded favorably to the UK's plan to carry out the coup, and the preparations for its implementation In Iran.

With the triumph of the coalition of domestic and foreign coups, the most important US strategies in the post-coup d'état of 19 August 1953 would be:

1. The equipping of Iran alongside the penetration barrier against the spread of communism and the expansion of the Soviet Union
2. Obtaining oil rewards for American companies in Iran
3. Development and development of trade and trade relations with Iran

That is why the United States to achieve these goals, not only have a strong foothold in Iran creates, but, inevitably seeks out the competitors of his time, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union was. (Mohammadi, 1998: 37-36) After the August 28 coup, the United States decided to turn Iran into its base of power in the region. The total amount of US aid to Iran in the years 1953 to 1959 is estimated at about \$ 900 million, about \$ 700 million worth of grants. Undoubtedly, the United States aim was to integrate Iran's economic system into the global economic system and turn it into a lucrative account. (Naghizadeh, 2004: 206-205). The importance of SAVAK was from the American point of view because of two important points:

1. Neighborhood of Iran with the Soviet Union, which was the main rival of the United States in the region.
2. Preservation and consolidation of American influence in Iran (Velayati, 2009: 117).

With the increasing presence of Americans and their military advisers in Iran, the administration of Hasan Ali Mansour, while presenting a bill to the National Assembly, previously approved and approved by the government of the government, appealed to the American advisers and military personnel and their servants for immunity. At the Midnight Meeting of 21 October 1964, the National Assembly passed the bill quietly and threatening the deputies. Following the passage of the bill, the United States approved a \$ 200 million loan to Iran to buy weapons. In this situation,

Imam Khomeini, who was arrested by a member of the Secretariat of Parliament during the adoption of the bill of Capitol on November 4, 1343, in a very spectacular speech, which, according to a revolutionary American scholar, The most recent political commentary of Iran over the last 100 years, he strongly attacked the United States, Israel and the Shah. (Velayati, 2009: 134).

The internal conditions of Iran and its position in the global system were such that, on the one hand, they tried to obtain the satisfaction of the leader of the capitalist polemic, the United States, and on the other hand, for this satisfaction, they had to pay the costs Extensive, both material and immaterial. For example, the passage of the capitol directly affects the legitimacy and preservation of the regime's independence, and the huge costs and resources of military space, armament and maneuvers, and regional operations, all in line with the goals and recommendations of the United States, It has been damaging to the economy, industry and other sectors of society. Of course, these injuries, on the other hand, affected the distribution and distribution of incomes, which resulted in discrimination and non-compliance with justice by government agents. Most importantly, the United States has neglected a fundamental problem; it is that no nation can easily accept the dependence and loss of its sovereignty.

On July 24, 1969, on his trip to the Philippines on Guam Island, Richard Nixon announced his doctrine that the United States retained its regional interests by using its regional friends and allies without direct participation. And will provide. After the complete withdrawal of English troops from the Persian Gulf at the end of December 1971, a new regional security arrangement called "friendship politics" was established with the direct participation of Iran and Saudi Arabia. (Asadi, 2009: 357).

According to the friendship politics, Iran could act as a military pillar, in other words, as a gendarme or policeman of the region, and Saudi Arabia was a pillar of finance and support. Here, it can be said that the US policy, in addition to an ambitious ambition beyond the logic of Mohammad Reza Shah, made it possible for the Shah of Iran to focus on the wider place than focusing on domestic conditions and organizing domestic demands. While, if such a huge cost to Iran's military equipment was to meet the domestic needs of the country as well as to cope with the protest forces of the country, it would have been far more beneficial to the government of Iran and even the United States in the long run, By focusing on Iran's stability, not its regional interests, the United States could continue to benefit from Iran's market and oil, and also benefit

from its regional allies in regional developments. Although the Revolution in Iran was unavoidable due to the origin of the coup d'état of the Pahlavi state. Mohammad Reza Shah asked three things from the United States in view of the magnanimity he saw in himself and the Iranian government:

1. The CIA will help him to help the Kurds in their long-standing uprising against Iraq.
2. The United States sends him a large number of technical and military experts.
3. And most importantly, he can not only be armed, but also a non-limited right to buy any advanced weapons that were in the US arsenal. (Shawcross, 1997: 203).

