

**IRANIAN NUCLEAR PROGRAMME AND U.S.–ISRAEL’S
NATIONAL SECURITY: HISTORICAL APPROACH: 1990-2011**

**Joseph Chikodi Lemchi^{1*}, Pedro Obialor Iwuozor², Ambrose Oluchukwu Abaneme³
& Samuel Chidi Ogboji⁴**

^{1,4}Department of History and Diplomatic Studies, Alvan Ikoku Federal University of Education,
Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria

²Department of Social Science and Humanities Education, School of General Studies, Federal
College of Education (Technical), Asaba, Delta State, Nigeria

³Department of Political Sciences, Alvan Ikoku Federal University of Education, Owerri, Imo
State, Nigeria

*joseph.lemchi@alvanikoku.edu.ng

ABSTRACT: Contemporary World Politics hardly goes without one talking about nuclear issues; if not about the World Powers, it will either be Iran or states referred to as Rogue Nations. It has become a recurring decimal, in a situation where a day hardly goes without a reference to the crisis of Iran's nuclear weapon development. This is because the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was signed in 1968, which came into force in 1970, as the centrepiece of the global non-proliferation regime. However, the recent move by Iran to develop nuclear technology and capacity has been causing serious disquiet around the globe, in addition to the volatile nature of the Middle East as the haven of Rogue States. The study investigates historically the synergy between the existential threat faced by Israel at the hands of nuclear Iran on the one hand, and the national interest of the United States in the Middle East on the other hand, via the United States insistence on denuclearising Iran. The paper made use of secondary sources of data collection such as textbooks, journals, Newspapers, Magazines and internet sources. A descriptive method of data analysis is used. The paper adopted the Power theory as its theoretical framework. The paper revealed that while America is seeking to protect its interest and that of its allies in the Middle East, Iran, on the other hand, seeks to enhance its military capacity against real and perceived military attack, especially from its long-standing enemy, Israel. The paper recommends that both the U.S, Israel and Iran should seek a diplomatic solution to resolve their face-off rather than military confrontation. America is a victim of its contradiction, having applied a double standard on its earlier role in Iran and the entire Middle East.

Keywords: Iran, Nuclear Programme, U.S.-Israel's National Interests

INTRODUCTION

The threat of a Cold War between the U.S and Russia has decreased dramatically during the last couple of decades. Unfortunately, the theatre of proxy cold war between these two world powers thus shifted to the Middle East, especially as it concerns Iran on the one hand and Israel. In

support of the above assertion, on Sunday, October 31, 2004, virtually on the eve of the U.S. presidential election, the Majlis, Iran's Parliament, met in Tehran. The 247 Lawmakers present of the 290 total considered an inflammatory resolution, which is on the bill to enrich Uranium. The session was carried live on Iran National Radio. As the Assembly voted unanimously to enrich Uranium, the members of the parliament took up the eerie chant "Death to America, Death to Israel" (Corsi, 2005:19).

As Nuclear issues are back on the global political agenda, hardly a day goes by without a reference to the ongoing crisis in Iran, the prospect of nuclear power renaissance triggered by record oil prices, the intricacies of the U.S—India nuclear deal, and the alleged threat of terrorist groups gaining access to weapons-grade nuclear materials (Iwuzor, 2013: 2).

Apart from the day-to-day firefighting, a more wide-ranging debate on how to tackle nuclear challenges has emerged. In two remarkable Wall Street Journal articles, Former U.S secretaries of State and defence George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Senator Sam Nunn have argued for a "World free of nuclear weapons", a call that both Barack Obama and John McCain have echoed during pre-2008 election rallies and campaigns (Thakur,2008). The greatest threat to America's national security is Iran's nuclear arsenal, its pursuit of more advanced missile technology and the possibility that it could transfer nuclear weapons or materials to other states or terrorist groups, which pose significant dangers to the U.S and its allies in the region (Israel) and beyond (Thompson, 1992).

