

## The United States' Foreign Policy and Politics of Disarmament: A Case Study of Iran's Nuclear Programme, 2003–2013.

Eneasato Benjamin Onyekachi

Department of Political Science Enugu State University of  
Science and Technology

---

### ABSTRACT

The character and trends of international system is undoubtedly shaped by the states as principal actors in pursuit of their national interests. National interests ostensibly influence state's actions and in-actions in her relation with other entities of the international system. America in pursuing her foreign policy goals has always tried to dominate other players globally. This has not gone down well with other actors and has created mistrust in conduct of her relations with others particularly the Middle East region of the world. Power theory was adopted as a theoretical guide in explaining the relationship of United States of America and Islamic Republic of Iran concerning the politics of disarmament. Secondary source of data was adopted because of its utility in providing information relating to the area in diverse forms. It was discovered that divergence in national interest is behind increasing tension existing between the United States of America and Islamic Republic of Iran. It is recommended that multinational negotiation under United Nations should be initiated to harmonies their interests and ensure global peace.

Keywords: International system, national interests, foreign policy and politics.

---

### INTRODUCTION

The character and trends of international system are undoubtedly shaped by the States (as principal actors) in pursuit of their national interest. National interest ostensibly influences state's actions and in-actions in her relations with other actors in the international system. Remarkably, national interest is expressed by the foreign policy of a state. In this regard, the foreign policy of every country is, at all times, presumably designed to promote the national interest [1].

[2], defines foreign policy as the search for the preservation of a country's independence and security, the pursuit and protection of its economic interest. United States of America, in keeping with this, interest has always maintained a

hegemonic posture in her relationship with other States in the international arena.

In other words, America in pursuing her foreign policy goals has always tried to dominate other players globally. This has created ill-feelings and mistrust among some States as they relate with the United States of America including the states of the Middle East region of the world.

The United States of America and the Islamic Republic of Iran emerged on the global stage in pursuit of their respective national interests for national power, security and development. The actions and in-action of these sovereign states are, to a reasonable extent, regulated by

several binding instruments and resolutions on the platform of United Nations Organization (UNO). The expediency of these global regulations is aimed at ensuring a safe and stable world in spite of the dangerous ambitions of the states as reflected in their national interest and expressed through foreign policy. This development is further exacerbated by global, regional and inter-state warfare which had for centuries, years and recent times deployed sophisticated weapons that have claimed millions of lives and destruction of properties worth trillions of dollars. Accordingly, [3] aptly noted,

*The world is awash in weapons. There are an estimated 875 million or more small arms in circulation according to the United Nations Secretary General report to the Security Council on April 2008, nuclear weapon states possessed more than 23,000 nuclear war heads, more than 8,000 of which are operational and several thousand of which are kept on high alert ready to be launched within minutes. World stocks of fissile materials, the materials used to make nuclear weapon are in the thousands of (metric) tons enough to produce tens of thousands of new war heads. Seventy-three (73) countries continue to stockpile billions of cluster bombs which according to Human Rights Watch, have been used in Iraq, Lebanon and Georgia in the recent years.*

This development has been further worsened by the 2011 Arab spring that swept through Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen, Bahrain and presently the Syria including the onslaught of ISIS in Iraq, and Islamic extremism and insurgency in the Eastern and Western parts of Africa. These recent developments are not novel but illuminate the anarchical nature of

the international system aimed at UN interventions and restrictions.

The UN nuclear non-proliferation treaty was one of the interventionist strategies to ensure a safe world after the devastating impact of the first and second world wars. It also represents effort towards nuclear disarmament as initiated and driven by the five super powers; USA, Russia Federation, France, China, and United Kingdom. This is against the backdrop of the rapid proliferation of nuclear weapons as explicated by [4]

*The proliferation of non-conventional weapons and nuclear arms in particular is still one of the greatest threats to global peace. It emanates from the risk of a new-regional arms race, triggered by the development of nuclear weapons outside the recognized nuclear arms states. It also comes from the threat associated with the acquisition of nuclear capabilities.*

It is pertinent to note that under the non-proliferation treaty, countries are entitled to peaceful use of nuclear technology.

Iranian nuclear programme has elicited global anxiety and concern by the super powers on the basis of the report of International Atomic Energy Agency,[5] which indicates that,

*Iran has nuclear programs that could potentially provide Tehran with the capability to produce both weapon-grade highly enriched Uranium (HEU) and plutonium-the two type of fissile materials used in nuclear weapons. Similarly, the US intelligence community also indicates that Iran has the technological and industrial capacity to produce nuclear weapons at some time. The*

*international Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) raised a global suspicion on the nuclear development because of the inability of the agency to inspect the Iranian nuclear facilities and activities in compliance with the IAEA safeguards agreements.*

[6], further write,

*Multilateral negotiations regarding Iran's nuclear program date back to 2003 after the international Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) reported on the existence of clandestine nuclear facilities at Natanz. In October of that year, Iran concluded an agreement with France, Germany and the United Kingdom under which Iran temporarily suspended aspects of its nuclear program, including the enrichment of Uranium and signed an additional protocol to its IAEA safeguards agreement, but also asserted its right to develop nuclear technology. In January 2006, Tehran announced that it would resume research and development on its centrifuges at Natanz. After that time, Iran held multiple rounds of talk with China, France, Germany, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United State (collectively known as the P. 5+1).*

The failure of the Islamic Republic of Iran to suspend its uranium enrichment led to series of Western sanctions on Iranian energy and economy. This unpleasant development further worsened the strained relationship between Tehran and Washington since the Islamic revolution in 1979.

The United States foreign policy towards the Islamic republic of Iran has been

hostile and, the stream of sanctions on Iranian economy consequently exacerbated this crisis. Dramatically, the emergence of President Hassan Rouhani as the Iranian President in June 2014 brought fresh negotiation and reforms in Tehran nuclear deal with the nuclear power countries. Thus, the development culminated with the interim nuclear agreement the Joint Plan of Action (JPA) and Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA).

