

Mirage of Reality for Dream of Neutral Government in Iran

Mahmodabadi AZ*

Department of Political Sciences, Zahedan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Zahedan, Iran

*Corresponding author: Mahmodabadi AZ, Department of Political Sciences, Zahedan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Zahedan, Iran, Tel: +989133565526; E-mail: amirhussein_zarei2020@yahoo.com

Received date: July 24, 2018; Accepted date: Sep 28, 2018; Published date: Oct 08, 2018

Copyright: © 2018 Mahmodabadi AZ. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

The emergence and formation of a neutral government in Iran is considered to be among the challenging issues in the field of foreign policy and international relations. This is despite the fact that the creation of a neutral government in the current environment is impossible with regard to the main components of these governments, since neutral governments are governments that are not in a sensitive and strategic position, and all of these governments have deep deficiencies that ignore controversy in international conflicts and foreign policy seeking for relative immunity. Although in the Third World, most governments are weak, they cannot declare neutrality due to some issues such as ideological sovereignty and the relation of sovereignty. On the other hand, Iran, in addition to the two, is a regional superpower and economic and military power. Therefore, the formation of a neutral government in Iran is impossible and very far from the current situation.

Keywords: The government; Neutral government; Iran; Neutrality; Middle East

Introduction

The government can be named as the largest internal organization of the country's execution, since all executive agencies are formed within the government, and the government has the duty and mission of organizing executive agencies to govern the country. Therefore, it can be said that the state is the pillar of the political system of every country. It also affects the political community, while the beginning of the formation of governments is extremely complicated, but in the end, after many ups and downs and behind various experiences, we now see the formation of different governments [1].

Governments that are formed over time and in different countries across five continents are addressing their political affairs, and run their societies from their own views and attitudes. Communities that directly or indirectly have chosen and appointed these governments relying on collective wisdom, and since these governments are based on the needs and problems of the countries, they have some kind of special features that may not be possible in other parts of the world to apply and implement them, and they have also evolved in this direction, and the Islamic Republic of Iran is a typical example of these sovereign systems.

Of course, the formation of different governments cannot be based on the exact needs and real problems of societies, as we can see the growth and emergence of governments of history that are looking for personal self-interest and the power of a certain number of individuals, which is why in many cases governments have not only not been in the right direction and have not grown up, but have evolved in the direction of personal goals, and most of these governments can be clearly seen in third world societies.

What is certain is the lack of imagination of social life without government, which in some way causes insecurity and chaos in the human community, and has led the governments to formulate

smoothly and in line with the general needs of society, and is now also witnessing a growing and expanding nature. Governments have grown and expanded on the basis of the transformation and trends of human needs, since it is the task of governments to organize and form executive bodies and administrative bodies in one country in addition to organize a set of views, attitudes and beliefs that cause their emergence and, consequently, the growth and development of governments directly and indirectly.

Therefore, having a proper understanding of different governments and the process of their development and advancement requires an adequate understanding of various theories of politics and political philosophy that deal with the formation of governments, the necessities of their formation, and the structures of different governments appropriate to various human societies. That is why the accurate and adequate recognition of the philosophical and political philosophy of the emergence of governments is of paramount importance in correct understanding of governments [2].

Given the complexity and ambiguity surrounding the emergence of various types of governments, role and importance of government in societies cannot be explicitly examined from one-dimensional aspect and far from many of the political and philosophical concepts of the past until today. Description of phenomena surrounding the government, as well as the extent and the way these phenomena are linked to this important institution in each country, we can achieve important elements that play a significant role in the accurate and practical recognition of governments in different societies, on one hand, and the utilization and integration of these elements on another hand provides to the researchers.

In this context, one of the political and important phenomena of the new age and perhaps the twentieth century, which is the result of global tensions, is the emergence of neutral governments in the domestic and foreign arena, while perhaps the neutral government was apparently the result of the wars of the twentieth century. They caused that some countries to consider the use of a neutral government in foreign policy and international relations in order to be immune from

the damage and consequences of these international wars and their need.

Of course, in many countries, there is a neutral government in various aspects of domestic politics, although it is as much as a claim. Therefore, in this paper, we try, in addition to the general introduction of some of the various governments that have so far formed, we refer to the points and components of the neutral government in different dimensions and to analyze the structure of such states more than it is internationally discussed and consider whether the existence of a neutral government is possible or not in the international arena and in different areas of the domestic politics of each country especially Iran!