Iran presents a range of issues for U.S policy: the sponsorship of terrorism, regional stability, human rights, influence on the Arab-Israeli peace process, and expressed hostility toward American allies, among others. Ultimately, Nuclear Proliferation remains the primary concern for U.S foreign policy toward Iran. In particular, the basis for concern regarding Iranian Nuclear Proliferation stems from Iran's violation of its Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) obligations and refusal to provide objective guarantees that it will use its Nuclear programme strictly for peaceful, civilian purposes (Whitehouse,2006). While American and European officials believe Tehran is planning to build Nuclear weapons, Iran's leadership says that its goal in developing a nuclear programme is to generate electricity without dipping into the oil supply it prefers to sell abroad and to provide fuel for medical reactors. This has brought Iran and the West into conflict over its nuclear programme for years. But the dispute picked up steam since November 2011, following the findings by international inspectors (New York Times, 2012). In line with the foregoing, the Middle East simultaneously offers dramatically contrasting opportunities for the dangers to the United States' interest in the Persian Gulf. On the one hand, a democratic and free market-oriented Israel and others in the region have developed, enhanced military capacity and political clout and an expanded set of shared interests with the United States. On the other hand, a secretive, totalitarian and episcopal Iran has expanded its capacity to threaten regional and global stability through continued development of fissile materials and nuclear capabilities, and has directly challenged the global Non-Proliferation regimes.

It is therefore, against this background that efforts are being made in this paper to examine the causal explanations of the United States security policy towards Iran, most especially in the area of nuclear arms race, with focus on the Iranian nuclear programme.

Theoretical Framework

The task for scholars of international politics and diplomacy is to build on the past, but not be trapped by it; rather, to understand the continuities as well as the changes.

On this note, we must learn the traditional theories and then adapt them to current circumstances. One can logically say that theory is an idea or belief about something arrived at through assumption and, in some cases, a set of facts, propositions, or principles analysed in their relation to one another and used, especially in sciences (Faleti, 2007).

Theories, in view of their nature, share a deep relationship with practice or research with empirical orientation. Based on the subject matter of this paper, we tend to adopt and apply, for clarity purposes, certain propositions emanating from the Realist Theory of Power as propounded by Hobbes, Machiavelli, Morgenthau and Waltz, etc. Power is frequently defined by political scientists as the ability to influence the behaviour of others with or without resistance. Max Weber (1947) defined power as the probability that an actor within a social relationship would be in a position to carry out his will despite resistance. The activation of power is dependent on a person's will, even in opposition to someone else.

Following the above assertion, the strength and limit of a state's actions are seen to be predicated on the amount of power such a state commands. Power, therefore, was seen as not merely the means to an end but as an end in itself. In the same vein, Morgenthau (1948) asserts that the principal trait in it is striving to dominate, which shapes relations not only among individuals but also among nations. Thus, the central organising concept for the realist is "power", supplemented by the concept "National interest". The central thesis of the realist perspective is that states, acting through statesmen who personify them, think and act in terms of interests defined as power. Power for them is so necessary for states in international relations because of divergent national

Interests of states. And the principal cause of prevalent conflict in international politics is also a result of the absence of a centralising authority to guide the behaviour of actors. The only weapon that could therefore guarantee the security of states for them in international politics is national power. To that extent, the realist assigns little or no role to moral principles, law, etc., in guiding the conduct of states in international relations. The implication of the preceding lines of argument to this paper is such that the leadership of the Islamic Republic of Iran through its quest for the acquisition of nuclear power and technology is threatening the extant global regime on nuclear non-proliferation, which threatens not only its immediate neighbours but is perceived by the larger members of the global community as a threat to world peace and security based on the historical antecedents of the region both as "axis of evil" and constant theatre of war and friction.

It is against this backdrop that the United States, using the instrument of power, is demanding that Iran dismantle and discontinue any further research and development regarding its illegal and secretive nuclear programme that is suspected to have military capacity and intentions.

This paper, therefore, on the basis of the propositions made above, believes that power rooted in the realist theory of international politics and relations would effectively address the growing

tension and face-off between the United States of America and its allies (Israel) and the Islamic Republic of Iran over the latter's seeming threat to global peace and security as typified in the Iranian nuclear programme.

In summary, therefore, one can say U.S-Israeli opposition to Iran's nuclear programme is about maintaining core control over Gulf oil and, at the same time, preventing a regional Challenger to Capitalist hegemony, not just "security".

Hypotheses

This paper is guided by the following hypothesis:

1. There is a positive relationship between the protection of the state of Israel and United States sanctions towards Iran's nuclear programme.
2. The United States economic interests in the Middle East influence its actions against Iran's nuclear programme.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The focus of this section of the paper centres on some scholars' views concerning Iran's nuclear programme and U.S-Israel national security. One of the leading scholars on this, Bahgat (2006), argues that Iran's nuclear ambitions are motivated by security concerns, technological advancement, national prestige, and the desire to become a dominant regional power. He further maintains that Iran's pursuit of nuclear technology can not be understood solely as a military project but must also be viewed within the broader context of national development and regional politics.