The lack of real understanding of the Shah and the United States from Iranian society, and the situation, in which Iran was located, pushed Iran toward militarization. In other words, although the Soviet Union in northern Iran was a potential threat, it was not the first priority of government programs. Indeed, some of Nixon's suggestions, encouraging and supporting Mohammad Reza Shah's suppression of domestic opposition, showed that the real socio-political situation in Iran was not understood and understood. It may be argued that the Shah and the United States had forgotten the Constitutional Revolution and its origins.

In January 1963, the Shah proposed a widespread reform program called the White Revolution, and passed its general approval to a national referendum. Initially, the White Revolution included six major initiatives: the extension of the land reform program, the program of employee participation in profits, the nationalization of forests and pastures, the sale of government-owned stocks, the granting of women's right to vote and the creation of the knowledge corps. Other initiatives were also added afterwards, including the Health Corps, the Revolutionary Guard Corps, the Anti-Extremism campaign, the nationalization of water resources, and the provision of free public education. Although the White Revolution was routinely scandalized by critics of the Shah, it had a significant impact on the standards of life of many Iranians. The most important aspect of this was the land reform program, which officially ended in September 1971 and owned half of the Iranian peasants (Gaziorsky, 1992: 310).

But nevertheless, the White Revolution has had different consequences that, before addressing them, it should be noted that what is evident in these reforms is the attempt of the Shah to make the Iranian community of Western democracy. He introduced some standards of liberal democratic societies, such as granting women the right to vote and providing educational facilities, to all Iranian people wherever they were, while at the head of this political system, the

king It was supposed that all the power of the country and the decisions of the state were summarized in itself. In fact, despite this personal power and its supremacy over other social forces, the right to vote was given to women, and what was not given, did not affect the political process of the country, but the effect of these reforms in society, the opposition was clerical and traditional middle class.

The white revolution had various consequences, but left three very important long-term consequences for Iranian politics: first, it greatly enhanced the state's abilities and made the king make the image of a progressive leader, and this the arrangement will weaken popular support for the opposition. Especially in the 1960s and 1970s, when land reform programs were still in progress, and by crushing more agricultural real estate, almost all the landlords in Iran were eliminated, and in this way, they essentially destroyed the traditional high class. It is true that the land reform led to the collapse of the master-land system and the peasantry to get rid of the lords, but the lack of lords and organizations of mastery was filled with bourgeois lords and government agencies and agencies (Azghandi, 2010: 191). Secondly, the Land Reform Program, coupled with the rapid economic growth of Iran, forced many Iranian peasants to move to urban areas, which led to the swelling of low urban classifications. Thirdly, the clergy advocating against the law on women and land reform, increased their opposition to the Shah and, with the help of the people, held a large public demonstration in Qom, whereby the right to vote Women canceled. What is striking is that the announcement of the White Revolution in January 1963, and the holding of a referendum to legitimize it, even provoked more opposition. (Gaziorsky, 1992: 311). Therefore, the US intervention and the greater dependence of the Pahlavi regime caused mass mobilization and the gradual loss of legitimacy of the regime among social groups.

US STRATEGY IN IRAN IN 1977-1978

Carter's victory in the US election brought a period of uncertainty and uncertainty in the relationship between Iran and the United States. One of the concerns of the Shah was about a new position, which was likely to emerge from the general strategy of Washington toward communism, since Carter was not too concerned about the Soviet movement in Africa, Cuba, Afghanistan and elsewhere (Zibakalam, 2009, 188). In April 1977, when the conference of the Council of Ministers of Sento in Tehran was convened, US Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, in a private meeting with the Shah, urged him to moderate the regime of dictatorship and respect for

human rights, instead of buying it. He had plenty of weapons and ammunition and put him in a hole to fulfill their demands (Houshang Mahdavi, 1989, 290). Jimmy Carter, in general, has identified his positions in three important issues, which can be considered as a doctrine that is manifestly contradictory at the strategic level:

1. The explicit and loyal commitment of the United States to any military response in any way necessary, from any Soviet attempt to present geopolitics in the world.
2. Emphasis on human rights, political open space, civil liberties and pressure on communist governments, especially in Eastern Europe, to respect them.
3. Promotion of reformist activities aimed at preserving United States dictatorial governments, such as the Shah's regime and preventing their collapse. (Vaezi, 2002: 76-75).