The Concept of a Neutral Government

Neutral government is one of the words that entered the political literature on international relations and foreign policy after World War and especially World War II. Undoubtedly, all political scientists and researchers are familiar with the conditions and reasons for the neutrality of governments, but in brief, it is necessary to describe the concept of a neutral government based on international relations and what came about after the Second World War. After the Second World War and with regard to the fire that took place in large parts of European countries, the discussion of neutral governments was seriously raised. So that now, the neutrality of these governments is also recognized by the United Nations.

Neutral governments are those that have declared neutral, in accordance with the political, economic, political, geopolitical, and political and regional power they have, in the sense that they play a neutral role in all political, military, economic, and other global conflicts, and if their neighboring governments engage in military conflict, they will not help any of the parties involved in war at any level [3].

Although the notion of a neutral government is recognized by the United Nations, so far only two governments in the countries of Switzerland and Austria have stated that they are completely neutral and if different countries, and even countries that are members of the international alliance of NATO and in their immediate neighborhood, they will not engage in war and battles at any level, they will not intervene and will take a completely neutral approach to such military, diplomatic, political, economic, and other conflicts. Although in most cases the rights neutral governments are violated by hostile countries involved in these wars but the announcement of neutrality and recognition by the United Nations is enough to have a disproportionate role in many of the controversies of these governments and, more likely, their countries. Of course, it should not be forgotten that, in many cases, neutral governments are also helping and supporting some of the countries that are engaged in war, but in general and in principle, they are recognized as a neutral government based on the foreign policy of the country and the acknowledgment of the government in the United Nations.

Regarding the concept of a neutral government, it might be better to look at some of the measures, including the Do's and Don'ts of these governments, and examine them briefly. One of the most important aspects of the neutrality of these governments is the lack of participation in any war [4]. Neutral governments in times of war should not allow, in any circumstances, to provide weapons and ammunition for the military forces of one of the parties of the conflict.

Also, these governments, based on international protocols and the observance of the principle of neutrality of the United Nations Charter, in their trade and economic relations with the states involved in war, should observe and preserve the principle of equality. Among the other bases that these countries are obliged to do during the war is not to interfere at the margins of the wars; that is these governments are not allowed to interact indirectly with countries involved in the war, such as providing satellite and military information.

On the other hand, neutral states should have goodwill during the war against their neighbors and countries involved in the war and show their innocence in various aspects of the military, political, economic affairs to the United Nations and the parties to the conflict. On this basis, if one of the hostile and involved countries in the war asks for inspecting the flotilla of a neutral government in international waters or territorial waters, it must be followed up by the call to show neutrality and good faith [5].

Of course, the declaration of neutrality also requires the acceptance of the United Nations and other international institutions in addition to the above requirements, so if a country wants to introduce itself as a neutral government and country, its historical record will definitely have an impact and importance on international institutions and societies. And if there is a history of warfare and support for terrorism, there will definitely be problems for the acceptance of the international community and, undoubtedly, it is bound to take confidence-building measures to win the international community's trust.

Origin and All Types of Neutral Governments

Having a neutral government for managing each country is based on the indicators that based on them, the government has found that neutrality is the best mode for international relations in its foreign policy, and if we want to have a proper analysis of this issue, it is clear that neutral governments can be categorized into four categories. Governments are the first group that can be considered as weak governments by considering different indicators. Governments that are not sufficiently capable of effective presence in the field of international relations and foreign policy and even avoiding diplomatic wars and the like.

Because in such fields they will suffer greatly because of the inability of these states in various aspects of the military, political, economic, etc. although neutrality is not complete immunity in some wars and international relations. Perhaps the experience has proven that many of the countries that have declared neutrality have often been attacked by hostile parties, but in general, military conflicts and political conflicts in the diplomatic arena are less disturbing to them [6]. Therefore, these governments are trying to lessen or compensate their weakness and distance with other powerful and effective governments in this way.

The second category of neutral governments is governments that declare neutrality due to their structural weaknesses, on one hand, and their location in important and sensitive geographical areas on the other. They announce their neutrality in membership of international protocols and organizations because with a neutral position, the costs of administering the country in the domestic arena and foreign policy, especially in extreme situations, namely, war, are as low as possible, but due to being placed at a very important global point, they try to become active in international institutions to compensate for this weakness and backwardness, and in principle, become dependent on a

regional or transatlantic power to participate in contributions of foreign policy and international relations.