### **National Interest, Foreign Policy and Disarmament**

As earlier noted, national interest underscored the activities of state as a principal actor in international relation; it therefore defines and shapes the actions and inactions of sovereign states in relation with other entities of the international system. In this regard, the national interests of a sovereign state assess its viability, influence and prestige in pursuit of goals imperative for national power, development and security.

National Interest as a concept in the literature of international relations and political science elicits varied definition among scholars. [7], defined National Interest as the issues that affect the goals and objectives of the state in its interaction with other state actors in the international arena. A state has to be affected directly or indirectly by some particular phenomena on the international platform for such phenomena to be significance to its national interest.

In other words, state's national interest represents the cherished and promoted values and expectations in relation with other countries in the international system.

Explicitly, [8] aptly classified a state's national interest:

*The primary interest or core national interest relates to the issues of the*

*promotion and defence of her territorial sovereignty and political independence . The secondary or peripheral interest that seeks to promote and defend the nationals or citizens and their investment abroad and, the General interest which relates to the promotion of world peace and security.*

*In more specific terms, foreign policy may be also defined as those fundamental principles, rules and regulations, norms and values combine to shape the actions or in actions of states in their interaction with one another and other non-state actors.*

It is therefore established that the tendencies of the state in the regional and global intercourse is a function of national interest expressed through the framework of foreign policy. In other words, foreign policy is imperative in the promotion of national interest of a state.

Invariably, foreign policy, like other concepts in international relations and political science is defined in varied perspectives. Foreign policy by its very nature is a two-fold entity, comprising external and internal considerations. There is the world of systemic environment on one hand and the complex of demands which arise in any country and which somehow the government must satisfy or make a show of satisfying [9]. Accordingly, [10], defined foreign policy as the aggregate of actions and non-action, pronouncements and non-pronouncements by which a country regulate its relationship with the rest of the world. Foreign policy therefore represents a framework of rules, principles and strategies that determine the orientation and action of state in pursuit of her national interest in relation with other countries. On this note, [11]explicates further,

Notably, national interest and foreign policy determines the disposition of states in the international system. The United States of America and Islamic Republic of Iran are countries with asymmetrical national interests vigorously pursued in the process of exerting national power on the global arena. Hence, Iran's concern of nuclear armament is to enhance her national power in the Gulf region which conflict with the United State's foreign policy of nuclear disarmament in ensuring the security of her allies in the region. It is therefore pertinent to explicate the dialectical variables of armament and disarmament.

It is the principal means, by which a nation endeavors with the power at its disposal to maintain or re-establish the balance of power are armaments. The armament race in which Nation A tries to keep up with, and then to outdo, the armaments of Nation B and vice-versa, is the typical instrumentality of unstable, dynamic balance of power. The necessary corollary of the armament race is a constantly increasing burden of military preparations devouring an ever greater portion of the national budget and making forever deepening fears, suspicions, and insecurity [12].

Subsequently, [13] defined disarmament as the removal or elimination of arms, usually following the cessation of hostilities, voluntary or compulsory. In this vein, the National Open University of Nigeria [14] handwork on theories of conflict management opines that disarmament involves total surrender of weapons so that the one armed nation-state becomes armless.

Furthermore, disarmament is the reduction or elimination of certain or all armaments for the purpose of ending the armaments race. It is believed that by doing away with one of the typical manifestation of the struggle for power on the international scene, one can do away with the typical effects of that struggle: [15].

Impliedly, disarmament is the process of dispossession and destruction of arms and weapons of destruction. Though, this is yet to be achieved in the world [16]. In the context of this discourse, we examine critically the interest of the United States in the Iranian nuclear disarmament to ascertain the propelling factor and outcome.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The study of United States foreign policy and politics of disarmament with reference to the Iranian nuclear program obviously illuminates the essence of conceptual framework of analysis. In this regard, the researcher adopts "power theory" to analyze the dynamics of United State's national interest as expressed through her foreign policy in the Iranian nuclear disarmament. Commenting on the development of power theory, [17] writes that power theory of the state with its emphasis primarily on the development of effective military power by state was first advocated in Germany in the nineteenth century by historians like Heinrich Von Treitschike and philosophers like Friedrich Nietzsche and was upheld by several writers there in the twentieth century. The term power is an instrument of coercion and has physical effect. Thus, George Catlin, Max Weber, Harold Lasswell and Kaplan are political scientists whose research and writing underscored the essence of power in the

literature of political science with the following thrust:

- i. Power represents the control of one man over another or of the group over the individual or of the group over group.
- ii. The relationship of men in association and competition, submission and control is driven by power.
- iii. Power is central in political negotiations and determines the viability of the government.

Furthermore, power theory gained more relevance in the analysis of trans-national relation involving states and non-state entities. In this vein,[18] writes that power theory in the study of international politics evolved from the weakness of the utopian idealist school of the pre-world war II era that emphasized the legalistic and institutional approach. The idealist believed that international court and the League of Nations would prevent a war situation. However, at the close of World War II the futility of this approach became evident with the realists stressing power and national interest rather than ideas. The main proponents of this school were Hans Morgenthau, E.H Larr, R. Niebhur, George Kaman and Henry Kissinger.

These scholars argued that the pursuit of national power is a natural development in the international system. That those states which do not strive for power encourage war, for, if all states strive for power concurrently, peace will evolve because the struggle itself creates power and eliminates hegemony.

In credence to this assertion, Morgenthau in his book, *Politics among Nations*, also stressed that national interest should best be defined in terms of power pursuit and, in fact, post-world war II is power politics. Also, Morgenthau explicates further that politics like society in general is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature. And, human nature is such that the conduct of men bears the assumption

that “statesmen think and act in terms of interest defined as power”. For the realists, the dominant motive in international politics is the search for power by governments.