In general, Carter's policy in the first year and the first half of his presidency was confusing the Shah. As he could no longer America allies know that we can rely on him, and for the first time, after twenty-five years, was forced this fact into account, the supporters of the American form of government the authoritarian regime He prefers. Meanwhile, Ayatollah Khamenei, in a message in December 1356, addressed to Clergymen, about the use of political openness and opportunity as a result of the policy of human rights Carter, were developed, said: "Today's respite find Consider this opportunity as a booty, and if this were not achieved, the situation would not have happened "(Houshang Mahdavi, 2002, 299).

But gradually, and since one of Carter's external goals was to prevent the outbreak of the revolution in the US-dominated countries, and also because of the incitement intensified by the Soviet Union in Iran and its proximity to its borders, it was expedient In the aid of the Shah regime, he began to address Mohammad Reza Shah's help requests. Carter's plan to support the Shah, in January 1978, which had been the source of a fire of opposition to the Shah, swept across Iran, became apparent with his official presence in Iran. At the banquet in Tehran, he expressed his full satisfaction and support of the Shah, and in his words, Iran was considered the island of stability in a riot region. Carter's remarks from the Shah's regime, which at that time did not even observe the basic principles of human rights in Iran, while Democrat leader Carter came up with a slogan supporting democracy and human rights.

It can be concluded, therefore, that the United States easily abandoned its liberal and humanitarian values whenever its regional interests were jeopardized. Therefore, in the case of Iran, the pressure exerted by Carter on the Shah since 1976 had caused the worst possible

situation for the regime, because the Shah, on the one hand, had declared political freedom, On the other hand, he declared a military rule to control the situation. In this way, at the same time, the king's credibility was reduced to within, and on the other hand, the revolutionary forces found a genuine opportunity to organize themselves. This issue can be clearly seen in the message of December 1977, Ayatollah Khamenei, mentioned above.

Following the publication of the insulting article of Imam Khomeini, entitled "Iran and the Red and Black Colonialism", in January 1976, a great opposition was made to the Shah, by which a massive demonstration on 9 January 1978 of the same year Qom was up. The government shot people, but forty days after that, the people of Tabriz fled to the streets in the forty Qom martyrs in February 1978. As these struggles intensified, the Shah's government was forced to announce a military rule in some cities in the summer of 1978. Due to the adoption of this policy, the bloody 17th of September happened in the same year on the martyrs of Tehran. The point to be made is that the United States was silent about all these repressions. So, it can be seen that at that time, the United States had followed its wrong policy of exerting pressure on the Shah to implement the principles of democracy and human rights, and sought to dismiss the Shah in the suppression of freedom. If necessary, help him. In fact, the principle that the main artery of a self-regulating regime is for the survival, the use of force, was for some time American-Americans.

In August 1978, in a statement issued by the CIA in August 1978, the White House and the US Congress announced: "Iran is not in a revolutionary state or even before the revolution (Vaezi, 2002, 81). At that time, the United States was so supportive of the Shah's rule that the CIA reporters were humbled by the shah's opponents.

The Shah, on the advice of the United States, set up a new cabinet in order to cope with the popular opposition, on 27 August 1978, and nominated Sharif Imami instead of Prime Minister Jamshid Amozgar. In October 1978, the popular struggle took on a large scale, and the imminent Shiite government of the Imami was completely disapproved. The king had a telephone call with Brzezinski, a national security adviser to the US, on 3 November 1987, who received a clear message; Brzezinski told the Shah: "Do whatever is necessary, and be fully sure that the government America will support him with all power (Vaezi, 2002, 81). After the phone call, Shah disposed of Sharif Imami and set up a military government under the command of Army chief of staff. The next day, 4 November, 1978, the horrific incident of students and students killing against the University of Tehran was caused by the Shah's military.

Regarding the approach to the Islamic Revolution, there was a divorce in the US decision-making body, which raised disagreements in the National Security Council and the US Department of State. In the late fall and winter of 1978, American strategic policy was based on the creation of divisions and rifts within the Iranian revolutionary forces. In fact, they tried to put nationalist groups and groups against the Islamic Movement under the leadership of Imam Khomeini. Eventually, after a series of internal conflicts in the US leadership, a policy was set up by Cyrus Vance, Perth and Sullivan, and Carter accepted it (Vaezi, 2002, 82).

