

obe

by Obe Nya

Submission date: 08-Dec-2019 03:56AM (UTC-0800)

Submission ID: 1229674439

File name: nuclear_deal.edited.edited.docx (31.06K)

Word count: 2491

Character count: 13497

²
Student's Name

Instructor's Name

Course Title

Date of Submission

Iran and Nuclear Program

Introduction

Iran nuclear program has been a great and critical talk for the last few decades. The country is well known for having research reactor, several uranium mines together with facilities for processing uranium that have three main uranium enrichment plants. First, Iran's history in nuclear programs is very rich knowing that it launched a nuclear program in 1950s with facilitation of United States (Salimi 1). Some scholars there in the past have argued that Iran in possession of nuclear poses a threat to not only the Middle East security but also to the whole world at large. For that reason, there have been suggestions that Iran should not be allowed to have nuclear an aspect that prompted the United States government to come into an agreement with Iran. Iran nuclear program deal is important to the study of international relations as the deal was to ensure that Iran remains and operates under the nuclear deal terms and does not break any one of them as such an action may pose a great threat to the middle east region. On the other hand, discussing the Iran nuclear program helps to understand that other European allies also signed the deal with Iran having in mind that running a nuclear program is a big threat and hence they had to keep Iran under watch (Salimi 1). However, this deal with Iran did not last for long as immediately Trump took to power he withdrew from the deal a step which has been

criticized by several European allies highlighting lack of concern towards the security of the Middle East people. On the other hand, some European allies support the exit from the deal although most of them are against it claiming that it is an ill decision. To clearly understand the Iran nuclear deal and what happened later regarding Trump administration withdrawal from the deal, it is good to discuss some aspects. The literature will focus on answering the questions if Iran directs a real threat to the Middle Eastern Security and international security, was Obama administration nuclear deal with Iran a good policy choice and if trump decision to withdrawal from the deal with Iran leaving other European allies in the deal a wise policy decision.

Threat to Middle Eastern Security

Iran being nuclear-armed poses a threat to America's close allies residing in Middle East. First, Iran's nuclear program has been an issue and has constituted danger and threat to Middle Eastern security. The Middle East is experiencing threats such as military aggression, social, economic and scientific problems (Hokayem 59). For instance, Israel is one of the US allies in the Middle East experiencing harassment. Iran leaders made it clear that Israel must be out of map. On the other hand, even with the United States becoming a main oil exporter, the economy remains highly dependent on stable international markets and thus calls steady oil export from Middle East. Therefore, the United States has huge interest to maintain calmness from threats in Middle East together with international community.

Iran possessing nuclear arms poses a threat by largely spreading its aggressive foreign policy with inclusion of ongoing involvement with Syria (Pollack 62). Aggression will continue rising as long as nuclear arms are possessed by Iran and this is likely to increase confrontations with the international community.

Consequently, the nuclear arms possessed by Iran are a big threat to the security in Middle East. Iran's military comfort has brought to the increase in military markets by its neighbors and by Iran possessing the nuclear arms they would destabilize this fragile and volatile region. Besides, Iran's possession of nuclear weapons would further encourage aggression in its foreign policy (Hokayem 67). As a result, these aggressions would lead to a greater confrontation with the international community hence presenting risk of security in Middle East.

Again, Iran's nuclear mission has participated in Middle East security economic sanctions. Iran would challenge Middle East countries' monopoly of nuclear weapons. To maintain an improved nuclear program, Iran has called courses of action to spread its influence at the same preserving its interest in the Middle East. This has been achieved through provision of direct material support to various terrorist groups and coming up with military capabilities threatening security in the Middle East (Pollack 62). Due to Iran's destabilizing efforts in this region, for example, its support of various terrorists groups Syria and Iraq, development of missile and naval capabilities directed and countering the defenses of Middle East, United States may have to come in. Therefore, United States may have to change its Middle East policies that reflect Iran's large and potential destroying role in this region at the same time expecting larger burden-sharing from partners in the region.

Threat to International Security

Consequently, Iran's nuclear energy program becomes a great challenge to peace internationally. The IAEA clarified that Iran violated a crucial provision contained in the nuclear agreement (Behnamand Mahmoudy 2198). The Iranian violations came fast to the globe and escalated tensions in the Middle East region together with the

relationship between Iran and United States. The main dilemma regarding Iran's nuclear program in the Middle East involves its alleged nuclear weapons development-related activities at military sites in past. Thus, Iran is considered generally as the leading world's terrorism sponsor through operational and financial support (Guzansky 97). On the other hand, Iran could share nuclear technology potentially with extremist hostile groups to attack Israel, United States and West. Thus, Iran's nuclear arms possession poses a direct security threat internationally.