The following are the basic assumptions of the realist epistemological foundation which upholds the essence of power realism in the international relation.

- a. The international system is anarchic
- b. Sovereign states are the principal actors in the international system.
- c. States are rational unitary actors each acting under the consideration of its own national interest.
- d. National security and survival are the primary “national interest” of each state.
- e. In pursuit of national security, states strive to increase national power
- f. National power and capability determines the relation among states.
- g. National interest defined in terms of national power guide the actions of the states in international relations [19].

However, power realist approach like other conceptual frameworks is susceptible to conceptual and methodological limitations. In this sense, [20] itemized these flaws as follows:

1. Realism is lopsided and stresses solely on power and power struggle- power monism.
2. That the basic assumption on which scholars like Morgenthau hinges realist theory are hardly verifiable and testable.
3. Findings show that over 90 percent of the 700 realist hypotheses are falsified
4. The reality of international politics has shown that states are not only and not even the most important actor in international relations.

However, beyond these critics, the model of analysis-power theory - is analytically suitable to analyze the interfacing variables under study.

### Statement of the Problem

The proliferation of biological and chemical weapons in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is a serious threat to global peace and stability. The nuclear dimension to it is indeed a dangerous trend and had inextricably affected the nature and dynamics of international politics. The peace and stability of the world is threatened by the conflicts, terrorism and wars going on in different regions of the world. It is even more disturbing, the activities of extremists. The statement credited to former Iranian president Ahmadinajad calling for elimination of State of Israel reinforces the need to regulate the production of nuclear weapon.

Similarly, [21] observed,

*The availability of this kind of power not only has made war more appalling but it has changed the foreign policies. In earlier eras, war was an instrument of policy through which one nation dissuaded another from doing something it opposed. Nuclear weapons have reduced the extent to which the threat of war can serve as a policy tool. A state holds nuclear missiles and bombs so that a potential aggressor will be convinced that aggression will be unacceptably costly.*

The multilateral negotiations over Iranian nuclear program were immersed with suspicion and power tussle between Iran and the west particularly the United States. Since the political exit of Shah and Iranian revolution in 1979, the United States of America has had strained diplomatic relation with the Islamic republic of Iran. Hence, the suspicion on the Iranian nuclear program was an outcome of the United States’ deliberate propaganda to elicit international condemnation towards frustrating Tehran’s energy development. Though,

some analysts have argued that the series of Western negotiations with Iran was expedient towards dissuading the Islamic country from developing a nuclear weapon. Successive Iranian governments have claimed that their nuclear program is a peaceful one aimed at boosting its energy use. In this vein, [22] write,

*Iran is a signatory of the Nuclear Non-proliferation treaty, whose Article IV grants its signatories the "inalienable right" to research, develop, produce and utilize nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. On that basis, the Iranian government has embarked on a vast program to develop a self-sufficient nuclear industry by mastering the fuel needed to power reactors. Western countries worry that this knowledge would also allow Iran to produce highly enriched uranium or plutonium that could be used to produce nuclear weapons.*

Interestingly, the United Nations and its organ- the International Atomic Energy Agency and the west have failed in certain extent to inspect and disarm some non-nuclear states of their nuclear weapons while some other countries had violated the non-proliferation treaty and evaded IAEA inspection. [23] remarked,

*So far, the Non-proliferation Treaty has been fairly effective but not totally so. For one thing, some countries including India, Israel and Pakistan-never signed the treaty. India and Pakistan have announced that they have nuclear weapons and Israel probably has 100 to 300 warheads (though it officially*

*refuse to confirm that it has any). Some nations (such as North Korea) have withdrawn from the NPT while still others have evaded inspection. New countries have developed nuclear weapon, the risk of further proliferation increases. Israel is believed to have assisted the South Africa program which secretly developed some nuclear weapons in the 1980s but dismantled its program and its weapon in 1990 and signed the NPT the following year.*

The West particularly the United States has activated the economic sanctions against the Islamic republic. There was headway in Iran-west nuclear negotiation in July 2015 and subsequent lifting of western sanctions on Iran. In this vein, [24] noted,

*On July 14, 2015, Iran and the six powers that have negotiated with Iran about its nuclear program since 2006 (the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, China and Germany collectively known as the P5+1) finalized a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). The JCPOA is intended to ensure that Iran's nuclear program can be used for purely peaceful purposes, in exchange for a broad lifting of European Union (EU) and United Nations (UN) sanctions on Iran. The JCPOA largely reflects what was agreed in April 2, 2015 framework for the accord. The agreement replaces a Joint Plan of*

*Action (JPA) interim nuclear accord in operation since January 2014.*

However, some US allies opposed to the agreement argued that the JCPOA deal will enhance Iran's influence in the region with regards to the lifting of UN proliferation on arms sales to Iran and, it also failed to address the Iran's imprisonment of some Iranian- American nationals on various charges. Meanwhile, others argued that the JCPOA will enhance relations and cooperation between Iran and US and also restrain the Islamic country from developing nuclear weapon for the safety of the middle-East and the world at large.

The politics of disarmament received much attention from 1957, when IAEA was established. Between the period, the world war ended and 1957, Soviet Union had improved her military capabilities in areas of nuclear technology with the launching of Russian made missile R-5 in March 15, 1953 (Aisa Defence and security show (ADAS)). This triggered nuclear arm race between the United States of America and Russian federation. One of the consequences of this was arming some of their allies with such technology.

Iran needs nuclear power to boast her energy need and enhance her national power. According to [26], Iran's national interests are regime survival and regional hegemony. This is against the American security interest in the Middle East that revolves around unhindered access to oil, elimination of terrorist threats, stopping the spread of weapon of mass destruction and protecting Israel.

### **The United States National Interest and Politics of Global Disarmament**

As noted, United States like other sovereign countries, is guided by national interest expressed through foreign policy in relations and interaction with other states and non-state entities of the international system.