The principles of US policy to confront the formation of the Islamic Revolution in Iran were:

1. A government led by nationalists, with a slogan of reforms.
2. The army and the armed forces should be fully supportive and supportive of the new government.
3. The Shah temporarily quit the scene, and sometime later, returning to the country as it was after the 19 August coup.
4. The new nationalist government has international support.
5. The United States will take responsibility for logistics and support.

During the meeting, Cyrus Vance, New Sam, Warren Christopher, George Ball, Brzezinski and Vice-President of the United States delivered a report by Carl Bush; the outcome was that: direct intervention of US forces in Iran failed But the United States must try to create a strong barrier against Ayatollah Khomeini (Vaezi, 2002: 84). This policy was to be formed on the scene through the creation of divisions within the Islamic movement and the placement of nationalists, communists, liberals and ecclesiastics, in front of Imam Khomeini. Robert Brad, the leader of the majority of the US Senate, traveled to Iran in November 1978, and his report from Iran was one of the factors behind the policy setting. But this policy could have come to an end: first, the Shah agreed to step aside. Secondly, nationalists, liberals, and economists will be aligned. Thirdly, an agreement between the military and the military should be carried out to protect the nationalists and the new government. Fourth, after the king's departure, the reigning council was formed.

Schlesinger, Brzezinski and a number of other US officials believed that by sending a special representative, the king should be informed that the United States could not engage in direct military intervention in Iran, as estimates suggest a failure of such a plan. Therefore, the Shah must accept one of two ways: either to stand up and apply the policy of an iron fist, and to rise to a military struggle with all force against the revolution, or temporarily withdraw from Iran, and a

five-stage plan, including the sovereignty of nationalists, with the slogan of reform. In late December 1357, Carter, after consulting with Foreign Minister Cyrus Vance, Brzezinski, National Security Adviser, Defense Secretary Harold Brown, and US Joint Chiefs of Staff David Jones, decided to send General Huyser to Iran to bring the above-mentioned mission to Implemented (Vaezi, 2002: 85).

General Huyser went to Iran to become loyal to the leaders of the Iranian army for Bakhtiar. The moves and actions of Hazer took a broad dimension in order to implement the plan to distort the revolution. As directed by William Lewis and Michael Ledin, on page 85 of Carter's book and the fall of the Shah, Huyser ordered, through a secure telephone connection; communicate with the Pentagon, information to Brzezinski and, through him, to Carter each night. Eventually, the Shah accepted the second solution, and Bakhtiar, a member of the National Front, came to the prime minister on 5 January, 1979, and the government went away. The major goal of the United States was to bring Bakhtiar to power, to silence the flames of the people's anger and to distort the revolution from its main pace. The Shah, based on the plan, left Iran on 16 January, 1979.

But in spite of all these efforts, the Islamic Revolution of Iran continued its journey, until Imam Khomeini entered Iran in February 1, 1979, and faced with massive public appearances. Bakhtiar's attempt to negotiate with Imam (PBUH) failed, and four days later, after Bakhtiar failed to force military commanders to prevent the introduction of a new government, Imam Khomeini, Mehdi Bazargan, as head of interim administration, Introduced. Sullivan wrote in his report: "We are trying to maintain our connection with the organization that is collapsing and smoke, while the revolution is victorious and Ayatollah Khomeini is the conqueror of this revolution. We refuse to accept this fact and adapt ourselves to it (Sullivan and Parsons, 2005, 497). These interventions affected public opinion and led to the loss of legitimacy of the regime.

