GLOBAL DILEMMA OF NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION: THE CASE OF IRAN

OSADEBAMWEN FRANCIS OSAYI
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY, EDO STATE, NIGERIA | *francis.osayi@uniben.edu*

KEYWORDS
WMD, National Interest, Nuclear Proliferation, Nuclear Weapons, NPT

ABSTRACT
The need for the international community to get her engagement right is crucial for the sustenance of Peace and security. The quest for self-preservation through the acquisition of nuclear weapons is often seen by other states as threat to their own existence. To balance the equation, supposed threatened states, irrespective of the cost implication, whether financially buoyant (as Iran) or not (as North Korea), joined the arms race. This of course has put a strain on global peace and security. The questions that this paper seeks to investigate are: If Iran has the intention of nuclear armament, why did she accede to all known conventions and treaties meant to rid the world of WMDs? Why do the US and the global community fear nuclear Iran? And what implication does nuclear Iran has for global peace and stability particularly in the Middle East region? The study adopts national interest as its theoretical framework. It finds that nuclear Iran poses a grave danger in the Middle East region and therefore recommended that there should be restrain in handling Iran and other middle level nuclear states.

Introduction

The immediate background to Iran nuclear arms program began on March 5, 1957through the atom of peace agreement under the auspices of Eisenhower' Program for atom of peace. The role of European governments, particularly from the West and Washington in nuclear program of Tehran went on till the Shah of Iran was removed through a revolution in the 1979 (Roe, 2007: Bruno, 2010). With support of Washington, the desire to build about 23 nuclear power plants by the year 2000 had earlier been given the nod by the Shah. The Shah had in March 1974 dreamt of a period when there would be an end to global oil supply as he observed that petroleum being a noble product is much too valuable to burn as Tehran (NTI 2006: Farhang,2006). This position of the US and other great powers exposes us to the reality of those responsible for the nuclearization of Iran.

The Iran-Iraq war and the revolution stalled the nuclear program due to Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini insistence that nuclear weapon are forbidden under Muslim ethics and jurisprudence. Iran started pursuing local nuclear fuel circle during the 1990s when she developed an infrastructure capable of mining uranium including experimentation of uranium enrichment and conversion. Iran nuclear activity consists of research reactor including facilities that can produce uranium, and two uranium mines. As Tehran continue to deny the presence of nuclear facilities in the country, a Paris-based opposition group by the nomenclature National Council of Resistance of Iran (NCRI) had in 2002 and2003 announced to the world the presence of nuclear facilities at Natanz and Arak. Iran later accepted she experimented with enrichment though on a Small scale and then suspended it in 2003 and restarted conversion of uranium and enrichment in 2005and 2006 respectively and increase same to 20 percent in the year 2010

(NTI. 2015). Moscow agency (ROSTOM) assisted Tehran with the completion of its first nuclear power plant which on the 12th of September 201 1 was officially commissioned (Ria, 2011).

Tehran told the international community about an ongoing 360mw nuclear power plant program which she said would be cited in Darkhovin with the intention of acquiring in no distant time, uranium mines and nuclear power plant of a medium size. This is despite the fact that she had signed and ratified the NPT in 1968 and 1970respectively; BWC in August 22, 1973 and CWC on January 13, 1993 which it ratified in November 1997, it test-fire a modern type of Shabab-3 distant range missile in 2008 which she says is capable of hitting Israel (BBC. 2015). It was expected that with the disintegration of USSR and the setting up of NPT, the appetite for states to acquire nuclear weapons will diminish. In the case of USSR, the thinking was, after the disintegration, the United States will be the sole global hegemon, the rallying point for the assurance of peace and security in the international system. This expectation did not materialize. It was as if the union kept all other members from seeking individual member nuclear weapon as the disintegration became the rationale for states to seek their own 'supposed' security in an anarchious global system.

