

The Role of Controlling of Congress Party Majority in American Foreign Policy in Respect of Iran

Amin Safdary^{*1}, Mohammadhossein Daheshvar² and Seyed Mohammadreza Mousavi³

¹M.A graduate in field of international relation from allameh tabataba'I university

²M.A graduate in field of international studies (middle east study) from university of Tehran

³Young Researchers and Elite Club, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Zanjan, Iran

Received: Dec. 2014 & Published: Feb. 2015

Abstract

The difference in political attitude and culture between two Democratic and Republican Parties has played an important role in orientations of domestic and foreign policies of USA. In fact, the review of reasons for changing or continuity of USA orientations to treat with world issues requires identifying the difference and correspondence aspects as well as the causes and effective factors on making decision in two Democratic and Republican parties. This measure is deemed as a lighting beam toward deeper conception of diplomatic issues regarding USA. The present essay tends to find the commonalities and disparities in intellectual beliefs taken by these two parties and their impact on orientation of USA Administration, especially in foreign scene. As a result derived from this investigation it was characterized that although taking a special policy is affected by USA national interests in international arena, this issue may be also related to a party that has power in their hand; two governing parties in USA represent two intellectual groups, although they do not oppose to each other, they have no common agreement in achieving American goals and ideals.

Keywords: Party Majority, USA Congress, Foreign Policy, Iran

Introduction

While many argue that foreign policy of the nations is assumed as the continuance of their domestic policies, it has been mentioned in some analyses that the issues and developing of domestic policy of these political actors are less addressed in study of foreign policy of the countries. In fact, in order to conceive as well as to predict better the foreign policy of the nations, it seems necessary to consider domestic political developments of the political actors such as elections and their results. This issue also applies to USA like other countries. Thus, to have proper perception about foreign policy of this country, the domestic political developments and preferences of various political institutions should be noticed along with considering the principles and fundamentals of foreign policy and its effect and fulfillment of some of current international developments formation and changing of foreign policy as well. In this course, the present passage

examines the dimensions of impact of the future mid-term elections in USA Congress on its foreign policy as one of the influential subjects in domestic policy in this country rather than considering the importance and priority of macro-strategies of USA foreign policy as well as the influence of current international developments and actions of other political actors.

Under these conditions when the republicans possess the majority votes in House of Representatives in this country as the critiques for USA current foreign policy they may also put the majority in House of Senate at their own disposal if they win in the forthcoming midterm election therefore change in preferences and policies of Congress will be inevitable in subjects regarding foreign policy. In fact despite of wide critics by members of House of Representatives and some senators against foreign policy of Obama, since Democrats have the majority of senate at their disposal thus we have not witnessed taking any

serious measure or impact by the Congress contrary to Obama's preferences. But it is expected that if the republicans can acquire majority in senate at the forthcoming elections, the pressures will be increased on foreign policy of Obama's administration and thereby several changes will be probably exerted in USA foreign policy as well. Therefore, by aiming at exploration of these probable changes, primarily the rate of Congressional role-playing in American foreign policy will be briefly investigated with respect to powers in Constitutions of this country and then we deal with the effects of future elections on USA foreign policy.

1- Theoretical framework

1-1- Modeling decision making trend in USA foreign policy

The trend of decision-making is very complicated in USA foreign policy. It is due to this fact that the newly-established country of America was designated in such a form that to have powerful and decentralized government thereby it is prevented from dictatorship of government over the people. As a result, USA foreign policy-making is a socio-political complex system, which covers various individuals, groups, and organizations and these decisions are made in such a way that they are affected by two formal and informal institutions. The official and effective institutions in USA foreign policy include the executive power, congress, and bureaucracy (which act as a single unit) and informal policymakers also comprise of several influential groups. The other factor of this complexity in the field of USA foreign policy is diversity and plurality in number of organizational (institutional) and personal actors. The major actors in this scene are as follows:

1-1-1- Governmental and official actors

a) The executive power

The influential organizations include presidency office, White House, National Security Council, Department of Foreign Affairs, Department of Defense (DoD), Department of Homeland Security, Central Intelligence Agency (CIA),

Federal Reserve Department, Department of Treasury, Department of Commerce, Department of Justice (Attorney General), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