In the era of revolutionary change, the position of the United States towards Iran is one of the most important developments in the foreign relations of the two countries before the victory of the Islamic Revolution. In general, during the revolutionary developments of Iran, US policy was the full support of Mohammad Reza Shah, but when the United States realized that it could not keep the Shah in power, following the departure of the Shah on January 26, 1979, he tried hard to apply himself. To the extent possible, keep Iran in the camp of the West and prevent the use of an Islamic regime, in my opinion. Finally, the sense of general hatred of devotion and humiliation was one of the deepest sources of alienation and hatred of the people of the Shah's regime, and

the Western society, and the puppet regime of the Shah by an Islamic movement led by Imam Khomeini, who had risen from the depths of the existence of society, Split up In fact, the alienation of the Persians from the United States came back to the notion that the country, with military, economic and political support from the Shah's regime, has trampled on Iran's sense of dignity and independence. So the slogans of death on the king and the death of the United States were of a kind of inner relation.

In fact, during the revolution and the historical context afterwards, the slogan of Death to America after the slogan of Allah Akbar was used as the second public slogan supported by the people and was used at various levels (Cottam, 1989: 172). Various studies show that political assessments and behaviors, such as voting, loyalty to decisions, laws and rules imposed by the legal system, are all influenced by citizens' judgments about the fairness of political processes (Tyler 1987: 45).

In sum, to find the roots of the hostile relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the United States on the one hand, it should be noted that the contemporary history of Iran and the relationship between the Pahlavi regime and the Americans should be ignored; on the other hand, the ideas and struggles of Imam Khomeini. Imam's theology and writings at various stages of his struggle show that the rebirth of Islam can reduce the influence of dominant and foreign influences in Iran.

It seems that from the point of view of the American political elite, the Islamic movements are challenging for the West's lasting interests in the Middle East because, if Islamist movements in Western Asia are not inhibited, Islam will become a single and fanatical geopolitical power that, based on the religious ideology The growing population and power of oil will be disrupted by the replacement of Islamic fundamentalists, rather than dependent states, with the interests of Western governments, especially the United States in the region. An article later acknowledged by Brzezinski, an American politics politician, describes the threat posed by Islamists: the revival of fundamentalist Islam throughout the region, with the fall of the Shah, and the seizure from Iran, Imam Khomeini, is a continuing threat to our interests in a region that the life of the Western world is completely dependent on it. Islamic fundamentalism the phenomena that have been neglected mainly in our reports and inquiries ignored today clearly threatens the order and stability of the present (Davoudi, 1987: 76).

What is certain is that the Islamic Revolution has reacted to the closure of the affiliation rings that ended the life of the Pahlavi puppet regime in Iran. Because according to Imam Khomeini's and Wallerstein's theories, they plunder the colonial and arrogant nations of the Third and Underdeveloped World, and revolution is the best way to cut off the affiliation of the oppressed nations. Other scholars also endorse this theory, including "Asef Hussein", who views the Islamic Revolution of Iran as an emblem of emancipation from the domination of imperialism and a symbol of the struggle against colonial goals, which are centered around the conversion of Islamic societies to secular societies, as well as the revolution. An independent government in Iran relying on the ideology of Islamic struggles and genuine Islamic thought (Hussein, 1985: 9-15).

Nikki Keddie, also acknowledging that the liberation from the cultural and economic domination of foreigners has a pivotal role in Shia thinking, summarizes the most important characteristic of Shi'ite political thinking in its anti-imperialist aspect, and this dynamic Shiite thinking contrasts with the ruling system before. From the revolution and the background to the emergence of the Islamic Revolution, he observes that by introducing Imam Khomeini as a model and symbol of the struggle against imperialism and emphasizing the distinction between the anti-imperialist movement of the Islamic Revolution and other movements, the aim of the Islamic Revolution of Iran was to gain independence from domination. America declares (Keddie, 1981: 19-20).

"John Foran" also seeks to re-establish the relationship between the Islamic Revolution and the United States, with reliance and emphasis on removing dependence (Foran, 1977: 10-11). Therefore, all the above-mentioned theories share the views of Imam Khomeini, which is one of the most important causes of the occurrence and occurrence of the Islamic Revolution of Iran, with the struggle against colonialists, domineers and interventionists. On this basis, the containment of movements and movements of religious thought is among the Middle East's goals of US foreign policy because Americans are afraid that political Islamists will dominate important areas of energy and jeopardize the security of the West. End up pricing and ultimately end the military and ideological domination of the West, especially the United States, in the world. Also, the most important strategies pursued by the United States in Iran following the August 28 coup d'état were to promote and promote the standards of Western society in Iran, to coordinate the people of the community, with the Shah's strategic policies, and above all to reduce the power of the elements. Resistance to Shiite Islam was in popular gatherings. Because of the high popular mobilization that exists in the Shia religion, it was one of the concerns of the

Shah's regime and the United States. But injecting western criteria into a society whose Islamic values centuries rooted in, not only did not create the spirit of compromise in the Iranian people, but also became one of the main concerns of the revolutionaries, because people made their basic values of life through outbreaks Corruption and unrest were in danger, and they tried to prevent any expansion of this situation in any way possible. The Pahlavi regime and the United States at that time were strategic allies.

