

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The study of state actors becomes the subject of contemporary international relations studies, the various issues that occur are increasingly varied so that many international relations scholars are increasingly placing their focus on the wealth of issues regarding state actors in the study of international relations. Often, studies on state actors appear with discussions that refer to the unfinished problem of conflict between state actors. The higher level of complexity may have contributed to the interest of scholars to study more deeply about international relations, especially those that put the focus on the dynamics of relations between countries in the world after the end of the second world war and consequently, trigger the complexity of relations between countries that is getting higher.

There are at least three reasons that cause this complexity to increase: First, the multiplication of actors in the field of international relations, among which disputes may arise; This multiplication is not only in terms of the types of actors but also the number of each type of actors. Second, the multiplication of the number of problems that can be the cause of the dispute. Third, the multiplication of ways and tools that can be used to resolve disputes in the future (Wright, 2013). In this complexity, often these interrelated state actors create friction with each other due to differences in interests, so that conflicts between state actors become unavoidable (Suissa, 2011).

In the post-cold war international political order, issues that have become the focus of attention of international actors are no longer only focused on the balance of power between the western and eastern blocs. Issues around human rights, the environment, free trade, peace in the Middle East, Weapons of Mass Destruction and terrorism were then also of concern. Among these international issues, the issue that stands out is the

Middle East. This is because the Middle East Region can be said to be one of the regions in the world that is never devoid of security problems, the Middle East Region is an area full of conflict. The Middle East region is an area that has strategic importance not only for countries located in the region but also for countries located outside the region, in this case, western countries such as the United States (Shah, 2011).

One of the interesting issues regarding the complicated relationship of one of the countries in the Middle East Region with one of the western countries, is the long dynamic relationship that occurs between Iran and the United States. As the two big countries that have major influence in the world of international relations, America and Iran have made a major contribution to the issue of the dynamics of complex relations between state actors. Therefore, scholars have studied a lot about the dynamics of the long journey regarding the complicated relationship debate between America and Iran which is often referred to as 'The Endless War' or war that never ends (Feffer, 2020).

One of the complicated dynamics that has been going on for a long time between Iran and America is related to the issue of the nuclear agreement that occurred after the change of leadership in America. Iran and the United States (US) have both attended together with various partner countries to agree on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) in 2015 or commonly known as the nuclear agreement. The agreement, which also involves China, France, Germany, Russia, Britain, and the European Union, emphasizes the peaceful use of Iran's nuclear power (El Khalfi, 2020). For President Obama at the time, this agreement was seen as one of the new hopes for a safer world (Hafezi et al., 2015). . In addition, the agreement made Iran begin to be freed from economic sanctions imposed by multilateral organizations and countries due to its nuclear development (El Khalfi, 2020).

The JCPOA is a deal in exchange for the lifting of sanctions against Iran. Under the agreement, Iran has lowered its uranium enrichment and pledged not to develop nuclear

weapons to lift international sanctions. This agreement stops Iran's nuclear development program, where Iran will be supervised by the United Nations nuclear monitoring team from the IAEA. Under the 2015 nuclear deal, Iran is allowed to have only 300 kilograms of uranium compared to the previous 100,000 kilograms. Iran can only enrich uranium up to 3.67% which can only be used for energy but is far from the 90% needed for nuclear weapons (El Khalfi, 2020). The agreement also limits ownership of Iran's decomposition facilities and only to older facilities that decompose uranium longer. Iran also has to reorganize its water reactor so it cannot produce plutonium and agreed to transfer the Fordo enrichment site, located in the remote mountains, to a research center. The inspection team from the IAEA must also gain access to Iran's nuclear facilities. These restrictions will be replaced by the removal of economic sanctions that exclude Iran from world oil banking and trade. Iranian assets worth billions of US dollars abroad will be returned, and Iran is allowed to buy commercial aircraft and conduct business deals with outside companies (Katzman & Kerr, 2016).