Thus, the fundamental principles of American foreign Policy have been stated

in general terms on innumerable occasions. More explicitly, [27] held the following principles as the foundation of American's Foreign Policy.

1. Sovereign independence
2. Continental expansion
3. Avoidance of the ordinary vicissitudes and ordinary combination and collisions of European politics.
4. The non-colonization principle
5. The non-transfer principle (i.e. no transfer by one European power to another of any possession in the Western Hemisphere).
6. Freedom of international trade
7. Self-determination of people
8. Freedom of the seas for neutral ships in time of war, and freedom of navigation of international rivers.
9. The right of expatriation and the wrong of imprisonment
10. Non-intervention
11. A feeling of anti-imperialism

Bemis pointed out that these principles were firmly established, acknowledged and generally accepted in the early days of the Republic, and they have been governing principle throughout most of America's history as an independent nation.

However, since the end of second world wars, some of these foundation principles have been modified. In this regard, [1], noted that freedom of seas for neutral ships in time of war, for example, antedated the development of submarine warfare. The principle of continental expansion is a matter of historical record. And, the United States is involved in European, and indeed in world politics to a degree that might have appalled the founding fathers. Nevertheless, present American foreign policy is influenced by traditional principle and as well as by the current interest and conditions.

Therefore, the current interest of national security, balance of power, security of her foreign investment and her allies and, conditions of arm-race may have influenced enormously her role in the trends of global disarmament. Basically, the violation of the League of



Nations' resolutions at Geneva Conference in 1925 which banned the use of chemical weapons to prosecute war and the atomic bombs that leveled Hiroshima and Nagasaki of Japan dropped by United States during the second world war (1939-1945) elicited global attention and condemnation. The effort at constraining the process of arm-race began in the cold world war ear. Specifically in 1957, the International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA was established to monitor the proliferation of nuclear technology including the nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, the United States and defunct Soviet Union agreed to "general and complete" disarmament in June 1961 at the Antarctic Treaty of 1959, which became operational in 1961.

The provisions of this treaty which now have more signatories from other countries are:

- i. The prohibition of all military activity in the Antarctic continent with each signatory accorded the right to aerial surveillance
- ii. The prohibition of nuclear explosions or dumping of radioactive wastes on the continent.
- iii. The right to inspect each other's installations to safeguard against violations.
- iv. The non-recognition of existing territorial claims, and agreement that no new claims may be made.
- v. The responsibility to settle dispute peacefully and to cooperate in scientific investigation on the continent cited in [28].

Furthermore, the 1963 Test Ban Treaty also shown the key role of United states in effort to ensure the safety of the World. [9] indicates.

*The partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963 was signed in Moscow by the representatives of Britain, the former Soviet Union and the United States*

*of America. The Test Ban Treaty bans nuclear weapons test in the atmosphere and under water. In 1966, the Test Ban Treaty was globalized in signatories and coverage when the United Nation General Assembly unanimously modified and approved it as the outer space Treaty. It was subsequently ratified in October 1967 by eight-four countries. As an international convention that restrains the arms race and seeks to elicit cooperation as well as establish rudimentary rules of international law for out space.*

The Treaty has the following as its major provisions:

- i. Prohibition of placement of nuclear or other weapons of mass destructions in orbit or on the moon and other celestial bodies.
- ii. Banning of military bases and maneuvers on the moon and other planets
- iii. Forbidding of claims of national sovereignty in outer space.
- iv. Encouragement of international cooperation in exploring space, in assisting astronauts and space vehicles, and in the exchange of scientific information.

In 1968, another Arms Control Treaty was signed by World leaders. This time, the focus was exclusively on the limitation of nuclear weapon production

popularly referred to as the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, it is an international agreement signed to prevent further spread of nuclear weapon technology to countries outside the five countries that already possessed them. That is, the United States, the erstwhile Soviet Union, Great Britain, France and China.

Emphatically, the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) represents an unprecedented effort to regulate nuclear weapon globally entered into force in 1970. Currently, 190 countries have joined the treaty including five nuclear power states, the USA, Russia Federation, China, France and United Kingdom.

The Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty has three pillars or main targets which are:

- a) Non- proliferation (i.e. stopping the spread of nuclear weapons and related technology).
- b) Disarmament (getting rid of existing nuclear arsenals)
- c) The Use of Nuclear Energy for peaceful purpose (including access to nuclear technology which is the right of all the parties to the NPT).

It is germane to note that these established protocols and treaties designed to ensure a safe world inextricably exposes the interest of United States towards her allies and foes- the politics of global disarmament which reflects as follows.

- i. United States has not demonstrated unflinching commitment to sanction her allies in the middle-East that violated NPT protocols. For instance, Saudi Arabia and Israel (strong allies in the Gulf region) are nuclear power but not members of NPT and on several occasions evaded the IAEA inspection of their nuclear facilities without condemnation from the US.
- ii. The effort to disarm non-allies of the United States and the West. For instance, the enforcement of NPT had afforded avenue for United States and her allies to strongly condemn the production

and test of nuclear bombs. Apart from the condemnation, they further moved to stop India and Pakistan from advancing in the development of their nuclear weapons. It is also in line with this thinking that the United States led the war against Saddam Hussein's leadership in Iraq in 2003. The current diplomatic shenanigans against Iran and North Korea are also influenced by US interest through the instrumentality of Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.

- iii. The interest of United States to protect her allies from countries with nuclear capabilities.

It is therefore instructive to note that the United States activate Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to sanction or disarm countries whose nuclear capabilities constitute serious threat to its interest and security of her allies in the international system of uncertainty and turmoils.

In this vein, we therefore examine critically, the interest of United States in the Iranian nuclear program.

### **The Iranian Nuclear Program and United State Interest in the Middle East**

The Middle East is a very strategic region with reference to religion and economic resources. Thus, it represents the cradle of Islam endowed with crude mineral for petroleum and gas. The Middle East (which also stretches to the Northern part of Africa) boasts of huge foreign investment from the US, China, Russia and other Western European countries.