In aligning with the above view, Waltz (2012), a controversial realist, sees Iran's programme as a strategic balance in the Middle East which will deter aggression and promote stability through mutual deterrence. Contrary to Waltz and Bahgat's position on Iran's nuclear programme, Sagan (2012) contends that an Iranian nuclear weapon would increase the risks of regional instability, accidental conflict and nuclear proliferation among Middle East States. He further maintains that preventing nuclear proliferation remains essential for international security.

This was corroborated by Takeyh (2009) and Parsi (2017). The duo maintained that Iran seeking greater regional influence will aggravate further military confrontation in the region, whereas a joint comprehensive plan of action that will sustain negotiation can reduce tension between Iran and the West.

METHODOLOGY

In this paper, we adopt a qualitative descriptive method of data analysis. According to Asika (1991), qualitative descriptive analysis is used to verbally summarise the information gathered in research. For the purpose of our data collection, we relied on the observation method. Observation

is not only one of the most pervasive activities of daily life; it is a primary tool of scientific inquiry (Selltize et al, 1951).

Scientifically, observation can be defined as a purposefully planned and systematically executed act of waiting or looking at the occurrence of events, activities and behaviour which constitute the focus of this paper (Obasi, 1999). Observation, as a method of data collection, is flexible, sometimes involving observation of interaction, examining organisational records, life histories, or other behavioural footprints. Also, it is the resolve of this paper to use observation as our method of data collection. This does not, however, vitiate the fact that we will apply content analysis where necessary.

America's Early Diplomatic Relations with Iran

The U.S government's interest and subsequent direct influence in Iran did not begin to take shape until after the Second World War. Yet, consistent with established policy, when the time came to look beyond the Western Hemisphere, America's approach brought to bear three themes dominant and recurrent in its foreign-relations history: the open-door policy (the goal), security (the pretext), and the domino theory (the method). The first of these three remains the principal consideration, with the other two being only procedurally relevant (Harms, 2010, p. 71). First, the American corporate and state sectors each desired unimpeded access to the immense energy resources available in the Middle East. Second, the declared fear of Communist expansion would provide the security-based rationale for conducting an aggressive programme of gaining access to, and more to the point control of, those resources in the name of deterrence and National interest; which necessarily would entail, third, exercising management over the region in such a way as to ensure political consistency and reliability among its leaderships.

The evolution of political relations between Persia (now Iran) and the United States began when the Shah of Persia, Naser al-Din Shah Qajar, officially dispatched Persia's first Ambassador, Mirza Abolhassan Mirza Shirazi, to Washington, D.C in 1856. In 1883, Samuel Benjamin was appointed by the United States as the first Official diplomatic envoy to Iran; however, Ambassadorial relations were not established until 1944 (Lesch, 2003, p. 52). In its diplomatic History, the first Persian Ambassador to the United States of America was Mirza Albohassan Khan Ilch Kabir. However, before this time Americans had been travelling to Iran since the early-to-mid 1880s, even before diplomatic relations existed between the two. Justin Perkins and Asahel Grant were the first missionaries to be dispatched to Persia in 1834 via the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Amir Kabir, prime minister under Naser al-Din Shah, also initiated direct contacts with the American government in Washington. By the end of the 19th century, negotiations were underway for an American Company to establish a railway from the Persian Gulf to Tehran.

America and Iran maintained good cordial relations until the end of the Second World War. As a result of this, many Iranians sympathetic to the Persian constitutional Revolution came to view the U.S as a "third Force" in their struggle to break free of British and Russian dominance in Persian affairs. American industrial and business leaders were supportive of Persia's drive to modernise its economy and free itself from British and Russian influence.

In retrospect, in 1909, during the Persian constitutional Revolution, Howard Baskerville, an American, died in Tabriz while trying to help the constitutionalists in a battle against Royalist forces. After the Iranian Parliament appointed American financial consultant Morgan Shuster as Treasurer General of Persia in 1911, an American was killed in Tehran by henchmen thought to be affiliated with Russian or British interests. This incident made Shuster more active in supporting the constitutional Revolution of Persia financially.