CONCLUSION

The history of Iran's socio-political developments shows that foreign domination is considered as one of the inhibitors of political, economic and social development of the country. This has been accelerating and expanding over the past two centuries. The interventions of Russia, the United Kingdom, France, the United States of America and the Soviet Union are as black but real events in Iran's history. These interventions have left a pessimistic mindset in Iran's public opinion and political culture. The post-coup d'état of 19 August 1953, is one of the most important historical stages in Iran's foreign policy, in which foreign policy went in full swing to the negative balance of dependence and subjection, and extended the presence of foreigners in Iran until the 1979 revolution.

During these 25 years, the Iranian government was virtually American puppet and under the control of this government, and had no function other than fulfilling the wishes of the United States. During these years, the flood of American economic and military advisers to secure the pillars of the imperial system and subsequent implementation of Washington's policies and orders became the way for Iran. The result was that Iran became the main player in the implementation of US regional policies, the great market for American merchandise and military goods, and the American culture. In those years, no place in the world was as rich as Iran for the Americans with the richest political and economic vernacular. The calm and influence of the Americans went so far as to make the regime of capitalization in Iran. A law that is less than the political unit in the world. The increase in the number of Americans in Iran, the comprehensive expansion of diplomatic relations, and America's centrality in all of the regime's plans, along with the needs of the bipolar system, and Iran's role in a coalition with the West, provided the ground for more American dominance over Iran. It was natural that in such a situation, "political tyranny" also dominated the Iranian society. Thus, the interventions of the powerful United States in the

internal affairs of Iran during the coup d'état of 19 August 1953, and its position on the Islamic Movement after the June 5, 1963 uprising, have provoked popular feelings and formed a pessimistic mentality towards them in Iranian political culture. The existence of such a mentality among the masses of the people, the attempt to expand the domination of Iran by the United States and the relationship between the Pahlavi regime's dismay with the Americans, which is the best example of the capitulation bill.

On the other hand, the thoughts and struggles of Imam Khomeini in the struggle against the influence of the hegemony have led to the island of stability of the Americans, and the revolution of the people with two objectives of the struggle and dismissal of the puppet regime of the Shah and the fight against any influence and foreign intervention in Iran Will undermine the foundations of the rule of one of America's allies in the region. The result of these struggles was to bring about the Islamic Revolution of Iran in February 1979 and to cut off the American interventionist intervention in Iran's internal affairs. From then on, the United States took hostile and courageous policies toward the Islamic Republic of Iran and did not hesitate to take any action to hit the Islamic Revolution of Iran.

REFERENCES

1. Azghandi, Alireza (2010), History of Political and Social Change of Iran 1977-1970, Tehran. Semat.
2. Asadi, Bijan (2009), Persian Gulf and its Issues, Tehran, Semat.
3. Ashori, Dariush (1994), Political Encyclopedia, Tehran, Morvarid.
4. - Heshmatzadeh, Mohammad Bagher (2003), A Framework for the Recognition and Analysis of the Islamic Revolution of Iran, Tehran, Cultural Institute of Danesh and Contemporary Andisheh.
5. - Hafezinia, Mohammad Reza (2003). Strategic Role of Strait of Hormuz. Tehran: Publication of the Semat.
6. Zibakalam, Sadeq, (2009), Introduction to the Islamic Revolution, Tehran, Raozaneh.
7. - Sullivan, William and Parsons, Anthony, (2005), Memoirs of two ambassadors, Translation by Mohammad Toloui, Tehran, Publishing Alam.
8. - Saeed Ahmad (2000) Political and Economic Issues Third World, Tehran, Organization for the Study and Compilation of Human Sciences Books at Universities.

-
9. - Shawcross, William (1997), *The Last Journey of Shah*, translation by Abdolreza Houshang Mahdavi, Tehran, Alborz Publishing.
 10. - Attarzadeh, Mojtaba (2004), *Formation of the Islamic Revolution*, translation of Mohsen Milani, Tehran, Publishing Ghazal.
 11. - Qavam, Abdul Ali (2009), *Principles of Foreign Policy and International Policy*, Tehran, Semat.
 12. - Gazirovsky, Mark, (1992), *American foreign policy and Shah*, translation by Feridon Fatemi, Tehran, Center publication.
 13. - Mohammadi, Manouchehr (1998), *An overview of Iran's foreign policy during the Pahlavi era*, Tehran, Publication Dadgostar.
 14. - Malkotyan, Mostafa (1993), *A review of revolutionary theories*, Tehran, Gomes.
 15. - Masoudnia, Hossein et al (2009), *Effect of Political Students' Conscious Knowledge on Their Attitude to the Legitimacy of the Political System Based on Weber's Theory: Case Study of Isfahan University*, *Political Science Journal*, Fourth Year, No. 4.
 16. - Mousavi Khomeini, Seyyed Rouhollah (1999) *Sahifeh Imam*, Tehran, Institute for the Regulation and Publishing of Imam Khomeini Works, Fourth Edition.
 17. - Mousavi Khomeini, Seyyed Rouhollah (1994) *Sahifeh Imam*, Tehran, Institute for the Regulation and Publishing of Imam Khomeini Works, Second Edition.
 18. - Mousavi Khomeini, Seyyed Rouhollah (1995), *Sahifeh Imam*, Tehran, Institute for the Setting up and Publication of Imam Khomeini Works, Third Edition.
 19. - Naghibzadeh, Ahmed (2004), *Impartiality and Psychology of Islamists in the History of Diplomacy of Iran*, Tehran, State Department for Documentation and Research Services.
 20. - Vaezi, Hasan (2002), *Iran and America*, Tehran, Soroush.
 21. - Velayati, Ali Akbar, (2009), *Contemporary History of Iran*, Tehran, Private Joint Stock.
 22. - Hobden, Stephen (2000), *International Relations and Historical Sociology*, Translated by Jamshid Zanganeh, Tehran, Political and International Studies Office.
 23. - Houshang Mahdavi, Abdolreza (1989), *History of Iranian foreign relations from the end of the Second World War to the collapse of the Pahlavi regime*, without publication, publication of the author.
 24. - Yergin, Daniel (1995). *World Oil History*. Translation of Gholam Hossein Salehayar. Tehran: Information Publishing.

25. -Foran, John, (1977). The Iranian Revolution of 1977- 1979: A Challenge for Social Theory ,” unpublished article.
26. -Hussain, Asef, (1985). Islamic Iran :Revolution and Counter- Revolution ,London, France Printer.
27. -Keddie, Nikki R., (1981). Roots of Revolutions ,New Haven, Yale University Press.
28. -Richard Cottam (1989) "Inside Revolutionary Iran" The Middle East Journal. No Spring Tp.
29. - Tyler, Tom, R. (1987), procedural justice Research, Social Justice Research
30. -Wallerstein, Immanuel, (1967). The Capitalist World Economy, New York: Cambridge University Press
31. Lenczowski, George (1994). Presidents of the United States and Middle East from Truman Sargent. Translation by Abdolreza Houshang Mahdavi. Tehran: Alborz Publishing.
32. Noorae, Fereshteh (1978). The history of American social and political transformation. Tehran: Tehran University Press.
33. Davoudi, Mohsen (1989). Western confrontation with what fundamentalism calls. Tehran: Bureau of Political and International Studies of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
34. Shawcross, William (1997). The last trip of the king. Translation by Houshang Mahdavi. Tehran. Publishing Pikan
35. Amini, Ali (1998), Memories, by the efforts of Ya'qub Tavakkoli, the artistic arena of Tehran.

How to cite this article:

Sohrabi H, Mollaali A, Askaritybi F. Investigating the role of the United States in the internal affairs of Iran in 1953 to 1978. J. Fundam. Appl. Sci., 2018, 10(1), 365-385.