Over time, with the change in American leadership led by President Donald Trump, it has sparked a long nuclear-related dispute between Iran and America in the JCPOA. In 2018, Donald Trump canceled America's involvement in the agreement that had been formed in the JCPOA (Kerr & Katzman, 2018). Trump's attitude like this can be traced since his campaign period when he stated that the negotiators in the JCPOA agreement were not competent in making policy (Lee, 2015). Trump said the deal brought Iran closer to building its current nuclear weapon. However, The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which monitors Iran's nuclear program, said the allegations were not true. The IAEA stated that Iran complied with all prohibitions contained in the JCPOA. However, Donald Trump ignored this assumption, and he still thinks that the JCOPA agreement will not bring peace and tranquility (Murphy, 2018). The JCPOA has been threatened with failure due to the unilateral withdrawal from

America in 2018 which was followed by political pressure and American economic sanctions on Iran. The foreign policy made by Donald Trump to leave the JCPOA caused an interesting discussion in the study of international relations and at the same time, many of the partner countries also disagreed with the foreign policy. So, in the context of this study, the author will analyze the causes of Donald Trump's foreign policy changes related to his decision to withdraw America from involvement in the JCPOA. This research will stand on the analysis of changes in foreign policy at the individual level, which is considered a state actor, which means that Donald Trump as the American president is the perpetrator of the issuance of the foreign policy.

B. Research Question

What are the factors influencing Donald Trump's change in foreign policy regarding America's withdrawal from the JCPOA?

C. Theoretical Framework

To understand the existing problems, the authors use the Theory and Concepts as follows:

1. Constructivism Theory

The theory of Constructivism in International Relations speaks of ideas and norms in people's social life such as environmental and human rights issues. This theory seeks to explain how the natural state of nature changes in world politics, where the world today has become more global and democratic so that other actors have emerged. The emergence of these actors also participates in managing various state affairs, not only the state that interferes in the foreign affairs of a country (Barnett, 2019).

An approach with constructivist theory is useful for knowing the true nature, such as violence, class, gender, racial issues, and so on. Constructivism not only explains but understands a phenomenon (Dunne & Wheeler, 1999).

Constructivist theory departs from social theory to illustrate how social science can help international relations scholars to understand how important norms and identities are in world politics. The theory of constructivism deals with the relationship of norms, ideas, and interests. They argue that there is no tension between the interests and sovereignty of the state and moral principles when it comes to countermeasures and protections of human rights. The point in this theory is the attention to the nature of the constitution to the realities of international politics, especially how states are formed and formed, as well as sharing values and norms.

Constructivism also weighs on human consciousness and its role in transnational life, using ideas as structural factors, considering the dynamic relationships of ideas and material forces because of how actors interpret material reality, and its importance in how agents create structures and how structures make agents. Thus, constructivism is generally a social theory that focuses on the conceptual relationship between agents and structures (Dunne & Wheeler, 1999).

Constructivism according to (Morgan, 2017), mentions 'social facts' such as sovereignty, rights, or money, which have no material reality, but remain important and realistic by a society that behaves accordingly. This construction of reality or as we often know it as objective reality has a lot to do with the concept of 'social facts'. It is with this existence that it shapes how we categorize and treat it with it. The questions that social constructivism always faces are when the norm changes, what causes the change in the norm, how the actor accepts the change in the norm, whether the actor persuades or forces the other to accept the new norm (Morgan, 2017).

This theory has different arguments about increasing sovereignty and its impact on human rights and norms in a country. In the case of generalizing a substantive claim, we must describe who is the main actor, what is his interest and capacity, as well as what is at the core of the normative structure. As one example, to understand rebel groups, we must understand their point of view, their motivation with normative material in their

social structure. Just as if they want to get a peaceful situation or respect for humans during a war, then the originators must establish norms, ideas, and relationships constructed with interests and identities by actors at the time of the war (Morgan, 2017).

While the actors themselves can bring them into activities formed on a cultural basis, that doesn't mean that it's forever certain, especially when it comes to politics. Knowledge shapes how actors interpret and construct their social reality. Knowledge, such as symbols, rules, concepts, and categories shapes how individuals' structure and interpret or translate their world. Reality is not out there and waiting to be discovered or recognized, but it is history that produces and with culture, produces a knowledge that gives rise to the individual to construct and give the meaning of a reality. Briefly it has the meaning that existing categories help us to understand, and can define the notion of the world and its activities (Barnett, 2019).

Power is not only the ability of one actor to make another actor what they should and should not do, but also because of identity, interests, and meaning within the limits of the power possessed by the actor in controlling his life. Constructivists offer the essentials of seeing a power. Where in terms of power, the greater the power, the easier it is for them to convince others of their interests, such as to work together to formulate and produce a policy. Normative structures also shape the identities and interests of actors such as the state.

Some use constructivists to identify how identity shapes a country's interests and turn into rational choices¹ to understand strategies in various habits. Human rights are a concept where norms and values are championed at the end of the cold war. Human beings having the right to life, the right to security and dignity, the right to choose an appropriate job, and other rights, are a construction of a value and norm agreed upon by the international community regarding human rights.

The argument of this theory of constructivism is also that relations between countries have been changed by universal interests. The protection of human rights has been integrated

with the goals and morals of the modern state and has become a dominant rationale by allowing power and power by an organization into the territory of the sovereign unit. In addition, if a country rejects universal value, then they must be prepared to be faced with the existing consequences. This is like punishment, expenditure, coercive actions taken to force new standards into the legitimacy of a country (Dunne & Wheeler, 1999).

In a constructivist view (Barnett, 2019), they provide a good start in the study of international law by finding considerable common ground with legal theories. It goes on to say that by expanding political understanding including the issue of identity and its objectives and strategies by enacting regulations, norms and ideas constitutively, not by means of coercion, and with an emphasis on the importance of discourse, communication, and socialization with the framework of the habits of the actors.

2. Foreign Policy Changes in Individual Analysis

In the study of international relations, foreign policy analysis begins to develop theoretical views including examining how foreign policy is made and assumed by policy actors both individually and collectively. Human collective behavior has shaped the nation-state and the theory of international relations is part of human political choices. Thus, in the study of international relations has developed a theoretical perspective that is foreign policy analysis (Hudson & Vore, 1995).

Foreign policy analysis contains an examination of how foreign policy decisions are made and assumed by the substantial number of individual and collective human behavior that continues to change in international politics (Hudson & Vore, 1995). Furthermore, Foreign policy also an action by government authorities to maintain what is desired or change undesirable things from the international environment (Andriole, 2014; Dugis, 2007).

The study of foreign policy requires understanding the actions and behavior of international relations actors, especially states in the international environment. According to (Breuning, 2007: 18), foreign policy is defined as the totality of state policies towards interactions with the environment outside its borders. However, the perspective of foreign policy from the government's point of view and foreign policy as a study from the analysis point of view have different points of view. From a scientific point of view, several comparisons are used to carry out in-depth analyses that help evaluate expectations of whether the same actions produce the same results (Breuning, 2007: 27).

Foreign policy analysts do not just explain a decision or behavior but understand why a decision was made, what options should be considered, who or what explains the decision and what if the decision is unfavorable and whether it is possible to produce a better decision. So that in analyzing foreign policy it is necessary to think in terms of cause and effect (Dugis, 2007:55). For this reason, foreign policy will always move dynamically following the prevailing domestic and international environmental trends. The changing and unpredictable nature of the environment often leads to changes in a country's foreign policy. This then further shows that a country's foreign policy can change at any time depending on the internal and external factors that drive it.

Changes in foreign policy itself are still closely related to the desire of a country to fulfil certain interests. The change referred to in this context refers to the implementation of actions in certain situations that are different from previous actions (C. F. Hermann, 1990). More specifically, changes in a country's foreign policy can be studied through a structural approach which states that policy changes occur because of the government as the main actor to adjust their behavior in response to changes in the international and / or domestic political environment (Doerer & Eidenfalk, 2013: 319).

According to (Hermann, 1990:76), there are at least four typologies of foreign policy changes, namely: First, is adjustment change that represents minor changes that allow

foreign policy to change. There is a change in the scale of efforts carried out by the state but does not change the actions, methods, objectives, and nature of the policy. Second, is program change which implies a change to the intent and method of the policy, but the basic thing remains unchanged. This encourages the state to create recent programs and instruments in achieving its national interests through the formulation of new foreign policies.

Third, international orientation change which refers to a fundamental change of the overall orientation of the state towards relations between countries. Changes in foreign policy can occur through four aspects, namely first, the desire of the incumbent leader, second, bureaucratic advocacy, third, the domestic restructuring of a country, and the occurrence of external shocks. Fourth, is the problem or goal change that will be the focus of this research to classify the typology of Trump's foreign policy change towards withdrawal from the JCPOA, this typology refers to changes in the goals and objectivity of a country's foreign policy. Changes occur in the objectives of foreign policy where old policies are replaced with new policies. This can happen because the original purpose of the policy is something that is fundamental to the state and is no longer considered appropriate so that it needs to be changed or eliminated.

Changes in foreign policy are not only influenced by external factors, but also internal state factors such as regime change or state transformation and changes in government orientation when maximizing foreign policy (Dugis, 2007). Thus, this then illustrates that foreign policy, whether being drafted, existing, or being changed, does depend on the country's domestic politics.

There are structural changes that must be seen based on individual decision-makers and agency-based scholarships. If viewed from the individual decision-maker, there are several methodological situations that are needed, first, before structural changes occur, individuals involved in foreign policy changes must prepare themselves to provide explanations in the

form of speeches, words in interviews, and expressions that are desired in changing foreign policy. Second, other members of the decision-making process should not express the same idea over time which indicates the basic idea of the key change maker. Third, structural change can be recognized as an opportunity to change policy through policy makers in their statements (Doeser & Eidenfalk, 2013).

The most influential individual in the policy-making process is a leader. The leader referred to in the context of foreign policy analysis here is the figure of the executive leader of a country. If we discuss the level of foreign policy analysis in the context of an individual, then of course we are talking about the figure of a state leader as the most influential individual in the policy-making process concerning the country he leads, including foreign policy. When a state leader speaks, it is explicitly interpreted that the state is speaking (Neack, 2008: 35).

In understanding the individual approach as foreign policy analysis, it is necessary to understand the rational actor model approach. This approach tries to see the leader as the state itself because the leader's decision is seen as the decision of the state. In some cases, the psychological and emotional symptoms of the individual leader cause the leader to make decisions outside the line of national interest. On the other hand, in (Palmer & Bhandari, 2000) argues that individuals who are responsible for foreign policy must undergo a sufficient process of socialization, education and political selection. The reason is that everyone has their own interests as rational actors, so that through a process of socialization, education and politics that can produce harmony in achieving common goals. This alignment allows individuals to form coalitions to form regimes or support structures.

A leader in taking a policy certainly cannot be separated from the element of subjectivity which certainly affects the ideology and even the goals of a country. Margaret G. Herman (M. G. Hermann, 1980), explained the importance of conceptual schemes in knowing the personal characteristics of leaders

identified based on beliefs, motives, decision style and interpersonal style.

a) Trust

Refers to the views or assumptions of a leader in seeing the world. Because most events in the world, including conflict, can be predicted through interactions between individuals. Trust refers to the interpretation of a political leader who can influence his environment, his role, and the strategy he is pursuing. Trust in a political context refers to ideology or nationalism, even the ability to control or power of a leader.

b) Motive

That is the main reason or point why a leader takes what action. The motives of a leader are often exceedingly difficult to identify, but these motives can influence the type of leader's behavior in dealing with the interests of his government related to foreign affairs.

c) Decision Style

Refers to the method of making a leader's decision. Decision style components include openness to the latest information, consideration of the level of risk, complexity of the structure and process of obtaining information and tolerance for ambiguity.

d) Interpersonal style or personal characteristics

That is the way in which policy makers interact with other policy makers. There are two personal characteristics, namely Paranoia or excessive suspicion and Machiavellianism or manipulative behavior. Because a leader is sometimes full of motions of distrust of other leaders, so this is suspected as a warfare personality.

By using the conceptual scheme that has been described, this study will analyze the factors of changes in foreign policy caused by the personal characteristics of the leader (referring to the four points already mentioned), in this

case Donald Trump who withdrew from the JCPOA. The study of foreign policy analysis in understanding a leader is often taken from the concept of psychological studies. This is because foreign policy analysis wants to understand the motives or behavior of certain people such as state leaders, which have similarities with psychological studies which study the elements of a person's personality or personality. The difference is psychological studies do analysis directly with the subject while analyzing foreign policy at the individual level such as leaders and analysts do by observing indirectly (Breuning, 2007).

D. Hypothesis

In this study, the authors draw hypotheses through the concept scheme popularized by Margaret G. Herman (M. G. Hermann, 1980) to determine the personal characteristics of leaders identified based on beliefs, motives, decision styles, and interpersonal styles in changing foreign policy, in this case study. is Donald Trump's decision to leave the JCPOA:

1. Trust

In this conceptual scheme, it refers to how a leader sees the world and the ideology he believes in. In this case study, the author hypothesizes that Donald Trump's change in foreign policy to leave the JCPOA is a long history of conflict between America and Iran, plus Donald Trump's understanding of Islam phobia.

2. Motive

In this section, the author's hypothesis on Donald Trump's decision to leave the JCPOA is about efforts to bring down Iran by imposing international sanctions, this is driven by a long history of conflict between Iran and America.

3. Decision Style

In this section, the author hypothesizes that there will be at least three aspects that are considered by Donald Trump to issue a decision that America leaves the JCPOA, which include fulfillment of campaign promises (Internal) and the influence of Israel and its elite (external).

4. Interpersonal style

In this section, the author believes that Donald Trump's suspicion of Iran which will benefit from the JCPOA and Iran's violation of promises by forming a terrorism movement against western countries became the dominant factors that pushed America out of the JCPOA. In addition, Donald Trump's manipulative attitude, which tends to falsely accuse Iran of these matters, has convinced Donald Trump to leave the JCPOA.

E. Research Methods

1. Types of research

In this study, the author uses a qualitative research method with a case study approach. Qualitative research can be interpreted as research that produces descriptive data regarding spoken and written words, and observable behavior of the people studied (Creswell, 2010; Prastowo, 2012). While the case study approach is a type of approach used to investigate and understand an event or problem that has occurred by collecting various kinds of information which is then processed to obtain a solution so that the problems revealed can be resolved (Gerring, 2004). This method will assist the author in explaining the factors that drive changes in foreign policy with descriptive analysis at the individual level, namely Donald Trump who decided to leave the JCPOA.

2. Data Retrieval Method

In this study, the author uses the literature review method to explain the case studies taken. Literature study aims to collect scientific data and information, in the form of theories, methods, or approaches that have developed and have been documented in the form of books, journals, manuscripts, notes, historical records, documents, news, and various other written sources that can support the writing of this research. (Bungin, 2011; Salim & Syahrums, 2012)

3. Data Type

In this study, the data source used is secondary data. Secondary data is a source of research data obtained through intermediary media or indirectly in the form of books, records, existing evidence, or archives, both published and not publicly published (Lexy J. Moleong, 2019).

4. Analysis Level

The level of analysis in this study is the level of individual analysis, which focuses on individuals as policy makers, how these individuals make policies, and analyzes the individual's point of view in making foreign policy and analyzes the influence of policies made by these individuals on the country that led (Breuning, 2007). . The individual referred to in this study is Donald Trump as the president of America who has an elite role in a country, which in this study can change its foreign policy.

F. Research Reach

The scope of this research is limited from the Donald Trump campaign in 2017, to America's withdrawal from the JCPOA in 2018.

G. Research Purposes

The purpose of this study is to analyze the factors that influence America's exit from the JCPOA during Donald Trump's leadership by examining them at the individual level, namely Donald Trump who decided for America to leave the JCPOA in 2018. Using the concept scheme of (M. G. Hermann, 1980), the writer will analyze the purpose of the research in terms of four aspects which include: Belief, Motive, Decision Style, and Interpersonal Style.

H. Writing System

The systematics of this writing are as follows:

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains the background of the problem, problem formulation, conceptual framework, research methodology, hypothesis, research scope, research objectives, and writing systematics. Chapter I describes the research to be carried out.

CHAPTER II: AMERICAN DYNAMICS WITH IRAN IN ACHING JCPOA

This chapter contains an overview of how the dynamics between America and Iran in reaching the JCPOA agreement and partner countries.

CHAPTER III: FACTORS AFFECTING DONALD TRUMP TO GET AMERICA OUT OF JCPOA

This chapter describes the analysis of the factors that influenced Donald Trump to get America out of the JCPOA

CHAPTER IV: CLOSING

This chapter contains several conclusions related to the results of research that has been carried out.