This must have prompted Iran's government to order Shu'a al-Saltaneh, the Shah's brother who was aligned with the goals of imperial Russia in Persia, to surrender his assets; Shuster, however, moved to effect its execution. This action prompted Imperial Russia to have landed troops in Bandar Anzali, demanding a recourse and apology from the Persian government. General Liakhoff shelled Iran's parliament in Tehran, and Morgan Shuster was forced to resign under British and Russian pressure. As a matter of fact, the American Embassy first reported to the Iran desk at the Foreign Office in London about the popular view of Britain's involvement in the 1921 coup that brought Reza Shah to power (Zirinsky, 1992: 646 and Ansari, 2006: 26-31).

However, the British embassy report in 1932 admitted that the British put Reza Shah on the throne. During this time, Persia did not view the United States as an ally of Britain. It is of note that friendly relations between the United States and Iran lasted until the 1950s.

The Impact of the 1953 Iranian Coup D'état on U.S.–Iran Relations

The 1953 Iranian coup masterminded by America's Central Intelligence Agency (C.I.A) marked a turning point in geostrategic politics in the Middle East and its entire neighbourhood. In the spring and summer of 1953, the United States and Britain, through a covert operation of the CIA called Operation Ajax," conducted from the American Embassy in Tehran, helped organise a coup d'etat that overthrew the Mosaddeq movement, whom they suspected of having established a dictatorship in Iran and also to clear the way for America's easy access to Iran's oil.

Following the success of the Coup, the United States helped build up the Shah's regime. In the first three weeks of the Coup, the American government gave Iran \$68 million dollars in emergency aid and additional \$1.2 billion dollars over the next decade (Gasiorowski & Malcolm Byrne, 2004, p. 257). This was regarded in America's fashion of strategic politics called "Carrot and Stick diplomacy". During this period, the Shah of Iran received significant American support, and he frequently made state visits to the White House, thus earning praise from numerous American Presidents.

However, these ecumenisms did not go down well, especially among the hard-line Islamic conservatives in Iran who saw the Shah's Westernisation policies as threats to their religious values (Menashri, 2000).

The 1979 Iranian Revolution and Its Hostage Crisis

The power play that took place in Iran, which brought in an anti-American regime, surprised the United States government, the State Department and the intelligence services, all of which

consistently underestimated the magnitude and long-term implications of this regime change, which brought in an Islamic leader called Ayatollah Khomeini.

This Iranian Revolution that ousted the Pro-American Shah demanded the extradition and execution of the ousted Shah, but the then American President Jimmy Carter turned down the request; hence, it was used by the Iranian Revolutionaries to justify their claims that the former Monarch (Shah) was an American puppet and this led to the storming of the American embassy by radical students allied with the Khomeini faction (Dougherty, 1997). These radical students who stormed the U.S embassy held 52 American diplomats hostage for a period of four hundred and forty-four (444) days. This single action was seen as a blow to America's image, hence deteriorating U.S.-Iran diplomatic Relations.

In the United States, the hostage taking was seen as a violation of a centuries-old principle of international Law that granted diplomats immunity from arrest and diplomatic compounds sovereignty in the territory of the host country they occupy (The New York Times, 1979).

However, America did not sleep over this, as an attempt at a rescue operation, tagged "Operation Eagle Claw", was launched in April 1980. The operation was abysmal and poor, resulting in the American Waterloo that led America to lose eight of its servicemen in the operation. This was the situation until the Algiers Accords in Algeria, which were signed on January 20, 1981 and led the Iranian government to release the hostages. Before this treaty signing, the crisis had led to lasting economic and diplomatic damage between the two countries.

Precisely, the curtain was drawn on April 7, 1980, when the United States officially broke diplomatic relations with Iran, a break that was not restored until the emergence of Donald Trump as President of the United States, with his foreign policy thrust of "making America Great Again".

Iran as an Existential Threat to the State of Israel

The United States has ensured Israel's security and survival since the founding of the State of Israel in 1948, an interest reinforced during the Cold War as each country sought to counter proxies of the then Soviet Union. Based on the context of this sub-theme, existential threat refers to a danger that threatens the survival, sovereignty, or continued existence of a state. In the Israeli context, the term is often used to describe threats that could fundamentally undermine Israel's security, territorial integrity, or ability to exist as a Jewish State.