Nuclear-armed Iran has also posed threat internationally and this has continued presenting foreign militias associated with Iran in Syria violating Syrian sovereignty (Abulof 404). Iran's actions to establish military actions in Syria and establishing pads in attacking Israel is already escalating unstable situation in Syria and at the Israel-Syrian border. However, Israel becomes justified to act and prevent Iran from coming up with such bases.

The international community needs to call out at the same time condemn and actively participate to prevent Iranian unacceptable policies (Guzansky 94). Such policies include providing help to Assad regime in the campaign fighting against Syrian people, interfering with the internal affairs of different countries and abusing human rights. Thus, the aforementioned aspects pose threats to international security with nuclear arms possession.

Obama Administration

Obama's Administrations of nuclear deal with Iran was a good policy choice. In times when United States, Iran, France, Germany, Britain, China, Russia and other European Union signed the JCPOA in 2015, no party was under any illusions about accomplishments by the deal (Rose 2). Obama did not expect the deal to remove the

range of threats to be brought by Iran's brutal foreign policy, especially in the Middle East neither did any of his counterparts. Obama stated it clear earlier that the deal was not to resolve any of their problems and it would certainly not resolve all problems they had with Iran. Besides, it was noted that the deal would wisely achieve one of their most fragile and reasonable security goals with Iran.

With Obama's administration, a good policy choice was made. They were able to manage Iran's threat effectively. That was an achievement in the United States' efforts towards attaining peace. Tehran, however, presented other dangers. The missile program which meant delivering conventional and nuclear weapons would support terrorist groups creating war with Israel and consistently intervening with the internal affairs of the Iraqi Government (Guerlain 489). However, this would be dealt with differently and separately. The agreement made was temporal, effective in the deals' term of 15 years a suggestion made for renegotiation in the future of United States.

Exchange for relief from sanctions created by Europeans allies and United States government came in occurrence of the Iranian government considerations (Guerlain 485). The considerations included the Iranian government agreeing to cut its stockpile of uranium which was suitable for weapons productions, lower levels enrichment of uranium, not leaving behind restricting enrichment to one facility rather than two. Also, the Iranian government would give access to its nuclear facilities in monitoring and verifying compliance with agreement to International Atomic Energy Agency (Behnamand Mahmoudy 2199). However, having the word 'comprehensive' in JCPOA did not bring an issue in the agreement but was as most international agreements ultimately a compromise.

Obama's administration in the nuclear deal with Iraq was a good choice taking note and observing, 1994 agreed-upon framework on nuclear weapons between North Korea and United States was designed just like other nuclear agreements before (Rose 2). Some nuclear activity for generation of energy and medical research was allowed by JCPOA which was permitted by international law. Hence, bringing Iran to acceptance of treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear ammunition was also an aim which was a signatory.

Consequently, Obama together with the administration made a good decision choice making a deal with Iran because, the period to be taken to build and make a nuclear weapon, from months adding up to a year was also an aim designed to buy time (Guerlain 482). Making of nuclear weapons and their duration extended breakout time for Iran. On the other hand, international and domestic events left room for inclusion of continued diplomacy. This could affect changes in Iranian government nuclear slowly. Also, it could slowly affect foreign and domestic policies such that they would no longer counter interests of the ³ United States.

Trump Administration

Donald Trump's administration withdrawal from nuclear energy agreement with Iran leaving European allies behind in the deal was a bad policy. If Trump had chosen by sticking to the deal, Iran could have addressed and discussed plans it has for the nuclear program before certain restrictions within the agreement with United States such as Uranium stockpile, levels of enrichment and expiry centrifuges (Koh 413). In addition, such a forum would help to discuss Iran's nuclear needs and implement them to keep strong and effective the goals made in the deal while in continuation build confidence among participants (Rice 1).

Again, Trump administration made a bad choice by withdrawing from the Iran deal because preparations of researches to go with enrichment and development plan that informed the limits placed on its centrifuge work advancement were prepared by Tehran during the period of negotiations (Tajbakhsh 41). Besides, consistent mechanism is ongoing with the nuclear' deal spirit stating that growth will occur in form of gradual evolution at a reasonable pace upon expiration of Iran's activities. In a way, it will happen consistently with international nonproliferation norms. Hence, nuclear program evolving would give hand in ensuring steps based on technical needs and surprises avoided that would lead to crisis. For that reason, it would be better and wise for the administration to stick to the Iran deal.