National Interest: Theoretical and Conceptual Discourse

The question of what constitutes the interest of a nation and the problem of how to identify it have commanded the attention and energies of policy makers and theorists for several decades. Though the concept is not easily amenable to precise definition, yet it cannot be jettisoned as a basis for political analysis and action (Asobie, 2007). In the International Relations literature, there are basically three strands of national interest. They include the realist, Behaviouralists and political economy conceptions. This paper adopts the realist perspective as enunciated by Hans Morgenthau. According to him, national interest of a state must be the main objective of its foreign policy with power as the ultimate. Further, this interest can only be explained in relation to security of a nation which in turn be explained as the integrity of nations institutions and territory. He argued that a statesman would be acting against the national interest that is, behaving irrationally if he fails to pursue those concrete (and selfish) objectives dictated by national power. Furthermore, it considers the core interest of the nation as relatively permanent; it has to do with the protection of the cultural, physical and political environment of the nation from encroachment by other states; all other interest is peripheral, their pursuit depends upon the power of the nation (Morgenthau, 1948). The philosophical base of this Morgenthau theorizing is Hobbes theory of state. Hobbes was an apostle of state absolutism and a great philosopher of discipline, law and order obtained through conformity and unquestionable obedience. The raison d'etre of state is its own survival. Thus in the Hobbesian sense, national security is an end in itself (Asobie,2007).

The realist conception of national interest is based on the protection of the survival and security of a nation. For a state to survive in the face of threat or in hostile environment (as in the case Iran), its security and survival must be its primary interest. In sum, this school contends that Security becomes the foreign policy thrust of a state because of the anarchy in the international System. Security in this sense means discreet management of power which is tied to military capability. It is only through this way that national interest can be preserved (Grifhtns and O'Callaghan, 2001). Thus for Iran, if it must survive in a hostile and dangerous environment, and from hostile and aggressive neighbors in the most dangerous region of the world. Then it must be able to protect its national institutions, boundaries security and heritage. So Iran cannot be expected to dismantle fully in a region which is hostile to it. Iran' nuclear Program as study has shown, is not necessarily for prestige and influence as in DPRK but principally for deterrence against aggression, hostility and the unknown. Thus for Iran, national security and survival is not negotiable. This is not an attempt to justify nuclear Iran but to appreciate its equal right to nuclear arms (whether for military or civilian purposes) in the face of threat within its borders. For Gasimov (2012), this argument is not based on the fact that, because nation's relative power can be valued and judged, makes it become an important objective reality. National Interest must be explained in economic and strategic terms because the struggle of power among nations is what global politics is all about.

Iran Nuclear Weapons Program: Myth or Reality

The Iranian authority has continued both and abroad and at different fora denied the possession of nuclear weapons for deterrence or retaliation. For instance, Atomic Energy Organization of INS Iran (AEOI), through its head, said that if Tehran has nuclear weapons, she won't use them because they (Iran) didn't use chemical weapon against Iraq. This is so because there is no threat from the country's neighbors, whether in the Persian Gulf, Islamabad or Kabul, nor the northern neighbor Moscow, a powerful nuclear state which Tehran cannot match its nuclear might (Smyth, 2004). Similarly, Zarif (2005) argued that though Tehran is in midst of neighbors in possession of huge nuclear weapons, she is unlikely to go in that nuclear direction. Instead regional and global engagement and inclusion will be the only option through which Tehran can attain sustainable security. There has not been any great power nation whose capabilities have prevented from falling or failing in war. Hence former president Ahmadinejad of Iran, in an interview in 2008, was quoted as saying that nuclear weapons could not prevent USSR from separating nor going down neither could it aid Washington in prevailing inside of Kabul or Baghdad. He concluded by adding that nobody should see nuclear energy as nuclear bomb because this is a new century in which nuclear bomb is seen as belonging to last century. He had earlier announced in 2007 that his country has produced nuclear fuel threatening not to bow to pressure from any quarter. Again in 2011, Ahmadinejad reiterated his earlier stance on nuclear weapon that those seeking nuclear weapons are mentally retarded simply because nuclear bomb are no longer in vogue.

In a meeting with Directors and officials of the AEOI in 2012 in Iran, its Spiritual Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khameini reiterated his country's stance on nuclear weapon by saying that Tehran has never and will never pursue nuclear arms program. He viewed nuclear globalization whether in theory, religious or logic, a great sin because of its dangerous and destructive power (Press TV, 2012). This stance of Ali Akbar Salehi, Ahmadinejad and its Supreme Leader appeared convincing. The question remains: if this position of Iran is true, why would there be any form of negotiation with the 'big 5' and Berlin? Does Iran have nuclear weapons or the technology to build nuclear weapon? The investigation carried out by IAEA investigators in 2003-2004 for instance, opened a can of worms when it established that the country had over the last 20 years hidden its nuclear activities which include the separation of plutonium and uranium enrichment. Though Iran denied, evidential reports proved otherwise (Bowen, 2004). Iran, though admitted in 2009 that at Qom, she is constructing for peaceful use, an enrichment plant for uranium but however tested several missiles, long and medium range that could strike if the need arise, Washington's bases around the Gulf and Tel Aviv. Iran's head of AEOI declared in 2011 that the country now has the necessary technology to produce fuel rods and plates (BBC, 2015). According to Dorell(2014), Tehran has continuously researched and developed its Natanz pilot fuel enrichment plant which Ali Akbar confirmed has power that is 15 times that of IR-1 centrifuge. On April 9, 2007, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad who had denied nuclear Iran, declared rather proudly that Tehran is now among those that have the capacity to produce nuclear fuel and that the country will not blink in its determination for nuclear enrichment despite criticisms and persuasion around the world (Dafna, 2007).

In its report of 2003 and 2004, the IAEA revealed some tests conducted from materials on centrifuge components, report which indicted Tehran of uraniumenrichment (IAEA, 2003 and 2004). In 2005, Iran Foreign Ministry Spokesman,Hamid Reza argued that whatever plan the international community has, must give recognition to Tehran's right for uranium enrichment, 'we had already announced that any plan has to recognize Iran's right to enrich uranium' In similar fashion, Akbar Salehi (2011: 58) exaggerated and declared proudly, that at the nuclear site at Ishfahan, his country has constructed high-level production unit for fuel plates. There is an impressive change in fuel rods production. As it stands, Tehran is among those few with the technology to produce fuel rods and fuel plates. Interestingly, the development of Shahab-4 ofTehran with payload of about a thousand kilogram and a distance of two thousand kilometer is said to be ongoing. According to Tehran, while Shabab-3 could be the last of its war weapons, Shabab-4 is to help Tehran launch satellites, both for communication and surveillance and Shabab-5 with a distance of 10,000km is allegedly being developed (NTI, 2010). Tehranpossesses 12X-55 long range cruise missiles purchased without nuclear warheads in 2001 from Kiev, with a distance of 2,500-3000km. Tehran's fajr-3, a radar evading missile which can strike targets same time utilizing multiple warheads, has a distance of 2500km. Tehran launched unarmed weapons on 2 November, 2006, to start a-10 day

military war games. These came following some US-controlled- military training in the Persian Gulf on 29 October, 2006 for the purpose of blocking transportation of WMDs (Pike, 2006).

On the 12 th of November 2008, Tehran test launched a surface to surface missile (SSM) known as SEJIL a two stage solid propellant with a distance of 1,930 km. (BBC, 2008). The first stage (sejil-1) is of more concern to Tehran's rivals because solid fuel missiles can be deployed with less notice than liquid-fuelled missiles, this explains the reason they are difficult to strike before deployment. The second stage (Sejil-2), an upgraded form, is a two-staged solid fuel missile with distance of 2,000 km initially launched on 20thof May, 2009 (CNN, 2009). The second-stage Surface-to- Surface Medium-Range Ballistic Missile was initially tested few months before its actual deployment (Press TV, 2009). Its improvement are: better navigation system, better targeting system, more payload, longer range, faster lift-off, longer storage time, quicker launch and lower detection possibility.

Why the World is Jittery over Iran Nuclear Arms Program

Iran, in its obligation to global peace and regional stability and security, has no right whether legal or not to build nuclear weapons for whatever reason because as a signatory to major anti-WMDs treaties such as the NPT, CWC and BWC. Its decision to go nuclear is seen as betrayal by all standards of its obligations to these treaties. However, what has happened to the principle of equality of states and persons? If India, Israel and Pakistan, three states outside of the UNSC approved nuclear powerscan go nuclear, what stops Iran from going same way if it has the means? As earlierstated, the Isfahan Nuclear site in Iran can produce fuel rods and plates. It must be noted that it is designed in such a way enriched uranium which are contained in fuel rods are domiciled in a nuclear reactor. The implication of this is that nuclear Iran can create a situation in the Middle East region which can force Egypt, Turkey and Syria to pursue nuclear program within a short period given their technological capabilities. This explained why President Barack Obama in 2012 asserted that, nuclear development by Iran is counter to Israel and U.S. security. Other countries may want to go nuclear and this will lead to a situation in which countries in the world's most dangerous region will aggressively pursue WMDs so as to outdo one another. Washington and Tel Aviv believe Iran is not matured enough for nuclear weapons. The defense for their nuclear option would always remain: our nuclear program is for peaceful purposes. This was exactly what Iran told the world in the early stage of its nuclear program. For instance, Akbar (2011) argued, we have said the truth. We have no hidden agenda a or pride in what we are doing.

The international community does not believe the fact that Tehran's only nuclear option is the acquisition of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Today, the statement has proven to be false. Rather than for peaceful means, Iran nuclear option has become a source of threat and danger to the Middle East region and the world at large. Accordingly, Obama commented again that, Israel will not allow Iran who denied the holocaust, sponsors terrorists and threatened to wipe out Israel from the world map to go nuclear. It is on record that former president Ahmedinejad has continuously argued about the reality of the holocaust and repeatedly asked the rationale behind the failure of the west to allow investigation into its existence, explaining that holocaust fairytale deployed to legalize the existence of Tel Aviv and oppression of the people of Palestine, and thus asked that Israel be dismantled (BBC, 2006).

Thus on December 2006, Iran hosted a scientific conference on holocaust to access the historical reality of the holocaust with the aim, of giving opportunity to those thinkers who had difficulty in Europe to express their views on the issue of the holocaust without threat. The conference was attended by 67 researchers from 30 nations including the UK. The comments that that emanated from the conference were thought provoking, chaos threatened and reminiscent of drum-beats of war. Israeli Prime Minister at that time, Ehud Olmert described the gathering as a show of the deep-rooted hatred extremist regime in Iran (BBC, 2006). This added to the call for sanctions if Tehran refuse to end its nuclear activities. The fear of deploying it against Israel or passing it to terrorist organization with deep hatred for U.S. and Israel became the major concern. Furthermore, Iran has consistently been accused by the U.S. and other Western allies of sponsoring terrorism. In his state of the union address of 29 January 2002, President Bush branded Tehran including all its allies as part of what he referred to as 'axis of evil' with the aim of arming themselves so as to threaten global peace. By desiring WMDs, they represent a serious and increasing danger because they can give arms to insurgent groups

with the aim of matching their hatred, attack US allies or blackmail Washington (Quoted in, Fuller, 2014).

Apparently referring Iraq, Iran and North Korea, President Bush thus described them as states with alliance to terrorist organizations. Similarly, in an interview with an Arab newspaper, Asharg, President Obama explained that, Tehran is a state sponsor of insurgency and the emergent Assad regime in Damascus, lend support to Hezbollah and Hamas (Gaza Strip) and Houthi rebels (Yemen. Thus it is legitimate for states within the region to be wary about Tehran's activities especially when it comes to its backing of violent groups within the enclaves of other states (Engel, 2015; Shear, 2015). The Middle East region is under threat, especially Israel and the global community is jittery over Iran's nuclear program. The fears are understood. Thefear of movement ofnuclear weapon into terrorist enclave.Hence the need for Iran, a 'terrorist sponsor',to denuclearize. In addition, Iran has never recognized nor respected Israel's sovereign right of existence. For instance, in his interview with Financial Times, Akbar Salehideclared enthusiastically that, Tel Aviv which happened to be our next door neighbor is not seen as a state itself but a sphere of Washington's influence. Since Tehran cannot rival Washington, it cannot also contend with Tel Aviv. Strategically, there is no difference between us, Ankara and all our neighbors(Gareth, 2004).

To justify this assertion, the global community, in a state of disbelief and bewilderment, heard the announcement by then Iran President, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, in a reassuring manner that it will wipe out Israel from the world map. He threatened that Tehran's fire will destroy whoever gives recognition to Tel Aviv while any leader from the Islamic world that lend support to the Zionists implies acceptance of the defeat and surrendering of Islam. There is no doubt that the recent Palestinian attacks mayultimately lead to the extinction of Israel (MacAskill and McGreal, 2005). Immediately after the announcement, Britain, France, Germany and the U.S. condemned the speech, while Britain and the Washington headed the push for the referral of Tehran to the United Nations Security Council due to the fact that Tehran is secretly involved in acquiring nuclear weapons capabilities with the intention of restarting its program on uranium conversion which is an initial step of such ability. Thus, these scenarios- fear of build-up of arms in the region, emergence of other nuclear state, Iran denial of the holocaust, Iran alleged terrorist sponsor and fear of nuclear terrorism and Tehran's threat to exterminate Israel, explained the rationale for concern in the global community. The question there is, should the global community use coercive means to compel Iran to denuclearize? Because according to Bush (2002), the fundamental objectives of Washington are to stop terror sponsor nations so that they will not threaten Washington, its allies or friends with WMDs. America will not allow wicked government to threaten her with the most deadliest weapons (Baer, 2008).

In the same vein, President Obama once declared in 2012 that on the desire to stop Tehran from going nuclear, there is no option off the table. This he said involves all the elements of Washington's power noting that he will defend Washington and its interest with the instrumentality of force if necessary. Though it was contemplated by the US and Israel that force be deployed against Tehran, but any decision based on this must meet these requirements: the ability to destroy Tehran's nuclear capabilities and render same incapacitated and its ability to rebuild its nuclear program; the possibility that Israel and Iran might face each other in terms of war should Israel lead a coalition against Tehran; and increased tension in the region (Uzi, 2005). Is the U.S., its allies and friends ready for this? The answer is simply, NO. Though Israel favorsa military response, in reality, it is not practicable. That is, if Tehran decides on going fully nuclear, Israel need to deeply consider the opportunity-cost presented by a nuclear Tehran against strategic fallout from an attack (Lee, 2009).

International Reaction to Iran Nuclear Program

As Iran maintained its stand on nuclear development in defiance to the stand of the global community, some countries and institutions imposed sanctions on Iran, all in a bid to stop nuclear Iran. The sanctions and assassination of Iran nuclear scientists were executed side by side. Between 2006 and 2015, the UNSC passed several resolutions calling on Iran to halt its nuclear program, some of which include.

Table 1: UN Resolutions and Sanctions on Tehran's Nuclear Program

Resolutions	Date	Decisions
1696	July 31, 2006	Required Tehran to halt its action on enrichment of uranium
1737	December 23, 2006	Sanctioned Tehran for refusal to halt enrichment of uranium
1747	March 24, 2007	Widened the sanctions against Tehran's entities
1803	March 3, 2008	Sanctions were extended to other Iranians and their concerns
1835	September 27, 2008	Committed to the earlier four resolutions
1929	July 9, 2010	Expelled Tehran from partaking in ballistic-missile-related activities; tightened travel ban on persons connected to the programme including embargo on arms and Tehran shipping agency
1984	September 6, 2011	Gave additional one year to the expert panel that was set-up on the9th of July 2010 that approves Tehran's sanctions committee
2049	July 7, 2012	Gave additional one year to Tehran's Iran sanctions committee
2105	May 6, 2013	Gave additional one year to expert panel of Tehran's sanctions committee
2159	September 7, 2014	Gave additional one year to expert panel of Tehran's sanctions committee
2231	July 20, 2015	Endorses joint comprehensive agreements on Iran's nuclear program

Source: UN, 2007, 2009; Haidar, 2015.

The sanctions against Tehran by Washington are in the areas of military, scientific, trade and economy. It suspended all dealings between Washington and Tehran whichin turn stopped the M sale of aircraft or any of its parts to aviation companies of Tehran (Haidar, 2015). These sanctions became part of the earlier ones imposed on Tehran by Washington over the hostage crisis (1979-81) and the bombing of Washington's marine base in Beirut, etc. On the 14h of November 1979, Jimmy Carterthrough Executive Order 12170, freeze all assets belonging to Tehran which arewithin Washington's jurisdiction. In view of this, Tehran was designated a statesponsor of terrorism by 1984 (Moin, 2000; Zachary, 2015). Other areas of U.S. sanctions according to Zachary (2015) include Banking and finance in whichWashington desired to ostracize Tehran from global financial system. Towards theclose of 2011, Washington pressured Tehran's oil exporters, preventing them frompaying through central bank of Tehran.

On the issue of oil export, president Obama's main focus has been how to curtailrevenues from oil accruable to Tehran in his bid to prevent nuclear proliferation. Before 2012, 50 percent of Tehran's revenue came from oil which was made up ofone-fifth of its GDP. Relating to trade, Washington has since 1995 prevented most ofits investors from investing or trading in Tehran through an embargo with exception inareas of trade relating to consumer's telecommunication software and equipment. Allassets belonging to individuals, entities and institutions in Tehran including the Revolutionary Guard Corps which are considered supportive of global terrorism werefrozen by President G.W. Bush immediately after the 11th September 2001 attack onWashington. These sanctions also included travel bans. Outside Washington, UN and EU, other countries such as Tokyo, Seoul, Ottawa,

Canberra, Australia, Oslo and Geneva, at different times and forms, sanctionedTehran. While these sanctions were ongoing, the assassination of its nuclear Scientistswas being executed simultaneously BBC, 2012; Marcus, 2012).

Table 2: List of Iran Scientists assassinated

Name	Profession	Date of Death	Manner of Death
ArdeshirHosseinpour	Nuclear Scientist	January 2007	Gas Poisoning
ShahramAmiri	Nuclear Scientist	October 2009	Disappeared
ShahriariMajid	Specialist in Nuclear Physics	November 2010	Killed by bomb strapped to his car
AlimohammodiMasoud	Specialist in Particle Physics	January 2010	Killed by explosive attached to a motorbike
DaryoushRezaeiNejad	Expert in triggering nuclear warheads.	July 2011	Shot five times
MostafaAhmadiRoshan	Nuclear Scientist	January 2012	Killed by a bomb affixed to a motorcycle
MojtabaAhmadi	Cyber Warfare	September 2013	Shot in the Head

Source: Lynfield, 2013

Calming Global Tension: Tehran's Nuclear Agreement

Attempt by world powers to restrict Tehran's nuclear program so as to calm globaltension and relax economic sanctions was reached on the 14thof July 2015 afterseveral years of discussion (BBC, 2015). The deal according to William and Sergio (2015) was not specifically targeted at total shut down of Tehran'snuclearambition but to restrict its nuclear activities. For instance, its Fordo plant is to beconverted to research in science while the one at Natanz will be reduced and thecentrifuges of about 5000 for uranium enrichment will remain at Natanz. Tehran alsoagreed to reduce to 3.7 percent of its enrichment and its stockpile of Low EnrichmentUranium (LEU) at 300kg which is deemed not sufficient to hastily make a bomb. Iranwill also need to rebuild and redesign its reactor in Arak to prevent the production ofweapons grade plutonium. Though the reactor will be non-operable, it will still remainin Tehran. As part of the agreement, all spent fuel from the reactor which can also beused for bomb production, will be taken out of the country and there will be no furtherreconstruction for the next 15 years, of heavy water reactor in Tehran.

To prevent Tehran from cheating, she agreed to ensure unlimited access andinformation with respect to its nuclear program while it will also allow IAEA tomonitor all sites that are deemed suspicious and investigates all hidden facilities whichare related to the enrichment of uranium. All supply chains that contributes toTehran's nuclear ambition will be subjected to inspection by IAEA inspectors. In linewith the agreement, Tehran is expected to lessen its LEU stockpile to around 98percent and reduce its research, development and capacity for enrichment for the next15 years. For the next 25 years, measures aimed at inspection and transparency for thedeal will be put in place. For sanctions to be lifted on Tehran, it must complete keynuclear steps after which arms sanction may be lifted in five years while it will takeeight additional years on ballistic missiles (William and Sergio, 2015).

Conclusion and Recommendations

Iran has continuously reiterated that as a matter of right, it has the ability for nuclearfuel enrichment but she will not produce nuclear weapons. The doubt howeverremains whether Tehran will stop weaponization so as to retain a virtual capacity ofnuclear. Any lesson Tehran might have gotten from Pyongyang nuclear activities, needed to be checked in line with the various strategic domains either in North-eastAsia, Middle East or the issue of Tel Aviv (Lee, 2009). Irrespective of the differentstrategic importance and political development of Tehran's nuclear weapons program, it has

benefitted from nuclear nationalism. Whatever the faction, from religiousconservatism of the left, there is general agreement that Tehran reserve the right toactivate nuclear fuel cycle including the development of nuclear weapons, fi she sodesires. Public opinion in Iran favorsTehran nuclear stance (LaFranchi, 2004).

Iran as a sovereign state has a right to go nuclear if she chooses but the question hasbeen and still remains: Is she matured enough to possess nuclear weapons? In the faceof aggression and threat, can she be able to hold itself not to deploy it and does shehave the necessary security to secure its nuclear facilities? What this means is that, allowing nuclear Iran may lead to the 19 emergence of other nuclear states. This is notproper for international peace, security and stability which the world so much desire.If the effect of nuclear proliferation will be curbed, an effective strategy to reducenuclear dangers, according to (Perry et al, 2009), must be situated around five pillars:reviving strategic dialogue with nuclear powers like Moscow and Beijing, increasedpower for IAEA; reconfirm the security of Washington nuclear canopy over its allies;Washington credibility on nuclear deterrent must be maintained; and unquestionablesecurity exercise for nuclear weapons and other weapons materials globally. Similarly, nuclear weapon countries like Iran and DPRK should not be coerced into stoppingtheir nuclear programs as such may add to the already tensed situation. Instead, thereshould be a diplomatic solution through negotiation which should not be unilaterallyexecuted by the United States.

In accordance with this recommendation, of 16th January 2016, Washington and theEU relaxed oil and financial sanctions on Tehran including the release of its assetworth around $100 billion following reports by global inspectors that Tehran honoredits promise to collapse a major section of its nuclear activities (NYT, 2016). If therewill ever be reduction in arms build-up by states, or denuclearization, especially fromcountry like DPRK, force nor threat should not be applied, except there is possibilityof total or near demoralization of the supposed nuclear armed country, or else, diplomacy, dialogue and negotiation as it is done in the Iranian case, should beapplied.

References

Ahmedinejad, M. (2008). Transcript: Response will be a Positive one. *NBC News*, July 28.

Akbar, S. (2011). Iran Claims Nuclear Technology Breakthrough. *The Punch*, January 10.

Akbar, T. (2012). EU Embargoes Iran over the Nuke Issue July 8. Available at: http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article31795.htm, accessed 23/10/2023.

Asobie, A. (2007). Nigeria National Interest in a Globalized World: A Theoretical

Perspective. In: Akinterinwa Bola (ed.), *Nigeria National Interest in a Globalized World: Further Reflections on Constructive and Beneficial Concentricism*, Ibadan: Bolytag, pp. 1-41.

Baer, R. (2008). Iranian Resurrection.*The National Interest*, 98:36-45

BBC News Middle East (2006). Iran Defends Holocaust Conference. Available at:http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/6167695.stm, accessed 23/10/2023.

BBC News Middle East (2008). Iran Tests Longest Range Missile. November 13.

BBC, (2012). EU Imposes New Sanctions on Iran. October 15.

BBC News Middle East (2015).Iran Profile-Timeline. Available at: http://www.bbc.com./news/world-middle-east-19947507, accessed 23/10/2023.

Beard, C. (1934). The Idea of National Interest: An Analytical Study in American Foreign Policy. New York: Macmillan.

Bowen, W. (2004). Iran and Nuclear Safeguards: Establishing the facts and seeking Compliance. In: Verification Yearbook. London: Verification Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC), pp. 107-126.

Bruno, G. (2010). Iran's Nuclear Program. *Council on Foreign Relations*, March 10.

CNN News (2009) Iran Tests Medium-Range Missile capable of striking Israel. May20.

CNN News (2011). Fareed Zakaria Interviews Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. October 22.

Dafna, L. (2007). Iran Asserts Expansion of Nuclear Operation. *Washington Post*, April 10. P.A9

Encyclopedia Britannica. Available at: nhttp://www.britannica.com/biography/Ruhollah- Khomeini, accessed 24/10/2023.

Encyclopedia Britannica. Available at: http://www.britannica.com/event/Iranian- Revolution-of- 1978-1979, accessed 24/10/2023.

Engel, P. (2015). Obama just made his Clearest Statement yet on Iran's Support of Terrorism. *Business Insider*, March 13.

Farhang, J. (2006). Chronology of Iran's Nuclear Program (1957-Present). Oxford Research Group.

Fuller, J. (2014). Axis of Evil.*The Washington Post*, January 25.

Gareth, S. (2004). Iran's Nuclear Program is Peaceful. *Financial Times*, September 9.

Gasimov, S. (2012).The National Interest in International Relations Theory. Available at: www.ahtmm.com/proceddings/2012/2ndahtmmo_submission_95.pdf, accessed 24/10/2023.

Griffith, M. and O°Callaghan, T. (2001). International Relations: The Key Concepts. New York: Routledge.

Haidar, I. (2015). Sanctions and Exports Deflection: Evidence from Iran. Paris School of Economics, University of Paris, 1 Pantheon Sorbonne, Mimeograph

Hamid, R. (2005). Iran Rejects Unacceptable EU Nuclear Incentives. Available at: http://www.aljazeera.com/archive/2005/08/200849143345931646.html, accessed 24/10/2023.

IAEA (2003).Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran.GOV/2003/63, August 27, pp.7.

IAEA (2004).Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran.GOV/2004/34, June 1, pp.6.

IISS (2011). Iran's Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Capabilities. London: IISS, pp.7

Khameini, A. (2012). Iran will never seek Nuclear Weapons. *Press TV*, February 22.

LaFranchi, Howard (2004). If Iran Goes Nuclear...' *The Christian Science Monitor*, November 23.

Lynfield, B. (2013). Iran Claims Cyber Warfare Expert not Assassinated as Israel Remains Cagey over Involvement. *The Independent*, October 3.

MacAskill, E. and McGreal, C. (2005). Israel should be Wiped off Map says Iran President. *The Guardian*, October 27.

Marcus, J. (2012). What will be the Impact of EU Ban on Iranian Oil? BBC News, January 23.

Moin, B. (2000). Khomeini: Life of the Ayatollah. New York: Thomas Dunne Books.

Morgenthau, H. (1948). Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. New York: Knopf

NPT Review Conference (2010).Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons.Publication of the U.S. Delegation to the 2010 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference. Available at:

www.state.gov/documents/organization/141503.pdf, accessed 24/10/2023.

Nuclear Threat Initiative (2006). Iran Profile-Nuclear Chronology 1957-1985. Available at: http://www.nti.org/e_research/profiles/1825_1826.html, accessed 24/10/2023.

Nuclear Threat Initiative (2010). Country Overviews: Iran Profiles, Missile Capabilities. Available at: http://www.nti.org/country-profiles/iran/, accessed 24/10/2023.

Nuclear Threat Initiative (2015). Country Profile: Iran. Available at: http://www.nti.org/country-profiles/iran/nuclear/, accessed 24/10/2023.

Obama, B. (2012). Speech at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC)

Conference. Washington: Washington Convention Center, March 4.

Oren, D. (2014). Iran Advancing its Nuclear Program Despite Pact with West. *USA Today*, February 28.

Perry, W. Brent, S. and Charles, F. (2009).How to Reduce the Nuclear Threat.The Wall Street Journal. Available at: http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB124338405214956695, accessed 24/10/2023.

Pike, J. (2006). X-55 Long Range Cruise Missile. Available at: http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/world/iran/x-55htm, accessed 24/10/2023.

Roe, S. (2007). An Atomic Threat made in America. *Chicago Tribune*. Available at: http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/chi-061209atoms-dayl-staory-htmIstory.html, accessed 24/10/2023.

Ria, N. (2011). Iran Launches Busher Nuclear Power Plant.Available at. http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/news/iran/2010/iran-100821-rianovosti02.htm accessed 24/10/2023.

Shear, M. (2015). U.S. Will Remain Tough on Iran, Obama Tells Arab Newspaper. (Foreign Desk) (Pan-Arab Newspaper Asharq. The New York Times, May 13.

Smyth, G. (2004). Iran's Nuclear Program is Peaceful. *Financial Times*, September 9.

The Guardian (2006). Holocaust Denial Gather in Iran for Scientific Conference. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2006/dec/12/iran.israel, accessed 24/10/2023.

The New York Times (2016). Iran Complies with Nuclear Deal; Sanctions are Lifted. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/17/world/middleeast/iran-sanctions-lifted, accessed 24/10/2023.

United Nations (2007). Security Council Committee Established Pursuant to Resolution 1737 (2006). Available at: http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1737/index.shtml, accessed 24/10/2023.

United Nations (2009). Security Council Tightens Restrictions on Iran's Proliferation-Sensitive Nuclear Activities, Increases Vigilance over Iranian Banks, has States Inspect Cargo. Available at: http://www.un.org/press/en/2008/sc9268..doc.htm, accessed 24/10/2023.

Uzi, M. (2005).Revealed: Israel Plans Strike on Iranian Nuclear Plant.*The Sunday Times*, March 13.

William, B. and P. Sergio (2015).The Iran Nuclear Deal-A Simple Guide. The New York Times, July 15.

Zachary, L. (2015). International Sanctions on Iran.Council on Foreign Relations. Available at: http://www.cfr.org/iran/international-sanctions-iran/p20258, accessed 24/10/2023.

Zarif, J. (2005). An Unnecessary Crisis: Setting the Record Straight about Iran's Nuclear Program. New York Times, November 18.