The Middle East and North Africa (MENA)-Sudan included- accounts for more than 66% of the world's proven global oil reserves, most of which are concentrated in the littoral states of the Persian Gulf. This development undoubtedly reinforced the United States diplomatic, political and economic ties with the countries of the Middle East. For Instance, the US Energy Information Administration, [28] Indicates that as the oil and gas reserves in the other regions of the World get depleted, the United States and Other Oil- consuming nations

will become even more dependent on the Middle-East.

The United States ties with the countries of the Middle East began in the 1930's with Saudi Arabia as [27] embellished,

*“The US's first formal involvement in the Gulf region can be traced back to the Saudi oil concession in the 1930's and the announcement of a strategic relationship at the meeting between President Roosevelt and King Abdulaziz in 1945”.*

Indicatively, this development open a footage of myriad of diplomatic ties with the Oil Gulf countries such as Iran, Kuwait, Bahrain and of course Israel- a powerful country and strategic ally although in hostilities with her neighbors. On the other hand, Iran was a former ally of United States.

The Islamic Republic of Iran has a population of 66.3 million and territory of 636,296 square miles. Its indigenous population speaks Persian language along with regional languages. In reference to religious inclination, 90% were Shiite Muslims, 10% were Sunni Muslim and 1% were non-Muslim [27]. The international image of the Islamic Republic has been battered in the recent years following the allegation of developing nuclear weapon and the economic sanctions from the West. However, it is evidenced that the Iranian nuclear Program (which has generated a lot of controversy) was initially supported by the US in the early 1970's.

In this regard, [9] noted that Iran's nuclear energy program dates back to the

late 1960's when Shah Mohammad Reza, Pahlavi a close ally of the West, governed it. Hence, its (non-weapons) program received assistance during the following decade from the United States and West Germany. Its purpose was to produce energy for internal consumption allowing Iran to export more of the petroleum it produced. As a signatory to the NPT, Iran allowed inspection by the IAEA. Following the 1979 Islamic Revolution which overthrew Shah, the program was frozen and during the Iran-Iraq war of 1980-1988, the entire nuclear program was suspended. Iran resumed nuclear energy development in the 1990's and in 2002; the United States accused it of seeking to develop nuclear weapon plants.

It is therefore instructive to indicate that the Iranian revolution of 1979 occasioned with the hostage taking of American diplomats in Teheran severed the diplomatic relation between the Islamic country and Washington. Though, experts from the International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA has alleged that Iran is rapidly moving towards the capability to produce nuclear weapon but they disagree on how long it might take to stop them or persuade them to stop. Although for many years after the Arab revolution in 1979, Iran had continued to allow regular inspection of its nuclear program by monitors from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In 2003, Iran admitted that it has been secretly enriching uranium- a process that is necessary to create both nuclear power and nuclear weapon.

However, Iran in the face of global condemnation, voluntarily suspended its enrichment program but re-start the process again in 2006. In the face of this dilemma, the European Union, and the countries of US, Britain, France, China, and Russia has been engaged in show and halting negotiation with Iran with the intention of giving the country assurances and assistance in return for international inspection that could verify its claim that its nuclear program is solely designed for peaceful purposes. In a dramatic turn, the IAEA expressed concerns about Iran's nuclear program which it stated that there is no definitive proof that Iran is developing nuclear weapon.

Nevertheless, the United States and her allies insisted that the Islamic Republic intends to build nuclear weapon. On this premise, [5] explicitly highlighted the potentiality of the Iranian nuclear program which elicits the apprehension of US and her allies.

Iran has three gas centrifuge enrichment facilities (Nataz Fuel Enrichment Plant, Natanze Pilot Fuel Enrichment Plant and Fordow Fuel Enrichment Plant). Gas centrifuges enrich uranium by spinning uranium hexafluoride gas at high speed to increase the concentration of the uranium 235 isotope such centrifuges can produce Low-Enriched Uranium (LEU), which can be used for fuel in nuclear power reactors or research reactors, and weapons-Highly Enrichment Uranium (HEU). LEU used in nuclear power reactor typically contains less than 5% uranium-235, research reactor fuel can be made using 20% uranium-235, HEU used in nuclear weapons typically contains about 90% uranium-235. Tehran argues that it is enriching uranium for use as fuel in nuclear power reactor.

The following are Iranian nuclear enrichment facility and status of their potentiality:

#### 1. Natanz Commercial-Scale Fuel Enrichment Plant

In this facility, Iran is using first-generation centrifuges called IR-I centrifuge to produce LEU containing up to 5% uranium 235. As of November 2013, Iran had installed about 15,400 of these centrifuges, approximately 8,800 of which are enriching uranium.

#### 2. Natanz Pilot Fuel Enrichment Plant

Iran had been using IR-I centrifuges in this facility to produce LEU containing approximately 20% uranium-235. Tehran's production of LEU enriched to the 20% level has caused concern because such production requires approximately 90% of the effort necessary to produce weapon-grade HEU, which as noted, contains approximately 90% uranium-235.

#### 3. Fordow Fuel Enrichment Plant

Iran was using IR-I centrifuges in this facility to produce LEU containing approximately 20% uranium-235. Iran has installed about 2,700. First generation centrifuges approximately 700 of which were enriching uranium.

#### 4. Arak Heavy Water Reactor

Iran is constructing a heavy water-moderated reactor at Arak. Heavy water reactors produce spent fuel containing plutonium better suited for nuclear weapons than plutonium produced by light water-moderated reactors, but Tehran asserted that the reactor is intended to produce for radioisotope use and to replace the Tehran research reactor.