Also, it was a bad choice for Trump administration to withdraw from Iran's deal because the United States would have asked Iran's compliance with current issues and resolve before U.S gets in the deal again (Rice 1). Iranian officials considering rolling back some commitments appeared to have political messages sent. Also, this position should have 2020 presidential candidates communicating early to hinder Iran from having such activity. On the other hand, the future U.S president should be able to rejoin the deal if Iran does not have a clean bill of health and continue emphasizing its expectancy on Iran to adhere with all International Atomic Energy Agency obligations and requirements once it's back in the deal (Behnam and Mahmoudy 2200). Also, U.S should focus to work with the International Atomic Energy Agency to address any issues arising and emerging concerns.

Trump's administration decision was a bad choice of withdrawing from Iran's deal and if the administration stuck to the deal, missile issues would be solved before bringing the nuclear deal back and simply getting it as an agenda (Rice 2). Hence, United States should be securing agreements and discussions from Iran about the

Missile program. However, since the defense and capabilities are supported by Iran's missiles centrally, the U.S starting point and a single possible entry would be to explore how to codify self-imposed range limit of Iran which is 2000 kilometers. Also, threats faced by Iran from Israel and U.S would certainly be included in any part of discussion.

Lastly, United States would have had an ideal moment to start discussions involving differences in nuclear programs much less complex and pronounced (Rice 2). Iran and United States could have got in agreement to introduce discussions about regional issues broadly. Issues had to be formatted and addressed separately by having no original signatories included. Therefore, Trump administration made a terrible decision on withdrawing from the Iran deal.

Conclusion

Having focused on answering the questions if Iran poses a real threat to the middle eastern security or international security, was Obama administration nuclear deal with Iran a good policy choice and if trump withdrawal from deal with Iran leaving other European allies in the deal a wise policy decision, it is clear that Iran being in possession of nuclear energy is a matter of concern. To ensure that the Middle Eastern region together with international peace is maintained, nuclear possession must be controlled, monitored and regulated. On the other hand, Trump administration withdrawal from agreement needs to be revisited as a way to ensure that Iran does not continue to support militia groups that end compromising not on the United States security but also the security of its allies in the Middle East. As evident from the paper, trump administration should have initiated discussion with Iran instead of doing away with the deal in such a reckless manner. It is evident that once

the deal has been disregarded it poses huge security threats to not only the Middle Eastern region but also internationally at large.

Works Cited

- Abulof, Uriel. "Revisiting Iran's nuclear rationales." *International Politics* 51.3 (2014): 404-415.
- Behnam, Biook, and Behzad Mahmoudy. "A critical discourse analysis of the reports issued by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) director general on Iran's nuclear program during the last decade." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 3.12 (2013): 2196-2201.
- Guerlain, Pierre. "Obama's Foreign Policy: "Smart Power," Realism and Cynicism." *Society* 51.5 (2014): 482-491.
- Guzansky, Yoel. "The Saudi nuclear genie is out." *The Washington Quarterly* 38.1 (2015): 93-106.
- Hokayem, Emile. "Iran, the Gulf States and the Syrian civil war." *Survival* 56.6 (2014): 59-86.
- Koh, Harold Hongju. "The Trump Administration and International Law." *Washburn LJ* 56 (2017): 413. Rose, Gideon. "What Obama gets right." *Foreign Aff.* 94 (2015): 2.
- Pollack, Kenneth M. "Fight or Flight: America's Choice in the Middle East." *Foreign Aff.* 95 (2016): 62.
- Rice, S.E. Trump's Most Foolish Decision Yet. The New York Times , International edition; New York. (2018): 1-3.
- Salimi, Khadijeh. "Deal with Iran's Nuclear Issue." *J. Pol. & L.* 8 (2015): 1.

Tajbakhsh, Kian. "Who Wants What from Iran Now? The Post-Nuclear Deal US Policy Debate." *The Washington Quarterly* 41.3 (2018): 41-61.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

3%

SIMILARITY INDEX

2%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

1%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

www.mathsisfun.net

Internet Source

1%

2

mastersessaysharks.com

Internet Source

<1%

3

www.channelnewsasia.com

Internet Source

<1%

4

dergipark.org.tr

Internet Source

<1%

5

Submitted to Oxford Brookes University

Student Paper

<1%

6

Submitted to University of Melbourne

Student Paper

<1%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On