Israel's perception of Iran as an existential threat stems from a combination of ideological, military, strategic, and nuclear concerns. In view of the preceding assertion, the United States and Israel shared new enemies after the Cold War as both countries struggled against violent Islamic organisations and belligerent regimes in Tehran and Damascus (Jentleson et al, 2012, pp. 9-10). The Islamic Republic of Iran has never accepted the existence of the State of Israel. Iran's policies towards Israel run counter to much of the rest of the international community.

Iran recently increased its hostile rhetoric towards Israel. This has been an annual military parade, during which missiles are draped with anti-Israeli slogans (The Telegraph, 22 September, 2004). Again, in 2005, President Ahmadinejad notoriously called for Israel to be wiped off the map (The Guardian, 27 October). In a bid to broker peace between these two belligerent nations, the United States hosted the Annapolis Conference in late 2007 in a bid to re-energise the Middle East Peace Process that is aimed at ensuring and strengthening the peaceful co-existence between the Jewish State of Israel and its Arab neighbours.

However, the Iranian President Ahmadinejad called it “a trap set up by the Zionists and neither Iran nor Hamas were represented (Jerusalem Post, 22 October 2007). On its part and in its quest for survival, Israel has strongly opposed Iran’s nuclear programme. Its former Defense Minister, Ehud Barak, once rejected the assessment of the United States intelligence estimate that Iran had halted work on its nuclear weapons programme in 2003; He argued:

It is our responsibility to ensure that the right steps are taken against the Iranian regime. As is well known, words do not stop missiles (New York Times, 5 Dec, 2007).

It is of note to state here that Iran’s nuclear programme pre-dated the Donald Trump regime; it began during the Clinton administration and has continued to the point where Iran might have a deliverable nuclear weapon any day. In the release of the CIA’s 2004 7rI Reports. The Bush administration gave off clear signals suggesting Iran was very close to having a deliverable nuclear bomb. To buttress the above assertion, U.S former Secretary of State Colin Powell gave an impromptu news conference to reporters en route to Chile to attend an economic summit with Pacific Rim Leaders. He said thus:

“I have seen some information that would suggest that the Iranians have actively been working on a delivery system . . . you don’t have a weapon until you put it in something that can deliver a weapon” (Corsi, 2005).

In fact, as it has always been the case, the only case today in which a UN member country is calling for the destruction of another member is Tehran’s repeated threats to obliterate Israel. Official Iranian comments about Israel are continually genocidal in nature. A good example is an article in the Iranian press in February 2012, circulated by the Revolutionary Guard’s Fars New Agency but originated at the website Alef, which has ties to the Supreme Leader, that calls for the destruction of the Jews. The Author, Alireza Forghani, a chief strategy specialist, is a significant figure in Iran; more important is that key regime websites are promoting his views.

However, a report at the IND view website summarizes the Central paragraph of Forghani’s analysis of the necessity for destroying Israel and its people this way:

Under this pre-emptive defensive doctrine, several Ground Zero points of Israel must be destroyed, and its people annihilated. Forghani cites the last census by Israel, which has a population of 7.5 million citizens, of which a majority of 5.7 million are Jews. Then it breaks down the districts with the highest concentration of Jewish people, indicating that three cities, Tel

Aviv, Jerusalem and Haifa, contain over 60 percent of the Jewish population that Iran could target with its Shahab-3 ballistic missiles, killing all its inhabitants (Chosky, 2012, p. 2).

This call for genocide is an acceptable discourse in the Islamic Republic of Iran. In this connection, the United States, which is an acclaimed die-hard ally of the Jewish State of Israel, necessarily has a course to believe that Iran would launch a Nuclear attack at Israel the day it acquires the capability to understand that both itself and Israel cannot tolerate a nuclear weapon in the hands of this regime.

In addition to the threat of State action, Iran could also provide such a capability to Hamas, Hezbollah, or some other terrorist groups with which it has connections as a way of masking its own role in the attack. Iran could also use a newly acquired nuclear capacity to defend stepped-up terrorist activities, both against Israel proper and against Israeli and Jewish individuals and sites around the world. The recent attacks some time ago on Israeli officers in India and Georgia and the bombing of the Israeli embassy and Jewish community headquarters in Buenos Aires in the 1990s were all conducted when Iran did not have the added protection of a nuclear weapon.

Similarly, Hezbollah and Hamas rockets have bombs; attacks and terrorist bombings and kidnappings have all occurred when their benefactor in Tehran did not have bombs. Israelis are of the opinion that they paid a great price in blood and treasure to survive in the decades when it had a nuclear monopoly in the region. To confront the same hostility, terror and aggression when that monopoly is gone could undermine its ability to survive.

American Foreign Policy and Iran's Nuclear Program

The United States foreign policy on Iran revolves around power, interests and threats. According to Gaddis (1992:3-4), American foreign policy in the 20th century is undergirded by the intertwined following: power, interests, and threats.

By power, he means “nothing more complicated in form than the capacity to make things happen in the world, whether in the military, political, economic, ideological or cultural realms of human activity”. The accomplishment of this power, he opines, became a reality as a result of the interplay of geographical insecurity of the United States from her rival powers and the accidental and concomitant consequence of the outcome of the Second World War. Similarly, Condoleezza Rice, in an opening remark to the commission on Terrorist attacks on April 8, 2004, declares categorically that the outlook of American foreign policy towards international terrorism is taken in the form of pre-emptive action. To actualise this, according to her, America will use the “Carrot and Stick method, as well as proxies in the different “nest” countries.

Besides, she further maintains that the policy will, in pursuance of the above, confront the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Relating American foreign policy to the Iranian nuclear programme, Solomon (2009) asserted that since Barack Obama’s administration, America has reiterated its willingness to engage Iran in a direct dialogue through high-level contact, which offers details on a broader strategy for the U.S. As of July 2009, the precise outline and substance of a diplomatic initiative remain unclear, with direct U.S-Iran contact limited to a

brief exchange between U.S Special Representative Richard Holbrooke and Iran's deputy foreign Minister, Mehdi Akhundzadeh, at an international Conference focused on Afghanistan.

In a similar development, Mullen (2009) reiterated that "Iran's strategic objective is to achieve Nuclear weapons" and that the Iranian leadership remains committed to that path. This lent credence to the assertion that, in this process of disarmament, there are certain procedures that need to be taken for nations to disarm. Nevertheless, the most important of all is that of a nation's foreign policy. Every nation has a strong policy on how to defend its national interests, security, boundary, and integrity. United States of America and Iran are both basically defending their foreign policy from any external aggression and that of their allies.

According to Oyene et al (2002:205), foreign policy is:

The underlying cause of action concerning the relationship among nations refers to the decisions and actions taken by a state to pursue its interest in relation to other states. It is based on goals and objectives which a nation seeks.

In recent times, Iran and other nations are trying to acquire nuclear facilities as an aspect of their foreign policy on the issue of their national security. On this note, Rourke (1997:44) observes:

over 40,000 Nuclear weapons exist in the world; some countries are trying to acquire nuclear weapons; other countries are building chemical weapons plants. The only safety some observers maintain is complete disarmament, beginning with complete nuclear disarmament.

Not long ago, Iran developed a nuclear weapon with a powerful range that can reach Europe. This Aja (2009:100) observed:

Peace in the nuclear age is running out of man's control because of the clear absence of world government as an international leviathan with absolute commanding authority and power to enforce compliance.

Based on the preceding assertion, during a meeting of Mayors of Peace, of which about thirty persons attended, with other five hundred and eighty cities that members of Mayor Itoh of Nagasaki, one of the cities of Japan bombed in 1945, addressing the preparatory committee on review of NPT, Itoh (2004) laments:

"The cry of the citizens of Nagasaki for the elimination of Nuclear weapons began with our unspeakable experience of 50 years ago, and continues to this day. But we bear no hatred against the United States, the nation that dropped the atomic bomb. In fact, the first sister city relationship between Japan and the United States was established between Nagasaki and St. Paul, Minnesota in 1955, and we are now looking forward to the 50th anniversary of exchange between our citizens. The suffering sustained by Nagasaki must never happen to anyone; we continue to voice our appeal to the world that the citizens of Nagasaki may be the last victims of nuclear warfare.

In a similar vein, Mayor Akiba of Hiroshima requested the world to accept the NPT and abide by the treaty in the interest of peace and security. He pleaded as follows:

on behalf of the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki; on behalf of the 350 million citizens of the 580 cities that are members of Mayors for peace, on behalf of the thousands on NGOs with millions members, on behalf of all human beings, who wish to live free of the Nuclear threat, and on behalf of our children and generation of children to come whom we are duty-bound to bequeath safe, peaceful and clean planet, I urge you to establish a clear time frame and begin negotiations and planning for the total abolition of all Nuclear weapons by the 2020. Please let our venerable Hibakusha (Japanese atomic victims) go to their final rest comforted in the knowledge that world's leaders are at last determined to take the step necessary to welcome future generations into a nuclear weapon-free world (Akiba,2004).

The preceding speeches by Itoh and Akiba show the deep negative side of nuclear weapons on humanity. These emanated from the horrific consequences that the survivors of the atomic bombs in the two cities of Japan are telling the world. From their speeches, one concludes that they were calling for a nuclear-free world.

In this regard, the Islamic Republic of Iran has been a Central focus of U.S national security policy. The United States has decried Iran's Uranium enrichment activities, which allegedly are being used to develop nuclear weapons. Iran also has been accused of arming Shiite militia in Iraq, providing support to Hezbollah and Hamas and influencing sectarian strife in the Middle East. Besides, a Nuclear Iran will be a potential security threat to the existence of the Jewish state of Israel if left unchecked.

Conclusion and Recommendation

This paper uses a historical perspective to assess how the Iranian nuclear programme has shaped U.S.-Israeli national security calculations since the 1990s. In more specific terms, the paper sought to determine the synergy between the implications of a nuclear Iran on the survival and corporate existence of the Jewish State of Israel on the one hand and the need for oil and energy security in the Middle East on the other, with America's quest to denuclearise Iran.

This becomes necessary in view of the fact that Iranian leaders, both secular and religious, have consistently and persistently voiced their desire in no ambiguous manner to decimate the Jewish state of Israel at the slightest opportunity. Iran also occupies the choke point of the Hormuz Strait, along which passes more than half of the world's oil and energy transactions daily, which usually threatens to block an area in which the United States have many economic interests and allies. The above scenario made Iran an existential threat to both the United States of America and Israel and their allies in the Middle East. Existential threat refers to a danger that threatens the survival, sovereignty, or continued existence of a state.

In Israel's perception, the term is often used to describe threats that could fundamentally undermine Israel's security, territorial integrity, or ability to exist as a Jewish State. Israel's perception of Iran as an existential threat stems from a combination of ideological, military,

strategic, and nuclear concerns. Israel's perception aligns with or confirms realist expectations about proliferation incentives: states facing regional adversaries and uncertain alliance commitments pursue latent nuclear capabilities as a hedge.

Historically, Israel treats a nuclear-capable Iran as an existential risk due to geographic constraints and proxy encirclement, while the United States frames it as a systemic non-proliferation and Gulf stability problem. However, this paper would recommend some possible ways through which the Iranian nuclear programme could be solved without infringing on their fundamental right as a sovereign State.

First and foremost, economic sanctions should collectively be imposed on Iran, not only by America and Israel but in conjunction with other countries affected by the existing wrangling in the region. The aim of these sanctions is to constrain Iran from doing business with any country in the global market, hence limiting Iran's access to the international financial system. Other areas such as sanctions would target include the banking system and oil exports. This will go a long way to pressurise Iran into altering policies related to its nuclear programme.

Another measure to be adopted is military deterrence. The United States of America should maintain a substantial military presence in the Middle East, and this military presence should work closely with other regional allies to deter Iran's nuclear threats. Again, despite every odd, diplomatic engagement has to be opened where Iran will be drawn to a round table concerning the dangers surrounding the development of nuclear weapons. While this is going on, Iran has to be assured about the sanctity of their sovereignty and internal security as enshrined in international law.

Furthermore, America should, as a matter of fact, seek to protect its key allies, including Israel, Saudi Arabia and other Gulf States, from Iran's nuclear threats.

REFERENCES

- Aja, A.A (2009), *Policy and strategic studies* (Revised edition). WillyRose & Applessed.
- Akiba (2004) "Address to the Preparatory Committee on Review of NPT" Cited in D. Roche, "Re-nuclearization or Disarmament: A fateful Choice for Humanity", *Middle Powers Initiative Policy Brief*.
- Ansari, A. M. (2006). *Confronting Iran. The failure of American foreign policy and the roots of mistrust*. Hurst & Company.
- Asika, N (1991). *Research methodology in the behavioural science*. Longman Nigeria
- Bahgat, G (2007). *Proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East*. University Press.

- Chosky, J.K (2012). Are the mullahs losing their grip on Tehran? Retrieved on 2nd November 2012 from <http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/tehran-politics-are-mullahs-losingtheirgrip>.
- Corsi, J.R. (2005). *Atomic Iran: How the terrorist Regime Bought the Bomb and American Politicians*. Cumberland House Publishing
- Dougherty, J. & Pfaltzgraff. Jnr (1997) *Contending theories of International Relations*. Longman.
- Faleti, (2007). Theories of social conflict: In: Best S.G (ed) *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies*. Spectrum.
- Gaddis, J.L (1992) “*The United States and the end of the Cold War: reconsideration and implications, provocations*” Oxford University Press.
- Gasiorowski, Mark. J. & Malcolm, B. (eds) (2004) Mohammad Mosaddeq and the 1953 Coup in Iran. *International Journal of Middle East*, 24 (4), 639–663
- Harms, G. (2010) *Straight power concepts in the Middle East: U.S foreign policy, Israel, and world history*. Pluto Press
- Itoh (2004) “ Address to the Preparatory Committee on Review of NPT” cited In: D. Roche “Renuclearisation or Disarmament: A fateful Choice for Humanity: *Middle Powers Initiative Briefs*.
- Iwuozor, P.O (2013) The United States Interests in the Middle East and Iran’s nuclear Programme. *unpublished M.Sc. Thesis*: Nsukka, University of Nigeria.
- Jentleson, B, et al (2012) *Strategic adaptation: Toward a new U.S strategy in the Middle East*. Centre for American National Security.
- Jerusalem Post (2007) “Annapolis is a trap set by Zionists” October, 22nd
- Lesch, D. W (2003) *The Middle East and political reassessment* (3rd edition), Westview Press.
- Menashri, D. (2000), *Post-revolutionary politics in Iran: Religion, society and power*. Frank Cass.
- Morgenthau, H. (1948) *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace*. Knopf Inc.
- Mullen, M, (2009) ABC News “This week” interview, May 24,2009. [http://www.abcnews.go.com/This week/story?id=664073&page=1](http://www.abcnews.go.com/This%20week/story?id=664073&page=1)
- New York Times (1979) “ U.S may drop key conditions for Talks with Iran” April 3

- New York Times (2012). "Israel unconvinced Iran has dropped Nuclear Programme" December 5th
- Obasi, I. (1999). *Research methodology in Political Science*. Academic Printing Press
- Oyeneye, M. O, Oyeneye, O., & Olayiwola, L.M (2002). *Fundamentals of Nigeria foreign policy*. Longman Nigeria Plc
- Parsi, T. (2017). *Losing an enemy: Obama, Iran, and the triumph of diplomacy*. Yale University Press
- Rourke, J.T. (1997) *International politics on the world stage*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Sagan, S.D (2012), "why Iran should not Get the Bomb." *Foreign Affairs*, 91 (6),36–42
- Selltiz et al. (1951) *Research methods in social relations*. Methuam and Co Ltd
- Solomon, J. (2009) "Senior U.S, Iranian meet at Afghanistan Conference" *The Wall Street Journal*. April 1
- Takeyh, R. (2009), *Guardian of the revolution: Iran and the world in the age of the Ayatollahs*. Oxford Press.
- Thakur, R, & Evans, G (2008) *The United Nations and nuclear order*. United Nations University Press.
- Thompson, K.W (1992) *Traditions and values in politics and diplomacy: Theory and practice*. Louisiana University Press
- The Guardian (2005) "Israel should be wiped off Map, says Iran's President", October 27th
- The Telegraph (2004) "Israel Challenges Iran's Nuclear Ambitions" September 22nd.
- Waltz, K.N (1979) *Theory of International Politics*. New York
- Waltz, K.N (2012), "why Iran should Get the Bomb: Nuclear Balancing would mean Stability" *Foreign Affairs*, 91(4), 2–5.
- Weber, M. (1947) *Theory of Economic and Social Organization*. Free Press.
- White House (2006) *The National Security of the United States of America*. Government Printing Press.
- Zirinsky, M.P. (1992) Imperial Power and Dictatorship: Britain and Rise of Shah, 1921–1926, *International Journal of Middle East*, 24 (24), 639–663.