Basically, these nuclear plants and facilities undoubtedly elicited the apprehension of US and her allies. [6] aptly identified critical factors that elicited US reaction to Iran's nuclear program which constitute serious threat to its interest in the Middle East,

1. The United States has labeled the Iranian government a state sponsor of terrorism for its support of Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in the Palestinian territories.
2. The United States accuses the Iranian government of human rights abuses against the Iranian people. For instance, the crackdowns of post-presidential election protest.
3. The Israel's security is also a concern for US policy makers. Iranian leaders have taken a hostile stance toward Israel and, an Israeli leader considers Iran to be one of the greatest threats to their country's security. Some observers fear that the Israel will launch their own attack on Iran's nuclear facilities if the US government does not take a strong stance against Iran's nuclear aspirations. This could force the United State, a key Israeli ally into a military conflict that could potentially spark a bigger regional war.

4. The economies of the United State and US allies are closely tied to the oil that flow from the Persian Gulf, the region in the Middle East where Iran is located. The continued flow of oil at steady prices is a critical part of the US recovery from the financial crisis. Some observers worry that any increase in price of oil could plunge the global economy into recession. US policy makers must consider the effect that any policy towards Iran will have on the flow of oil from the Persian Gulf.
5. The Middle East is currently experiencing a period of major transformation. In what has been called the Arab spring, democratic protests in countries across the region have threatened and even toppled long-term Middle Eastern leaders, some of them important US allies.

Consequently, this suspicion had generated series of sanctions from the United States, her allies and United Nations Organization.

The unilateral sanctions from the United States is sweeping and long-standing as revealed under the table below,

**Summary of Major US sanctions on Iran**

<b>FINANCIAL AND TRADE RESTRICTIONS</b>	
Baking	On Nov 6th, 2008, the Department of the Treasury banned U.S. banks from handling indirect transactions with Iranian banks.
	The Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability and Divestment, Act (CISADA) of 2010 excludes foreign banks from the U.S financial system if they conduct transactions with the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps or entities sectioned by executive orders or the United Nations.
	The Nov, 21,2011, Secretary of the Treasury, Timothy Geithner used section 311 of the USA PATRIOT Act to identify Iran as a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern.
	The National Defence Authorization Act of 2012 restricts foreign banks that do business with Iran’s Central bank from accessing the U.S financial system.
Assets freeze	Executive order 13224 (2001) authorizes the president to freeze assets of entities supporting international terrorism and ban US transactions with these entities.
	Executive order 13382 (2005) grants the president the authority to block the assets of WMD proliferators.
Trade and investment	Executive order 12959 (1995) ban US firms from trading with or investing in Iran, with exemptions for food and medical products,
<b>Oil and Gas Sector Restrictions</b>	
Cure oil .purchase	Executive order 12613 (1987) bans US companies from importing Iranian oil.
Refined petroleum	The CISADA amended the Iran sanctions Act (ISA) OF 1996 by sanctioning the sale of gasoline and the sale of equipment related to Iranian energy imports and production to Iran.
Trade and investment	The ISA sanctions foreign entities that invest in Iran’s energy sector.
	Executive order 13590 (2011) modifies the ISA to include the sanctioning or sales to Iran of oil and gas exploration and extraction equipment.
<b>Strategic Trade Controls</b>	
Nuclear and missile Technology	The Iran-Iraq Arms Non proliferation Act of 1992 imposes sanction on foreign entities that supply Iran with WMP technology or “destabilizing” conventional arms.
	The Iran-North Korea- Syria Non proliferation Act of 2000 authorizes sanctions on individuals or corporations that are assisting Iran’s WMD Programs.
Conventional Arms	The Arms export control Act of 1976 bans US. arms sales to Iran given its status as a state sponsor of terrorism.
	The International Emergency Economic Powers Act Of 1977, implemented by Executive Orders, allows For restrictions on the sale of dual-use items to Iran.
Shipping	Executive Order 13382 (2005) freeze The US-based property of Islamic Republic of Iran shipping lanes and other relate entities.
Travel	The CISADA impose travel bans on Iranians identified to be involved in human right abuses since Iran’s June 12, 2009 presidential elections.

**Source:** ACD Research Report, 2013.

It is instructive to indicate that these sanctions were also preceded with increasingly multi-lateral sanctions from US allies in Europe and United Nations aimed at persuading Iranian's compliance with its nuclear non-proliferation obligations and addressing internal concerns about the nature of its nuclear program. These myriad of sanctions adversely undermined Iranian economy and deteriorated her strained relation with the West led by the United States. The consequence of this situation equally creates hostile relation between Iran and Israel and other key allies of the US in the Gulf region.

Iran's interest in developing nuclear weapons is directly aligned with the central priority of its leadership: the survivability of its regime. The Islamic Republics revolutionary government has seen itself as under threat since it came into power in 1979, both because of its adversarial relationship with the United States and from its bitter eight year war with Iraq. Although its former primary adversary in Baghdad had been replaced by a friendly government, the presence of U.S. forces in Afghanistan and Iraq, has likely weighted its concerns about the external threat from the United States. Tehran's national security aims are grounded in deterring threats to the regime, and according to a 2010 pentagon report on Iran's military power, Iran's nuclear program and its willing to keep open the possibility of developing nuclear weapon is a central part of its deterrent strategy.

Furthermore, the Iran's nuclear ambitions are also rooted in the country's aspiration to politically dominate its geographic neighborhood. Tehran's military power is not proportionate to its economic power, and its conventional military capabilities are limited by lack of training and modern weapon. This is essentially because, Iranian military modernization has been constrained since the Iran-Iraq, war because of limited access to foreign weapons exacerbated by unilateral and multi-lateral sanctions.

### **The Challenges Militating against Iranian Nuclear Disarmament**

Nuclear weapons are the most dreaded weapon on earth. For instance, a single bomb has the potential to destroy entire city, kill millions and contaminate air, land, and water for many miles around the original blast site for thousands of years. In the age of nuclear arms race, the safety of humanity and civilizations in the various parts of the world are threatened by the direct effects of the nuclear blasts and the resulting radiation.