The other group are governments that, according to international treaties, UN protocols and international laws, declare neutrality in certain special cases, that is in cases that there is a threat, risk or warning to their country politically and economically they declare neutrality in the field of foreign policy and relations, but they will participate in other international arenas that do not threaten their country or increase their country's interests; in such a way that their neutrality is limited to specific cases. For example, the European Union, which, within the framework of this union, the members of the union will have a completely neutral imbalance in the event of any conflict and involvement, but this is not the case with other issues, such as the euro currency, as each of these states seeks to increase financial and economic capabilities and increase the share of national gross production on the green continent.

The last category of neutral governments is governments that announce neutrality temporarily in all areas of international and regional and transnational conflicts, because some governments, for a variety of reasons, such as the political modernization that they are struggling from within, and the intense and serious presence in the context of conflicts in international relations, it may be possible to negatively affect the political reform carried out within the country, so, in order to reform and modernize their internal structures without being affected by foreign considerations, international relations and foreign policy, they declare neutrality temporarily based on time or based on international work schedule.

What is certain is that all the states that have been declared neutrality in the above have all one aspect in common. And it can certainly be said that this common aspect is nothing but apparent weakness in various dimensions, and these governments tend to be safe from many possible damages.

Neutral Government and Sovereignty

At present, countries that have officially declared their neutrality, the two countries of Austria and Switzerland, are countries where there is no significant difference between their sovereignty and government, and the two are homogeneous, and the government, besides the task of administering the country and dealing with the executive is partly integrated within the sovereignty so that separation of these two concepts, either in practice or in theory, is simply not possible.

On the other hand, in many countries governments and sovereignty do not merge and they can easily be separated from each other, and the complete arrogance of sovereignty over the government is so high that it can easily overthrow the government and replace the interim administration or another government. These conditions are predominantly dominant in the Third World and in developing countries, and this political connection is deeply rooted in those countries that are governed by theocracy and governed by special ideology.

Therefore, all political currents, influence groups, pressure groups and power centers are much stronger and more active in these countries, and are directly involved in all areas of the country, in particular government activities and decisions, and therefore, the implementation of simple executive tasks in these countries is very complicated and the declaration of a neutral government in the field of international relations and foreign policy is undoubtedly very difficult

and complex if the sovereignty of the dependent country is aware of the advantages and disadvantages of having a neutral government, of course there is a great distance between these countries and the reality of countries with a neutral government, wherever in a neutral government like Switzerland, every citizen can propose legislation to his own canton, and it is implemented if it is effective and feasible in the country or canton of that citizen's place of residence. This issue is more like a dream than reality in mentioned countries!

Considering the above conditions, the formation of a neutral government in Third World countries and even in developing countries that are often involved in religious ideological governments is far from mind and it is clear that if a government, in such circumstances, also wants to impose neutrality in various fields it is undoubtedly not acceptable from that government, since it is impossible to take into account the state of governance and the administration of the country and the political performance of its governments from the past, even if the international community accepts that, there is so much need for a great deal of trust which threatens the government, sovereignty and conditions of that country [7].

Neutral Government in the Third World

Regarding what was said about the neutral government and what was said about the internal and external conditions of countries for having a neutral government; the formation of a neutral government in the Third World is very difficult unless some specific considerations are true regarding that government and country.

The first and foremost necessity for constant and complete neutrality in all fields in foreign policy and international relations is the weakness of governments that third world governments often face with many weaknesses in different fields which cause their dependence on regional and trans-national superpowers. Therefore, it can be said that most of Third World countries have the first requirement of neutrality in the global arena. Of course, we should not forget that this weakness and poverty is not only international, but also in the field of domestic politics, and this is the cause of great decrease of formation of a neutral government in these countries.

Among other issues that are of great importance in declaring neutrality among the Third World countries is the lack of an ideological government and ideology in these countries. It can be said explicitly that all ideological governments are a major obstacle to their neutrality in many conflicts and international conflicts due to ideological foundations on which the sovereignty is formed. It is possible that indifference or neutrality against some issues fundamentally contradicts the foundations of sovereignty, values and standards of these governments, thus, almost in the third world countries with an ideological government there are not possibilities and conditions for the establishment of neutral government.