- b) The persons consist of president, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, National Security Advisor, Chairman of CIA, Chief of Staffs of USA Army, Head of Staffs in White House, and American ambassadors in important countries.
- c) Congress and USA Supreme Court: They include important institutions such as Committees of Foreign policy, military services, budget, and the relevant courts to diplomatic issues and their main personal actors comprise of heads of majority and minority in senate and the parliament, the chairmen of congressional committees relevant to diplomatic subjects and the master representatives from the rival party in these committees, senators, and critic representatives in congress, and master staffs in senators and representatives' offices as well as judges from National Supreme Court.
- d) Democratic and Republican parties
- e) State and local governments including mayors of important cities, governors of states, foreign trade agents from states

1-1-2- Actors and informal layer:

- a) Presidents, high-ranking political officials and the former ministers of department of foreign affairs (e.g. Clinton and Kissinger), first-rank well-to-do, owners of great economic enterprises, mass media and cultural and cinematic officials;
- b) Some institutions such as interest groups, backrooms and diplomatic institutes, important universities, mass media, churches and religious institutes, ethnic minorities, labor unions, guild associations, lobby corporations (more than 45 thousand formal lobby enterprises are active in diplomatic field

in USA), financial, economic, and commercial firms and institutions, Hollywood, Non-Governmental Associations and Companies in foreign scene (like Watch Human Rights, Friends of the Earth International Network, and Women Association).

There are several models in analysis of decision-making process to explore these elements and way of their effect and affection in diplomatic field of USA including Rational Actor Model (RAM), Organizational Process Model (OPM) or Organizational Behavior Model (OBM), and Governmental Politics Model (GPM). The rational actor model (RAM) is based on Theory of Rational Choice. In this model, which considered as the most prevalent model for analysis of diplomatic decision-making, the government is analyzed as the most essential unit within the framework of relations between the governments. These governments make their rational decisions based on priorities and maximization of their interests [10]. In this model, the governmental actor always regulates his objective together with diplomatic preferences and defines his facilities and solutions to achieve the given goal. Similarly, the government selects the way with the greatest benefits according to logic of realism in addition to review the possible results from his policies.

The Organizational Process Model (OPM) is also a model that has been noticed by thinkers of political sciences in analysis on diplomatic decision-making process with respect to importance of informal institutions such as NGOs, enterprises and interest groups, and mass media in affecting on public opinions and pressure on behavior of the governments. In this model, diplomatic decision-making process is affected by non-governmental actors in the formal institutions. At the same time, organizational behavior model tends to describe decision through the existing governmental structures. In this model, decisions are not simultaneously made inside these structures, but they are formed in the existing governmental organizations and their operational trends are regulated over the time. Like the organizational behavior model, the governmental politics model

is made in the governmental organizations but it differs from this model in that the policies and operational processes are not naturally regulated and over the time, but they are implemented in bargaining and interaction/ diversity between various actors (especially the governmental leaders on the one hand and subordinated institutions on the other hand) since each of actors has specific agenda and tends to certain result from decision making. Unlike rational actor model (RAM), in the aforesaid models, the diplomatic decision-making trend requires many information, resources, and data, which should be prepared and put at actors' disposal. The Bureaucratic- Politics Model is in fact composed of two models of organizational behavior and governmental politics and it emphasizes on role of formal and governmental institutions. In this model, the governmental organizations make decision based on their tasks and interests within the framework of national policy in competitive form and decisions are made not based on viewpoint of a single person (e.g. president) or based on rational decision among the actors, but also according to bargaining and interaction/ diversity between various organizations each of which has special plan [1]. In all of above-said models, decision-making is the output from a process that is oriented by the government and bureaucratic institutions inside a box, which is called 'Black Box'.

Unlike the above models in Political Process Model (PPM), it is emphasized on decision-making internal process inside black box as well as external actors. In this model, which is called as 'Gray Box' or the same as the actors outside the black box, bureaucracy is deemed as non-dominant actor and it especially used further under non-critical conditions when decision-making processes are long and the role of non-governmental actors is increased.

1-2- The model and formal effective factors on USA foreign policy

The policymaking includes a formal trend, which has been regulated to achieve the best result. The executive power and congress are tasked with this responsibility in USA. But these are exclusively some general titles and several actors intervene in

this process. Bow indicates their relative influence in formation of USA foreign policy by drawing a circular model from these actors.

He puts the president and his key advisors, especially the secretaries of state, defense, commerce and treasury, and national security advisor, and staffs in National Security Council at the center of this model. The executive and legislative powers are two formal institutions, which are tasked with determination of USA foreign policy by the constitutions. But this part of constitutions is not an exception to this rule in which some of its general features include a lot of ambiguities and some unclear parts of it. The authors of constitutions divided the power among various bodies in order to prevent from creation of a excessively powerful federal government (which they assumed it as background for dictatorship) and at the same time they wrote most parts of constitutions in such a way that not to be restrictive and the next generations to be able to employ it according to requirements of their own time with new interpretations from this law. For this reason, the president and congress, or in other words the executive and legislative powers, are two important factors in determination of USA diplomatic decisions and either of them may use their available to change and amend it if it contradicts to the current trend. On many occasions, this overlapping of powers has typically led to a type of conflict among two powers and occurrence of dispute over the expression of the final decision.

2- Foreign policy and international relations from views of two parties

2-1- Democrats: supporters of active diplomacy and enforcement of power with international unanimity and agreement

The polling signifies that national securities and terrorism are the major concerns for Americans in 21st century. But 59% of people assume the republicans and 19% of them deem the democrats as efficient to resolve this problem [4]. Given this fact, the democrats should make further efforts to acquire supporting for their own foreign policy. At the present, fundamentalism, emerging of superpowers, developing annihilating weapons,

uncertain energy sources, food and water, continuous gap among the poor and the rich, the speed of information and communication modern technologies are considered as some challenges on which the democrats emphasize to tackle with them. They develop USA interests from Baghdad to Kandahar, Karachi, and Pecking, Berlin and Bamako (Mali Capital) and call it defense from these interests as the preference in foreign policy. From their view, during term of presidency of George W. Bush the republicans overlooked international efforts (especially about International Criminal Court and Kyoto Protocol) in pursuance to his narrow-minded ideology and rather than this point that issue improved USA face as a haughty and forerunner superpower, it caused undermining of its allies and increased resistance against USA policies and expansion of terrorism under the worst conditions [2]. The Democratic Party maintains that there is no more important priority than renewal of USA leadership on the world scene and to the extent this factor depends on military power, it requires diplomatic skills as well. Therefore, all elements of American power should be employed to preserve security, freedom and welfare, and against threats and instead of alienation from the world, American nation should take this leadership once more so that this party has proposed some strategies to tackle with the challenges to which USA is exposed in the current world [3] in which it has been emphasized on USA active diplomacy throughout the world.

2-1-1- Failure of Al-Qaeda and fighting against extremism: Iraq is not the central front in war against terrorism and Al-Qaeda should be failed in Afghanistan and Pakistan. USA should contribute to establishment of a stable government in Afghanistan and not to allow this country to be turned into a base for terrorists. Expansion of relations with Pakistan also plays important role in control of terrorism. From the democrats' view, USA measure in military fighting against terrorism should improve the face of this country as a benevolent and respected superpower not a timid and concerned power [8]. With reference to novel extremism (radicalism), they assume this

point that there are three threats from Muslim world for USA: a) The issue of Islamist rebels; b) transnational Islamist terroristic networks; c) the subject of Iran's efforts to acquire nuclear weapon that is most challenging issues [8]. The policy of democrats is to tackle with threats for supporting from the moderate forces in Islamic states.

- 2-1-2- *Prevention from developing nuclear arms and its deployment:* The nuclear arms, chemical and biologic weapons, and cyber war are three important components in this strategy at age of terror. To tackle with these three threats, democrats recommend some solutions: a) A world free of nuclear arms (reduction of reliance on nuclear arms and finally to remove them); b) Security and safety of the existing nuclear arms and prevention from terrorist's access to them; c) The end of nuclear cold war by concluding agreement among USA and Russia; d) Stopping the production of fissile materials; e) Denuclearization of North Korea.
- 2-1-3- *Renewal of military power:* To reconstruct USA leadership, the military power should be revived. The democrats believe in that the military power requires for stability more than anything else. Thus, the military costs should be increased (Chuck, 2004:155). Within this framework, the coercive measure should be taken, which is also deemed as personal defense, under the condition in which the world stability needs to it by cooperation and participation of other countries.
- 2-1-4- *Improvement of security with joint cooperation:* Deepening of relations with the newly emerging powers (India, China, Russia, Brazil, Nigeria, and South Africa) and revival of world institutions are some cases, which are placed in this strategy. Accordingly, the world security should be provided through cooperation among European and Asian allies as well

as African and American countries. The democrats assume Israel as a key ally with respect to their common interests and values with USA and they argue that paying attention to interests of this regime should be assumed as start point in Middle East talks. One of other cases considered by the democrats includes security of Israel and granting of military aids to it and emphasis in placement of *Quds* (Jerusalem) in Israeli territory. One of the other critiques proposed by the democrats to Bush's administration is the ignoring the dispute among Palestine and Israel. Nonetheless, they confirm Bush's policies in defending from Israel and condemnation of supporting of autocrat Palestinian government from terrorism [4].

- 2-1-5- *Progress of democracy and development:* The respect for human rights, creating democratic institutes, giving help to human community to get rid of poverty, hungry, and campaign against human smuggling (trafficking) are considered as motto of democrats in this part.
- 2-1-6- *Environmental protection with providing energy security and fighting against climatic changes:* The energy security, reduced oil consumption to 35% by 2030, consuming clean energy and fighting against climatic changes are the latest cases of seven strategies to tackle with the threats to which USA is exposed in the recent century (Chuck, 2004:168).

Given these strategies, this point may be revealed that the democrats act as a bridge among American internationalism and liberal nationalism with supporting from alliance and developing USA interests and values as well as military power of USA while the republicans pay more attention to liberal nationalism and assume USA military power as important in upgrading American national security so this approach has been disclosed, especially in foreign policy of the conservationists.

- 2-2- *The republicans' effort to stabilize hegemony based on military power*

Traditionally, foreign policy of the republicans is concerned with strong national defense. The document of USA national security strategy in 2002 has well-defined the ideological guideline of this party at modern age. The preemptive invasion constitutes a part of this document in which it has been emphasized on readiness of USA to prevent from threat or deployment of special weapons against USA and its confederates.

The republicans propose seven strategies for conservation of leadership and defense from USA interests in the world scene [8].

- 2-2-1- USA should be still pledged to play leadership role in world economy;
- 2-2-2- Due to USA dependency on oil in the Middle East, any instability and conflict in this region can affect on USA interests. Thus, the USA policy about energy is linked with economy and foreign policy and USA national security depends on political stability in Middle East and other oil and gas- producing regions in the world;
- 2-2-3- The preservation of USA security and interests will depend on alliance and coalition as well as international institutions. At the same time, USA membership in international organizations should not hinder this country from fulfilling the task of leadership and spreading its values. Participation in these organizations should not lead to damaging USA national interests [3];
- 2-2-4- USA still continued supporting from economic and democratic reforms, especially in the Middle East. These reforms are reflected from USA national values and interests and they lead to proximity of these countries to USA;
- 2-2-5- The western hemisphere should be preferred in foreign policy;

2-2-6- USA should cooperate with its allies to fight against poverty and spreading disease in the world;

2-2-7- USA should exploit from strong and general diplomacy to achieve the goals along with other tools. Setup radio channels like radio channel of freedom plays important role in substitution of modernization with fundamentalism and preservation from USA national interest.

The republicans have asked for developing their foreign relations, particularly with European Union, Russia, India, and China and deemed it vital for world stability and security. From the viewpoint of this party, EU formed the most successful historical military coalition with USA after September 11. Therefore, preservation of relation with this union is crucially important in foreign policy. Furthermore, the republicans assume stationing NATO Missile Defense System as an important and praiseworthy measure to support from the member states in this union against threat from Iran. The relationship with Middle East is also considered as an important part of diplomatic strategy for the republicans. In USA republicans' opinion, USA is pledged to guard Israel against the potential enemies. Unlike the democrats about Iraq, the republicans supported from Bush's invasion to this country and they implied restriction of Iran's influence in the Middle East as the major success due to this invasion in addition to prevention from conversion of this country as a base for Al-Qaeda. Also in Afghanistan, the republicans consider the prevention from emerging Al-Qaeda again as one of their own achievements [9].

Generally, the democrats often take liberal and idealist approach while the republicans are supporters of realism and conservatism so this type of attitude may leave its specific consequences in military, political, and international economic forums. The liberal compromisers and conservative radicals are both agree in three ideals of deterrence of proliferation of nuclear arms, defense from allies, and spreading democracy, but there are wide gaps between them in the field of some ideals including environment, international economic

cooperation, addressing hungry, controlling weapons, strengthening United Nations, improving life in developing countries, and human rights. These factors are in high priority from liberalists' view, but military superiority, confrontation with drugs trafficking, and illegal immigrants are some ideals, which are considered more important by conservative group [9].

2-3- Intergroup factionalism

Two democratic and republican parties propose a single factional declaration for their fans, but whereas there is no factional discipline in both parties therefore every one may behave in various issues proportional to his/ her taste and will. The differences of opinion, which lead to intergroup factionalisms, can be explored from three viewpoints. One is geographic zones; two is separation of powers; and three is political affairs.

2-3-1- Geographic zone (state and regional issues): The dynamism of factional policies during the former century originates from rising division of parties based of geography. Regardless of nature of the discussed issues in political logic, the subject of geography is also passed through a long path in definition of differences among parties and inside them. Each of five states includes one Democratic Party and one Republican Party from geographic dimension. Hence, 50 parties have been formed based on geography inside any major party at this country each of them may prioritize their favorable issues and proportional to political, social, economic, and cultural conditions to their state versus other subjects. Identifying state factions depends on recognition of difference among these states. For instance, the special social conditions and public welfare in northeastern states have caused the democrats to become liberal versus southern states. The regionalism also affects on inter-factional gaps in addition to impact of state- related attitudes. Any region of the country has relatively entered in the world economy and it deems necessary the certain foreign and

economic policy for the country; with respect to their dominant position in each of regions, the parties may consider different foreign and economic policy. From this perspective, the Republican Party has two internal factions: Wall Street and Main Street.

Wall Street faction is deemed moderate and it is mainly focused in urban- inhabited and wealthy regions at eastern states and developing cities beside the seashore of Pacific Ocean. Due to its social base, this faction admits government's limited intervention in economy and believes in internationalist foreign policy. The Wall Street faction takes internationalist foreign policy and it supports internally from Cain's economic and cautious policy. Eisenhower and Nelson Rockefeller were the objective embodiment of Wall Street group that they were essentially moderate and sought for public satisfaction [6]. Unlike Wall Street, The Main Street faction took conservative procedure and it includes various rightist extremist attitudes. The Main Street group resides geographically at mid-west, south, and mainly in rural communities, small towns, and agrarian states and they oppose to any governmental intervention in economic and social affairs. This faction mainly comprises of fanatic Protestants and believers in religion and familial values. They seek for separation in diplomatic scene or at least reduction of responsibility of federal government outside the borders and they search for freedom of action versus the federal government in the scene of domestic policy. Ronald Reagan was one of the salient figures in Main Street faction.

The Democratic Party also includes some division regionally. This party acquires power traditionally from southern states. With respect to policy of this party in supporting from workers and immigrants, a major part of inhabitants in northern states are deemed as adherents for democrats as well. Acquisition of support in northern regions was formed in 1930s mainly with execution of Roosevelt's policy to improve economic situations in USA. Implementation of this plan affected significantly in upgrading life level for immigrants and low-income workers in northern states. The most basic regional

difference occurs inside the Democratic Party between southern conservatives and northern liberals. The gap between these two groups became further in 1960s when the northern liberals came to power and asked for observance of individual rights. In this period, a serious conflict occurred between northern democrats with traditional and reactionary southern democrats in such a way that some of democrats joined to the Republican Party.

2-3-2- Separation of powers: According to this variable, the ruling power of parties has been divided among presidency faction and congressional faction. The factional distinct features of these two factions have caused some of them to introduce USA factional system as four factional system including presidency democrats, presidency republicans, congressional democrats, and congressional republicans [5]. These two factions in any party are separated from each other and at the same time they are overlapped and they possess various supporting bases. The presidency factions tend to attract supporting from urban inhabitants in great states while the congressional factions are more sensitive to rural and outskirt regions.

This point can be implied that the congressional faction in both parties may not mutually agree in some cases. This event occurs under the influence by three factors including changes in geographic organization, institutional control, and economic conditions. The representatives from any faction need to support from their clients in order to be elected again and they should avoid from those decisions, which may undermine their positions in the given electorate since the addition product is zero in this game and success of any party is equal to failure of the other party. On the other hand, the institutional control variable affects on cooperation among two parties; namely, when no party fully possesses power, the members of congress, especially the moderates, tend further to cooperation, but when a party takes the power of both White House and Congress at the same time, the further collision may occur between two parties [6]. Also from economic perspective,

when the conditions are under appropriate status, the representatives may less notice the factional differences and inversely the disputes are revealed further under economic difficult conditions. At this time, the democrats mainly emphasize in workers' claims while the republicans further focus on benefits of great merchants.

2-3-3- Political issues: The adherents of both parties take various attitudes in respect of several domestic and global issues. The conservatives are the majority in the Republican Party while the liberals are the majority faction in the Democratic Party. There are some other intellectual groups and factions along with these two groups in any party, which could manifest their own attitudes on some occasions.

The intellectual tendencies are very various in the Democratic Party. Overall, there are five major tendencies inside the Democratic Party including the conservative democratic council, American supporters for democratic initiative, democratic peasant-worker, defender democrats and liberals (Mellow & Trubowitz, 2005:671). The conservative democratic council requests for reduction in governmental role, lowering taxes, improvement of private enterprises, and developing free trade market outside the USA with protection from general ideological leftist principles. The adherents for democratic initiative may support from governmental intervention in economic and social plans. This faction comprises of the leftmost point in Democratic Party. The northeastern and northwestern states, especially Washington State, are considered as the main base for leftist faction of Democratic Party. The democratic faction of peasant-worker is liberal radical and defender democrats are deemed ad followers of Truman while the liberals are assumed as supporters for rights of minorities.

Also in diplomatic dimension, democrats are divided into two groups of liberal and supportive internationalist. The liberal internationalists assume necessary to develop democracy for the world stability by following of Wilson's paradigm and they believe that democratic peace can be achieved more easily by activity in

multilateral institutions than enforcement of coercive power. The democratic supporters are also fans of St. Jackson and they believe that USA power should be progressed in line with rising peace and security inside the country [5]. Also four internal factions can be recognized in the Republican Party in terms of diplomatic attitude out of which the neoconservatives are the most well-known. Like followers of St. Wilson, the neoconservatives argue that employing military force by USA will contribute to spread democracy throughout the world. What it distinguishes the conservatives from followers of Wilson, is their commitment to application of military force. The neoconservatives are Wilson's followers with machine gun in hands. The orthodox Christians establish close relations with modern conservatives. They ask for improvement of religious institutions and financial supports from federal government for churches and clerical institutes. This faction is related to Jewish groups inside and outside USA and for this reason they are called Zionist Christians.

The conservative or traditional radicals are other group that emphasizes on USA superiority in the world. The radicals agree to unilateralism and argue that USA follow-up from international organization may reduce the authority of this country in the global scene. In contrast, the moderate republicans are traditional realist faction that support from power balance and believe that the international system can be managed with a combination of enforcement of power, diplomacy, and multilateralism. They believe in playing more active role in international system at diplomatic scene. Isolationists are deemed as another spectrum of Republican Party, which include classic and moderate isolationists. The classic group asks for reducing USA overseas responsibilities and in contrast the moderate group is loyal to Jackson's tendency and they accept USA intervention outside its borders under the conditions that this measure is aligned with prevention from damaging USA interests [5].

3- Role of congress in USA foreign policy

With respect to the powers given to congress of this country in USA constitution including in senate and House of Representatives, the

congress may play several roles like affecting in the path and goal of USA foreign aids, approval and or rejection of bilateral and multilateral treaties as well as enforcement of sanction against a certain country or actor in the relevant issues to foreign policy. Given such powers, the congress and specially House of Senate is assumed as an important institution in foreign and executive policymaking at USA. For example, whereas granting of foreign aids is considered as one of the tools for influence of USA foreign policy thus the type of congressional decisions within the framework of approval of laws regarding quality and or terms of granting such aids and or determination of possible paths and goals for these aids may extremely affect on execution of foreign policy of USA government. Likewise, whereas final acceptance of any bilateral or multilateral treaty by USA government will be subjected to approval by vote of two-third members in senate thus the political preferences and interest of senators may play important role in acceptance and fulfillment of USA government's obligations in foreign field and this issue certainly affects on quality of foreign policy in this country.

In addition to these cases, what it more clearly discloses the role of congress in USA foreign policy especially in its relationship with Iran, returns to its decisions in approval of several acts within the framework of enforcement of embargoes against other countries so that the congress will be entitled to ratify laws as it discerns thereby it can enforce some commercial or political constraints against other nations. Although, playing such a role by the congress has been usually done through coordination of USA government, in the case of difference in congressional opinion from the government of this country, making such measures by the congress will essentially affect on way of implementation of USA foreign policy since it has exerted the legal constraints on it. Therefore, one could find the importance of congressional elections and the consequences of rate of political coordination or non-concordance between its members with the government (Porter, <http://usforeignpolicy.about.com>).