Subsequently, there are nine states that possess nuclear weapons. The United State, the Russia federation, Britain, France, China, India, Pakistan, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and Israel. However, five of these countries- the United States, the Russian federation, the United Kingdom, France and China are recognized as nuclear-weapon states under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

The United States and the Russia federation with a total of more than 7,500 deployed warheads possess the vast majority of the world's nuclear arsenal (nearly 90 percent of deployed weapons) since the end of the cold war. The two countries have negotiated a series of bilateral treaties aimed at reducing the number of nuclear weapons deployed by each [27].

Invariably, the world today is alarmed with the proliferation of weapons in armed conflict while war still takes a huge toll globally- the increasingly number of conflicts and casualties. It is also observed that the world governments spent an estimated US 51,464 billion to arm themselves, a level of spending not seen since the fall of Berlin wall. This figure amounts to 216 dollar for each person in the world. The United States alone account for \$ 607 billion or nearly 42 percent of the total [28].

<b>Percentage of Increase in Military Spending 1998-2008</b>		
	<b>2008 Spending</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Africa	\$ 20.4billion	+ 202%
America	\$ 603 billion	+ 64%
Asia/oceanic	\$ 206 billion	+ 52%
Europe	\$ 320 billion	+ 14%
Middle East	\$ 756 billion	+ 56%

**Source:** Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2009.

<b>Financial Value of Global Arms Export</b>		
World total	\$ 45.628	Billions
United States	\$14.008	Billions
Russia federation	\$6.500	Billions
France	\$5.061	Billions
United Kingdom	\$3.792	Billions
Israel	\$ 3.00	Billions

**Source:** Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2009

<b>Deployed Nuclear Warheads, 2009</b>			
<b>Country</b>	<b>Strategic Warheads</b>	<b>Non strategic warheads</b>	<b>Total</b>
United states	2,202	500	<b>2,702</b>
Russia federation	2,787	2,047	<b>4,834</b>
United kingdom	160	-	<b>160</b>
France	300	-	<b>300</b>
China	186	-	<b>186</b>
India	-	-	<b>60-70</b>
Pakistan	-	-	<b>60</b>
Israel	-	-	<b>80</b>
<b>Total</b>			<b>8,392</b>

**Source:** Sipri Yearbook of Armament,2010.

This development elicits global concern on the security of mankind and the earth. But, it also illuminates the failure of effort at nuclear disarmament and safety of the world.

The Hague conference of 1899 and 1907 were first practical efforts, made to limit armaments by general international agreements. These achieved no positive result. It was however a pointer as to what is needed to be done. The League of Nations took series of serious steps after the First World War. By the league's efforts, there was a World Disarmament Conference in Geneva in 1932, where most countries were involved in negotiations covering all categories of weapon. This conference failed in 1935 due to rising tension among great powers of the time, especially Germany and

France, following Hitler's coming to power.

Although, there was more success in the negotiations for naval arms limitation. In Washington, USA in 1922 Conference was held in which the United State, Japan, Great Britain, Italy and France agreed to the size of their battleship fleets. At the London conference in 1930, the United State, Great Britain and Japan expanded the agreement to cover all fighting vessels.

The cold war which followed the Second World War saw many negotiations for disarmament and arms control by the two alliances of NATO and Warsaw blocs. This became serious when in 1960, it was clear that the Soviet Union has achieved nuclear equality with the United States of America. From there on negotiations



revolve mainly around nuclear weapons resulting in notable agreements being signed. These are the SALT 1 and SALT 11 treaties signed in the 1970's. SALT stands for Strategic Arms Limitations Talks while START stands for Strategic Arms Reduction Talks [25].

Recently, there are more innovations in the field of science and technology which have enabled states to acquire nuclear weapon capabilities. It is in the trend of this development that Iranian nuclear program had generated lot of controversy, western suspicion and widespread concern that Tehran's construction of gas centrifuge Uranium enriched facilities is currently the main source of proliferation concern. Iran ratified the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1970. Article III of the Treaty requires non-nuclear-weapon states-parties to accept comprehensive International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA safeguards. Since 2006, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, China and Germany-collectively known as the P5+1 had engaged in nuclear negotiation with Islamic Republic of Iran. This development further accentuates that the total amount of Iranian LEU containing 20% Uranium-235 would if it had been further enriched have the potentiality for a nuclear weapon and the Islamic republic had a stockpile that contains no more than 5% Uranium-235. [6].

The suspicion on the Iranian nuclear program began in August 2002 when the National Council of Resistance on Iran (NCRI), an Iranian exile group, revealed information during a press conference (some of which later proved to be accurate) that Tehran had built nuclear-related facilities that it had not revealed to the IAEA. At this point, it is pertinent to outline the difficulties that fraught Iranian nuclear disarmament.

1. In 2002, the IAEA began to investigate Iran's nuclear activities at sites named by NCRI, inspectors visited the sites and adopted resolution on the matter in September 2003. The IAEA Board called on Tehran to increase its cooperation with the agency's investigation, suspend its uranium

enrichment activities and unconditionally sign, ratify and fully implement the additional protocol.

In October 2003, Iran concluded a voluntary agreement with France, Germany and the United Kingdom, collectively known as "E3", to suspend its enrichment activities, sign and implement an additional Protocol to its IAEA safeguards agreement and comply fully with IAEA'S investigation As a result, the agency's board decided to refrain from referring the matter to the UN Security Council. As noted, Tehran signed this Additional protocol in December 2003, but failed to ratify it.