Nonetheless, Third World countries lacking an ideological government are better off to become neutral in the global arena because the fundamental values of the administration of the country are not contradictory or are less contradictory with foreign policy and international relations. Since neutrality leads to the immunity of these countries, the pursuit of formation and, in the end, the announcement of a neutral government from these countries, will bring more benefits to them and can often become to a degree closer to regional and trans-regional superpowers and attract their support in many areas. However, these governments must have a historical, ethnic and

acceptable past for global superpowers, or have to give confidence that it is so humiliating that it can be ruled out and unacceptable by some of these countries.

To the extent that it can be said explicitly, for the same reason, the Third World's weak governments, which lack any ideological government, have avoided declaring neutrality and are increasingly seeking independence, minus the occupying superpowers, although there has been no neutral government among the Third World and even developing countries.

Neutral Government and Iran

The formation of a neutral government in Iran, given the very special circumstances of Iran, is completely remote and impossible. It is possible to say that a neutral government is not only impossible for a country like Iran, but it is dare to acknowledge that the formation of a neutral government in Iran is considered to be contrary to all domestic and even foreign criteria, indices and factors of Iran.

Perhaps the most important factor, or the biggest obstacle to the formation of a neutral government in Iran, is that the country is in the most important and critical region and point of the Middle East and even the planet. Iran is a country located in the heart of the Middle East and has a very important global position. Therefore, neutrality is not wise for this country; it is also a lossy game because Iran must work on the basis of its regional and geopolitical situation and its location in order to maximize its use in foreign policy and international relations in different levels. A vast country that has 14 water and earthly neighbors as well as having direct access to the open sea is undoubtedly in a very important regional and trans-regional situation.

Iran's Economy and Neutral Government

Therefore, Iran's foreign policy and international relations are determined by the status and interests of the domestic and foreign interests, and we should not forget that this part of Iran's ability is only related to the sensitive political geography of this country, because now nearly 40% of the world's energy passes through the Strait Hormuz between Oman Sea and the Persian Gulf, which is also from Iran's territorial waters that has the capability of shipping, although in recent years, Western and Arab countries have been struggling to pull a 745-mile-long pipeline called the Eastern Transit Pipeline from the Arabian Oil Field Saudi Arabia to the Red Sea in order to some extent reduce this dependency, but what is absolute is that this pipeline offers less maneuverability and protection than tanks with a capacity of several tens of thousands. The pipeline, which is under construction, has only a capacity of 5 million barrels of oil per day, while the Strait of Hormuz and Iran Terrestrial Waters passes more than 20 million barrels of oil daily.

The Iraqi-Turkish pipeline extends to Ceyhan, which extends to the Mediterranean Sea, has been inactive for some time because of the war and some disagreements between the two countries and large parts of it have been destroyed, although this pipeline can be very important. It is strategic because it connects the north and south of Iraq, but has long been depleted, and in addition to other disadvantages of oil pipelines, it has less than one million barrels per day.

The UAE pipeline is another Western-Arab solution to solve this possible problem in order to control Iran. Of course, this pipeline only has a transfer capacity of 1.5 million barrels of crude per day [8].

Interestingly, this pipeline is eventually plagued with plenty of damage to the Khojira Dam in the south of the Strait of Hormuz, and eventually the Lebanese inactive pipeline, topline, with a capacity of 500,000 barrels per day, which is ineffective in practice.

In sum, we find that these energy lines, or crude oil, are inefficient and insufficient, and have a high vulnerability compared to crossing the borders of Iran, so it is obvious that such a country can easily take the control of world's Achilles i.e. the energy only by its political geography, although some countries in the region, such as Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, may come across temporarily, but in the short term they will face severe financial and fiscal problems and, therefore, will have to retreat. So you cannot expect such a country with such powers and abilities that are only due to its geopolitical position to declare neutrality in foreign policy and international relations, even temporarily or in a particular field.

On the other hand, the powerful economic potential of a country like Iran still has a direct and obvious impact on the formation of a neutral government in Iran, since it is quite evident that Iran is the second largest producer of crude oil at the World Organization of OPEC and the fourth largest producer of crude oil in the world. Iran is also the second largest natural gas producer in the world, and export of four million barrels of crude oil per day is part of Iran's oil and gas potential and economic power, and according to other sources that exist Iran such as gemstones and expensive gems such as diamonds, turquoise, ruby, agate, and etc. and precious metals such as gold, zinc, silver, copper, chromium, cobalt, iron, uranium, platinum, and so on, undoubtedly, Iran has one of the strongest economies in the world. Therefore, economically, having a neutral government in Iran is far from mind and irrational.

Iran and the Historical Background of Neutral Government

When the World War I began in August 1914, Iran had a special status. Before Iran officially declared its neutrality, Russia forces violated Iran for various excuses; in other words, about five years before the outbreak of World War, Tsarist Russia in order to carry out the intentions of the 1907 contract, established his forces in Azerbaijan, and the other Iran's neighbor government, Ottoman, also due to the internal crisis in Iran and the feeling of a lack of sovereignty had greed towards Azerbaijan, and although a mixed border commission was formed, defining the boundaries of the two countries, the Ottomans, considered the presence of Russian forces in Azerbaijan a threat for himself pursued his ambitious and supreme tendencies instead of uniting with Iran. The weakness of the central government of Iran gave the opportunity to Russia and the Ottomans to focus their forces on the borders of Azerbaijan, and this act of Russia and Ottoman on Iranian borders was a hindrance to Iran's neutrality during the First World War.

This was despite the fact that in spite of Iran's call for a neutral country, failed to materialize, although formally Iran has repeatedly declared its neutrality, but none of the countries and states of the conflicting parties paid attention during World War II, and the countries of Germany, England, Ottomans and Soviet Union were officially intruded to Iranian territory under various excuses, which is a bitter historical experience of Iran's neutrality during the World War, which was not recognized, and had a very detrimental effect on Iran.

The story of the neutrality of Iran and its occupation from the north and the south, during World War II, was renewed by the same Soviet

Union and British invaders. The value of the Iranian connection to the fate of the war was so much that it was called "the bridge of victory". Iran's injuries From World War II were more than World War One.

Though one day after outbreak of World War II, Iran declared its neutrality in this battle and warned foreigners that they would not suffer any kind of sentiment with Iran's neutrality, but this could not prevent the outbreak of war on Iran's soil.

On August 25, 1941, allied forces, including Britain and the Soviet Union, attacked Iran, regardless of Iran's neutrality, from the south and west, and invaded Iran from the ground and air and took cities along the way and came to Tehran.

Although at that time the Allies pretended to attack the German espionage in Iran, the next events indicated that the occupation of Iran was part of the Allied war plan against Hitler. Churchill later wrote in his memoirs: "The need to submit a variety of instruments and ammunition for the Soviet Union on one hand, and the growing defects of the North Atlantic Fragment and the strategic plans of the Allies in the future, on the other hand, would make us increasingly aware for the full use of Iran to communicate with the Soviet Union. Iran's oil was considered an important factor in the war [9]. A large number of the Germans were deployed in Tehran, and the German front in Iran was getting better every day. The plans for insurgency in Iraq and occupation of Syria from Britain and France, which took place in a short time, made Hitler's plans very difficult in the Middle East. Therefore we used the conditions and decided to unite the Russians and attack Iran.

With the Allied assault, all roads in the country, especially railroads and asphalt, were controlled by occupation forces. Iranian workforces were used to prepare the armies involved in the war with the lowest wages. Oil resources were plundered and the food crisis peaked in the country.

Shah's overthrowing murmur was heard from the government's emergency meeting; the day after Iranian occupation, board of ministers met in front of the Shah in the Sa'ad Abad palace, and Reza Khan stated at the meeting that he had initially decided to leave the country, but, at the advice of his advisers, initially made some changes in the government, and on this basis, Mohammad Ali Foroughi was appointed to the prime minister and ordered him to negotiate with Britain and the Soviet Union, but the Allies' condition was to withdraw Reza Shah from power, and eventually Reza Shah was forced to resign and arrested by the British, and then exiled to South Africa and then Morris island and the monarchy and crown was transferred to his son prince Mohammad Reza.

With a simple and passive look, we find that Iran has historically experienced a sense of neutrality in the field of foreign policy and international relations, and suffered irreparable blows from this neutrality declaration. Perhaps eliminating the sovereignty of the country in The second world War and even the torn apart of the country at various times have been a very small measure of Iran's neutrality during the wars of the world, but what has been remembered for all and seen in the historical books of Iran, includes dead of millions of people in Iran suffering from famine, civil war and the onslaught of war-affected countries.

Therefore, it is entirely rational and logical that these historical experiences would prevent Iran from establishing any neutral governments in the country and not only do not consider the neutral government beneficial, but sees it as an effective factor in the

destruction of its sovereignty and even its territorial integrity, while military, economic, political and geographic power of Iran is in contrast to a neutral government.

The Neutral Government in Iran and Military Power

Among other issues that can be considered for the neutrality of a government and country in the field of foreign policy and international relations, is the military power and armaments of that country, and the country of Iran, in recent years, relying on deterrents has a very high military capability, and maybe it is one of the few countries of the world which has suffered a devastating and long-lasting war of nearly 10 years, a battle that can be said almost all of the world's superpowers have participated in it indirectly. Therefore, it can be said that this experience of war has led Iran to seek to increase its military capability and consequently its deterrence, the ability that has been carefully developed and organized for Iran conditions.

To understand the level of Iranian military power, we need to have a proper survey and detailed analysis of Iran's military and regional power. I will briefly mention it here. In order to better understand Iran's military situation, it is enough to give a small look to the strategic Strait of Hormuz. At the moment, the main part of oil for 8 exporters around Persian Gulf is issued through this strategic waterway. For example, more than 88 percent of Saudi Arabia's oil, 98 percent of Iraq's oil, 99 percent of the United Arab Emirates oil and 100 percent of Kuwait's and Qatar's oil, and on average 97 percent of the oil of these countries crosses the Strait of Hormuz and about 50% of other commodity exchanges in these countries passes through the Strait of Hormuz.

Also, major military supplies to these countries are provided through the Persian Gulf, though the waters of West Arabia, the Yemen and eastern shores of Oman can replace the ports of this sea, but the cost, ground logistics and the total time needed to supply this supply can also be noteworthy. It is obvious that obstruction of Strait of Hormuz is considered as the vital artery of the world, and according to the cases that were said, it is only part of the most important effects of closure of Strait of Hormuz on ships. If the security risk is detected by passing ships, Iran can stop to allow these vessels cross the Strait of Hormuz which is most often part of Iran's territorial waters, and this can be done with the help of the Iranian military forces. If this strait is blocked, there will undoubtedly be oil price increase from \$ 350 to \$ 400 because the world will daily have an oil shortage of more than twenty million barrels.

How to Close the Strait of Hormuz

Iran's armed forces have been producing and storing the most modern and diverse anti-personnel weapons for over two decades, with significant budgets and extensive support from the country's authorities, and if in the past, closing the Strait of Hormuz was merely possible with naval forces and offshore-to-sea equipment and the enemy could overcome the problem by overcoming the naval and coastal forces, nowadays, various anti-ship missile systems of Iran can be used not only from the coast, but also even fires from the West Azarbaijan and Northern Khorasan to the ships in the Strait of Hormuz. Additionally, Ballistic missiles, mid-range missiles (such as Qarra and Nasr 1) are capable of bombarding the Strait of Hormuz running along the Persian Gulf up to depths of Kerman province.

Mining of the Strait of Hormuz, especially with the use of the radar boats, which are widely used by Iran's armed forces and are very

modern and equipped, can close the Strait; there are still rockets and artillery, beach bombers and drones, etc.

The fact is that the entire width of the Strait of Hormuz cannot be reached for large ships and tankers, and only a canal of about 10 kilometers wide is the pass way for tankers and large ships, so the continuous precipitation of a beam on a very small 10-kilometer canal is not a difficult task.

What Will Happen After Closing Strait of Hormuz?

This is a more important question than how to close the Strait of Hormuz; what will happen after closing Strait of Hormuz, and can Iran still keep the Strait closed? Assuming that Iran has announced that it will not allow ships cross the Strait from tomorrow morning and will shoot the passers-by will rocket and drown, undoubtedly, after this threat, no company will risk taking the ship and its passengers to danger and pass through under the rain of a rocket and from mines that may explode at any moment.

It is here that the first ship that may be in the US union with the American escort intends to cross the Strait of Hormuz will be crucial. If this ship is not attacked by Iran, and afterwards the transit process is carried out as usual, guillotine will fall without crashing into the head, and Iran has lost the case. So obviously, when Iran is "forced" to declare a blockade of straits, it will also be forced to block it actually, and the first explosions will be formed, and oil prices will face an unprecedented jump.

In such a situation, superpowers such as the United States have only two ways, to do nothing and despite all the claims and powers be an spectator of Iran's domination, or that he has to enter the fortune to open the strait, turning the flow of energy into normal, and it is normal that the United States, like Iran, does not want to be a loser beforehand, and will certainly decide to take action.

But the matter is, what action? If the process of closing the Strait of Hormuz was just in strait and its coasts, it would perhaps be possible to defeat Iran's naval and coastal forces with a heavy naval battle, and secured tanker safety with the deployment of more US naval units, but the point here is that Iran military power is not classical and is totally asymmetrical, and the US Navy is not a conventional navy and crew that can be defeated and submerged with a number of missiles, but the main challenge is the massive and asymmetric volume of radar boats, and more importantly, missiles that do not have fixed points on the beach but from moving points from around Iran and are firing at that 10 km and practically block the Strait and make it insecure.

Here again, the United States takes three decisions, first, to cope with the situation, second, to negotiate with Tehran and to give privileges to return to the previous situation, and ultimately to eliminate threats in the Strait of Hormuz; that is, the US military conquer the war beyond the confrontation in the sea and the periphery of the ships and tankers deep into the Iranian soil and try to identify and destroy all the Iranian rocket launchers.

Obviously, the first state means a clear failure of the US, and as a result, this option will definitely not remain on the agenda of the United States. The next two options, each of which depends on the circumstances of that time, if the United States and its allies are in a condition knowing that they will win in the event of an invasion to Iran, they will not be in doubt about this option, otherwise they will negotiate because their economy cannot continue to survive for a long time at high prices.

A possible US action to destroy Iran's missile power in the depths of Iran is considered a military strike against the sovereignty, and will lead to a full-fledged war, but the problem is that after the two valuable experiences of Afghanistan and Iraq, a military strike against a third country in the region is never a priority, and the US military and their allies are still deadlocked a decade after the occupation of Afghanistan, and the White House has recently announced that is willing to talk to Taliban, the same Taliban for destroying whom Afghanistan was attacked to!

Although the US attack will be very damaging to Iran, and even more damage than the United States is made for Iran, because Iran is fighting on its own soil, and it cannot be treated by slogan, but the Americans decision to attack Iran will not consider damage to Iran, but will, in the first stage, calculate the losses and costs it will incur for themselves, and this is a clever Western calculus that has hitherto made them vulnerable to a military attack on Iran, which is not basically comparable with Iraq and Afghanistan.

Assuming the US attack on Iran, the situation in the Strait of Hormuz is not better, but the burning fire in Hormuz will spread to the entire region, with consequences that nobody knows about its breadth and length.

Therefore, a comprehensive attack on Iran to open up Hormuz would be futile and inaccurate. As a result, if a comprehensive attack on Iran were to take place, the decision on it would not have purely tactical aspects for the reopening of the Strait, but necessarily a function of overall strategy of the United States toward Iran, so the strategic concern of the United States can be that Iran's action is to close the Strait of Hormuz before the time America and its allies are prepared for an attack on Iran.

Thus, the Americans have already begun their efforts to fundamentally prevent the action of Iran on threat of closing the Strait of Hormuz because in such a situation it is necessary to enter into a war with Iran with an uncertain future for both parties or negotiate and give some scores.

In a message sent by President Obama to the Iranian leader, after a threat to close the Strait of Hormuz, the invitation was negotiation, and this is a wise choice for Americans who, instead of negotiating in a war situation for the opening of the Strait are willing to negotiate in a non-war environment for not closing it.

The current president of the United States, Donald Trump, has come to the conclusion after survey of all its cost and utility, that it is not wise to wage war with a regional government that has allies in the Middle East as it is possible only with a widespread and massive attack that leads to breakdown of sovereignty with the help of an infantry, and perhaps even to repeat the decision of Harry Truman at the end of World War II? As Iran is the only serious challenge in the world for the US after containment of North Korea and its few allies.

This is small study of Iran's military capability in its area is confronting with a transnational superpower, and it is quite evident that such a country cannot be declared as neutral in international conflicts and in the field of foreign policy, given its very special military conditions and strategic power, and prefers to maximize income and share in international relations. However, if Iran's sovereign and ideological conditions are met, and given the impossibility of these conditions and fundamental differences with the regional and trans-regional superpowers, it is obvious that the neutral government option is not rational and reasonable for Iran.

It is natural for Iran, with this military power, to play an effective role in the international arena and, ultimately, international participation, and it is far from the rationale that it seeks itself as a neutral state in this area, because the style Iran's militarism is asymmetrical and naturally more powerful than its military rivals.

Political and Ideological Factors of the Neutral Government in Iran

Iran is one of the few countries in the world that has undergone an all-out revolution, although many thinkers believe that the Iranian revolution was the most humane revolution in human history, but fundamental and ideological changes took place in Iran, and revolutionary and religious ideals and values were embodied in a completely Theocracy sovereignty in Iran and, given the religious aspiration that exists in Iran, and high tendency of sovereignty to transcendental regional ideological issues, having neutral government is not only impossible, but more like a dream.

What is certain is that in all revolutions, we see withdraw of a government and upcoming of another government based on certain ideologies, and the theorists who make necessary designations for each revolution, from the time of the struggle until the victory, somehow predict the future in the path formation and the final outcome of the revolution as far as it is conventional. Iran was no exception to this rule and, even at a very high pace, undergoes fundamental changes that were counted impossible and contrary to all revolutionary values even from ideological and intellectual foundations of having a neutral government.

In the first stage, it is necessary to consider issues arising from the Iranian sovereignty system that is affected by religious issues from the problems of having a neutral government. According to the explanations given earlier, Iran, like other ideological governments, cannot separate sovereignty and government. The two are intertwined in a way that the neutrality of the government was considered as indifference of sovereignty, although the present conditions of Iran are also important and influential in the region, and presents Iran with such a moderate ideological sovereignty as a successful, influential and powerful country in the region and even the world. It has to be explicitly said it is moderation and support of some people in the region that has made Iran more powerful and, consequently, the effectiveness of some regional and trans-regional countries from Iran.

Because most of the countries have a religious ideological government dealing with a few major internal and external problems, first, they are often very hard-lined and subject to exaggeration, such as Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and such countries. There are international fears about the citizens and the sovereignty of these countries. Some of these countries are opposite of these governments, which seem to have an ideological government but do not observe many of the principles of belief in it.

And perhaps the major problem of these countries is that they explicitly allow themselves to have a fire in the name of religion in other countries, and it is obvious that such countries cannot have a neutral sovereignty and government, while Iran does not have any of these three problems and tries to improve his position by improving his influence in moderate Muslim countries without applying force.

The second stage is the effectiveness and modeling of many Islamic countries and regions, or Islamic movements from a country like Iran,

and it is entirely natural for a country like Iran to protect its mentors from around the world in order to increase its authority and influence in the region and in the world. He has certain enemies, according to the principles of anti-theocracy he has defined during his rule.

Therefore, the establishment of a neutral government in Iran, taking into account the revolutionary conditions in which it occurred, and the governments established in Iran, declaration of neutrality for this country is impossible, while Iran, given its military and economic strength has many claims in foreign policy and international affairs, and has a high potential for voting and contributing to global conflicts.

Conclusion

What was considered in this article for precise evaluation and analysis was conditions of neutral governments and those countries that have already moved away from many conflicts and international wars with their neutrality. We tried to examine and evaluate conditions of neutral governments with the current situation in Iran. Of course, all the countries that have been neutralized in any way possible in history have had clear and secret weaknesses. Islamic Republic of Iran as a powerful, regional and even transnational country is exception from this rule.

On the other hand, none of the countries that declare neutrality in different areas and in different fields have an ideological and religious government, because the relationship of sovereignty and government on one hand, and the religious and revolutionary axes, on the other hand, prevents the formation of a neutral government in Iran.

Also, Iran's presence in the region's most important geographic and political world has caused the unwitting power of Iran to dramatically increase, a power that can lead to the destruction of the global economy and even the economic bankruptcy of supranational superpowers.

Thus, Iran can be said to be a very powerful economic and military country located in the most important and sensitive part of the globe, having an ideological government and, in theory, a theocracy system based on its revolutionary ideals inside and outside its physical and intellectual boundaries. Taking the idea of having a neutral government in Iran that steps and decides away from all global and regional conflicts looks like a dream than reality! It's a mistake to test the tested!

References

1. Hassan S (2015) Introduction to Government Indicators. Office of Basic Government Studies 14623.
2. <http://ut.ac.ir/en/page/551/center-for-international-religious-studies-cirs->
3. Seidounes A (2015) Government in Farabi's Thought. Research Center of the Islamic Consultative Assembly of Iran, Office of Basic Studies, Publication.
4. Fair CC, Ramsay C, Kull S (2008) Pakistani Public Opinion on Democracy, Islamist Militancy, and Relations with the U.S. World Public Opinion pp:1-47.
5. <https://www.economist.com/books-and-arts/2017/11/18/a-modern-history-of-iran>
6. www.persiangulfstudies.com
7. www.fararu.com
8. www.asriran.com
9. www.mashreghnews.com