With respect to roles of congress in USA foreign policy, the midterm elections in USA House of Senate in November of current year may influence the USA foreign policy from two dimensions. One dimension of this influence refers to the present time and the other dimension will depend on the result of elections. Whereas some part of promotions and efforts for acquisition of votes from both Democratic and Republican Parties as well as the criteria of voters are related to diplomatic issues therefore the achievement and performance of current foreign policy in Obama's administration and attitudes of the Republican critiques will be effective in model of voting of citizens. Thus with respect to failure and unsuccessful result of democrats' foreign policy in Obama's government, particularly in respective of Syrian developments, compromise talks for the occupied Palestine, Ukraine, and Iraq, it seems that the republicans extremely emphasize in failures of democrats in their propaganda in these fields. In contrast, democrats and especially Obama's government will try to acquire some achievements in the field of foreign policy within the remained deadline. One could analyze the USA effort in its seriously presence in nuclear talks and its motive and requirement for acquiring final nuclear agreement with Iran and eventually resolving this international dispute within this framework in such a way that an agreement in this regard may be deemed as an achievement for presentation in electoral campaign is one of the motives of Obama's administration in nuclear talks since it has been exposed to some failures in other diplomatic fields. In fact, it is even possible under the influence of congressional midterm elections that we witness short-term and tactic changes in some obstinate stances of USA current government versus some foreign issues as well by aiming at acquiring several achievements for presentation in the field of elections.

But the other effective dimension of the forthcoming midterm elections will depend on results of elections and subsequently this may be followed by probable changes in policies of congress in the field of foreign issues. However, the majority in USA House of Representatives is currently at republicans' disposal, due to this fact that the democrats have so far preserved their

relative but fragile majority in senate; despite of some disagreements with Obama's diplomatic approaches, the congress could not yet create significant challenges for the government in this area. But it seems that the imminent midterm elections will also change the composition of House of Senate since several wide critiques have targeted Obama's government and the democrats in both domestic and foreign policies. Moreover, the voting pattern in two recent midterm elections at congress also shows that the side of scales will be in favor of the republicans in November elections of current year; therefore, it seems logic and practical to expect for success of the republicans in acquiring majority of senate votes. Certainly one could wait for several changes in patterns of senate behavior and generally in congress regarding diplomatic issues under the influence of such a result as the outcome of elections. In this regard, with respect to subject and critical axes by senators and the republicans in House of Representatives, it seems that the most of changes return to congressional approach toward foreign policy regarding the relevant issues and subjects to Iran's nuclear issue and type of interaction with Russia and Middle East related subjects. Given the possible winning of the republicans in the future elections and with respect to their positions regarding Iran and particularly the nuclear issue, it can be expected that USA current foreign policy about Iran's nuclear issue will be changed under the influence of taking power by the republican radicals in senate. This issue is revealed in stances and attitudes of current republican senators and leaders of this party.

Under the conditions when Obama's diplomatic establishment tries achieving a comprehensive agreement with Iran in nuclear area because of various reasons by taking some measures like lack of enforcement of new sanctions or reduction in rate of pressures, the republicans strive to compel him to retreat by exertion further pressures on Iran such as approval of wider sanctions on Iran. Taking this type of position during recent weeks was shown in effort of the republicans in the congress for proposing a bill to lack of extension of holding talks again with Iran and exertion of further embargoes on this country in the case of lack of agreement so that although

this bill will not be currently approved in senate due to presence of majority of democrats, in the case of victory of the republicans in the imminent elections, one could predict approval of such bills and acts to increase pressure on Iran within the framework of their attempt and this will also affect on the foreign policy of this country in respect of Iran with respect to role and legal position of congress in USA foreign policy issues. However, this issue may be accompanied with some reactions by Iran so taking such a position may be expectable regarding Russia by the republicans in the congress. Namely, if the pattern of midterm elections in November follows the pattern of elections in the previous careers and the republicans win the elections, one should wait for more strict measure by American congress in interaction to and diversity with Russia since a lot of critiques proposed by the republicans in respective of Obama's government foreign policy are related to lack of firm and definite behavior in reaction to the Russia.

It can be mentioned in this sense that the future composition of USA senate will move toward several measures such as approval of further sanctions against Russia and it will put Obama's administration under pressure in diversity with this country in some crises like Ukraine to take more strict stances. But regarding the effect of elections on USA Middle East relevant policy, the current critiques against Obama should be taken into consideration and at the same time the effect of element of Israel and Israeli lobby in process of elections should be noticed. So given the relative proximity of Israel lobby to the republicans, this lobby will support the republican candidates in the elections and in the case of winning of the republicans in elections, the congress will take further measures to support from Israel in such a way that it is possible to rush further aids into Israel with pressure on the government and other American institutes and also Israel's interests to be further considered in the regional issues and in USA policies relating to Middle East. This issue will be more probable, especially with respect to differences among Obama and democrats in some issues like Iran with Israel leaders. But the other relevant element in this regard refers to the republicans' critiques from Obama's policies in issues relating to Syria

and Iraq in such a way that Obama is accused that he has not undertaken the needed role to play it efficiently by taking cautious stances. For this reason, in the case of wining of the republicans in elections, one should wait for exerting further pressure on the government in the congress in order to play efficient role in Middle East related issues.

Conclusion

Although taking a specific policy in international scene is influenced by USA national interests, this issue is also related to the party, which takes the power. Two governing parties in USA represent two intellectual groups; however they are not opposite to each other, they do not agree in achieving American objectives and ideals to the extent that one party is totally known as the conservative and the other party is recognized as liberal. The republicans, who are well-known for their conservative paradigms, emphasize in reducing government's role in economic and social affairs in the field of domestic policy while they believe in that the government should exploit from any tool for authoritative support from USA interests in the field of international policy. Overall, the republicans are not satisfied with anything less than USA leadership role in various international forums and in fact they assume all interventions of this country in other nations relating to this subject and they argued that they should act powerfully in any part of the world where this role is subjected to the risk. They mention protection from the leadership role as red line for membership in these institutions by admission of this point that preservation from USA security and interests in long run depends on alliance, coalition, and also support from international institutions.

In contrast, with respect to their liberal policy in domestic and foreign issues, they emphasize on pluralism, open and responsive structure, and peaceful approach to the opposite group. The democrats reject unilateralism in utilization of coercion and they argue that coercive tools should employed by coordination and participations of other countries in addition to the conditions considered as individual defense under the situation when the world stability needs to it. Although the democrats assume the effort for

acquisition and preservation of USA leadership as the preference in their foreign policy in international scenes, they believe that their country should tackle with international threats as a benevolent and respective superpower. While both parties agree on non-proliferation of nuclear arms, defense from the allies, and spreading democracy, they have tangible difference of opinion about subjects relating to international economic cooperation, controlling weapons, strengthening of United Nations, improving life in developing countries, and human rights, this issue may be totally revealed through comparing the performance of two parties at the time taking power in White House. The essential point is that both parties take step in the course of increasing USA power and stabilization of its leadership despite of such differences.

References:

- [1] Baugh, W. H. 2000. United States foreign policy making; Process, Problems and Prospects, Earl McPeck.
- [2] Chuck Hagel, 2004, "A Republican Foreign Policy, Foreign Affairs, July/ August.
- [3] Dana H. Allin, Philip H. Gordon and Michael E O Hanlon, 2003, "The Democratic Party and Foreign Policy, World Policy Journal, Spring, pp. 7-16.
- [4] Jo Freeman, 1986, "The Political Culture of the Democratic and Republican Parties, Published in the Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 101, No. 3, pp. 327-356.
- [5] Mellow Nicole & Peter Trubowitz, 2005, "Red versus Blue: American Electoral Geography and Congressional, Bipartisanship, Political Geography.
- [6] M.J.C. Wile (2005), The politics and rule in United States, Transl. Ganji Ghorban Ali, Tehran: Ghomes Pub.
- [7] Porter Keith, The role of the Congress: Who makes U.S. foreign policy
<http://usforeignpolicy.about.com>
- [8] Renewing America's Promis, 2008, The Draft 2008 Democratic National Platform, Convention Platform Standing, Convention Committee, Inc., August, pp. 24-37.
- [9] Republican Platform, 2008, at http://www.Gop.Com/pdf/PlatformFINAL_WithCover.Pdf.
- [10] Wittkopf, E. R., Boyer, M. A., Jones, C & Kegley, C. W. 2007. American Foreign Policy: Pattern and Process, Thomson/Wadsworth