2. On September 24, 2005, the IAEA Board of Governors adopted a resolution (Gov/2005/7A) that, for the first time, found Iran to be in non-compliance with its IAEA safeguards agreement. The board, however, did not refer Iran to the Security Council, choosing instead to give Tehran additional time to comply with the board's demands. The resolution therefore urged Iran:
  - a. To implement transparency measures including access to individuals, documentation relating to procurement, dual use equipment, certain military owned workshop, and research and development locations.
  - b. To re-establish full and sustained suspension of all enrichment related activity.
  - c. To reconsider the construction of research reactor moderated by heavy water.
  - d. To ratify promptly and implement in fully the Additional Protocol
  - e. To continue to act in accordance with the provisions of the Additional Protocol
3. Iran further scaled back its cooperation with the IAEA in March 2007, when the government told the agency that it would stop

complying with the portion of the subsidiary arrangement for its IAEA safeguards agreement.

The modified provision code 3.1 (which Iran agreed in February, 2003) requires Tehran to provide design information for new nuclear facilities as soon as the decision to construct or to authorize construction of such a facility has been taken, whichever is earlier. Since March 2007, Iran has argued that it is only obligated to adhere to the previous notification provisions of its subsidiary arrangements, which required Tehran to provide design information for a new facility.

Similarly, Tehran had refused to provide the IAEA with design information for a reactor that Iran constructed at Darkhovin.

4. In March, 2007 Tehran's refusal until 2009 to allow IAEA inspectors to verify design

information for the Arak reactor. This action also appeared to be inconsistent with Tehran's safeguards agreement.

5. The Iran's failure to notify the IAEA of its decision to produce enriched uranium containing a maximum of 20% uranium-235 in time for agency inspectors to adjust their safeguards procedure may, according to February 2010 report from Amano, have violated Iran's IAEA safeguard agreement.
6. The IAEA board adopted a resolution in November 17, 2009 that described Iran's failure to notify the agency of the Fordow facility as inconsistent with the subsidiary arrangement under Iran's safeguards agreement, but this statement did not constitute a formal fining of non-compliance. However, on September 13, 2012, IAEA board resolution expressed serious concern that Tehran has not complied with the obligations described in IAEA Board of Governors and UN Security Council resolution.

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It was discovered that national interest in form of foreign policy shape the behaviour of State in their interaction with each other in international scene. This situation is seen as the cause of disagreement between United States of America and Islamic Republic of Iran concerning the politics of disarmament. It is therefore recommended that since States are allowed to embark on peaceful

nuclear programme, and the way the Islamic Republic of Iran is going about her own is doubtful to some major international actors, the United Nations Security Council should set up a multinational negotiating team that will alleviate the fears expressed in some quarters by supervising or monitoring the Iranian nuclear programme and will guarantee both regional and global peace.

### REFERENCES

1. Palmer and Perkins (2005), *International Relations*. India: A.T.B.S Publishers and Distributors.
2. Agbu, O (2006), *Introduction to International Studies*. Abuja: National Open University of Nigeria.
3. Aisien, E (2012), *Key Concepts to the Study of international relations* in Nnamdi Okafor and Amobi Chiamogu (eds) *Thoughts on international Relations*. Lagos: Absolute Media Productions.
4. Akinyemi, B, (1997), *Murtala/Obasanjo Foreign Policy in Oyediran, O. (eds) Nigerian Government and Politics under Military rule*. London: Macmillian.
5. Asika, N. (2006). *Research Methodology in the behavioural Sciences*. Lagos: Longman Nigeria Plc.
6. Asogwa, F (2009), *Anatomy of Foreign Policy*. Enugu: John-Jacob Classic Publishers Ltd.

7. Bemis, S (1950), *A Diplomatic History of United States*. New York: Holts.
8. Bierrenu-Nnabugwu (2006), *Methodology of Political Inquiry: Issues and Techniques of Research Methods in Political Science*. Enugu: Quintagon Publishers.
9. Chehabi, and 9.Keshavarzian (2011), *Politics in Iran in A*, Almond, G, Bingham, R, Dalton and K, Strom, *Comparative Politics Today: A World view*. India: Dorling Kindsley.
10. Cohen, L. and L. Manion (1980). *Research methods in education*, UK: Croom Helm.
11. Ethridge and Handleman (2010) *Politics in a Changing World: A Comparative Introduction to Political Science*. New York: Amson Ltd.
12. Gauba, P (2003), *An Introduction to political Theory*. India: Macmillan India Ltd.
13. Kerliger, F.N. (1977). *Foundations of Behavioural Research*. New York: Molt, Rinehart and Winston.
14. Melissa, G 14.(2009), *Disarmament: A Basic Guide*. New York: United Nations.
15. Morgenthau, H 15.(1973), *Politics Among Nations*. New York: Alfred Knopf Publishers.
16. Morgenthau, H 16.and Thompson, W (2001), eds, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. India: Kalyani Printings.
17. Northedge, F (1976), *The International Political System*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd.
18. Obasi, N (1999), *Research Methodology in Political Science*. Enugu: Academic Publishing Company.
19. Administration. Crown Center for Middle East Studies. Also at [www.brandies.edu.crown](http://www.brandies.edu.crown).
20. Iran's Nuclear History from 1950's to 2005. Institute for Science and Security Report.
21. Kerr , Paul (2012), *Iran's Nuclear Program: Status*. Congressional Research Service.
22. Kerr, Paul (2015), *Iran's Nuclear Program: Tehran's Compliance with International Obligation*. Congressional Research Service.
23. Kerr, Paul and Katzman Kenneth (2015), *Iran Nuclear Agreement*. Congressional Research Service.
24. National Open University of Nigeria (2006), *Theories in Conflict Management*. Abuja.
25. [www.russianspaceweb.com/chronology-misslehtml](http://www.russianspaceweb.com/chronology-misslehtml).
26. Agbu, O (2006), *Introduction to International Studies*. Abuja: National Open University of Nigeria.
27. Aisien, E (2012), *Key Concepts to the Study of international relations in Nnamdi Okafor and Amobi Chiamogu (eds) Thoughts on international Relations*. Lagos: Absolute Media Productions.
28. Akinyemi, B, (1997), *Murtala/Obasanjo Foreign Policy in Oyediran, O. (eds) Nigerian Government and Politics under Military rule*. London: