

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

This PDF is auto-generated for reference only. As such, it may contain some conversion errors and/or missing information. For all formal use please refer to the official version on the website, as linked below.

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

<https://www.e-ir.info/2011/08/09/the-non-proliferation-treaty-its-affect-on-us-foreign-relations-towards-iran/>

JONATHAN ALEXANDER, AUG 9 2011

Chapter 1

Introduction:

The Non Proliferation Treaty or the NPT was a historic document that had been put into creation by the nations of the international community in 1970. According to the United Nations "The Non Proliferation Treaty is a landmark international treaty whose objective is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament. The Non Proliferation Treaty represents the only binding commitment in a multilateral treaty to the goal of disarmament by the nuclear-weapon States." (www.un.org)

In the height of the Cold War the fear of nuclear disaster was a clear danger that was a threat posed to most nations in the world. The climax of the Cold War that brought the world the closest to nuclear fallout was during the Cuban missile crisis. The Soviet Union was building a nuclear base within the nation of Cuba for a close range nuclear attack on the United States. The conflict came to a point on the evening of Saturday October 27, 1962 when Soviet ships were running a blockade of US ships that was meant to halt the shipment of nuclear materials. The attack from either the Soviet Union or the United States would have meant nuclear war. The decision finally came for a mutual stand down after the US agreed to take missiles from Turkey if the Soviet Union would leave Cuba. This is believed to be the closest to nuclear war that the world has ever come to. (Hershberg 1995)

The answer from the fear that came from the many states in the international community at coming to such a close point to nuclear war was the Non Proliferation Treaty and it was signed to keep the number of nuclear states to a minimum in order to try and limit the threats posed by possible nuclear nations. This treaty affects and reflects the foreign policy of the many nations who have signed the NPT into creation. However the strongest advocate of the NPT is the United States.

This is where the aim of this thesis comes into play. This thesis will strive to analyze how the Non Proliferation Treaty has affected the foreign policy of the United States with a case study of Iran.

This aim has been chosen for the simple fact that the Treaty to prevent the spreading and creation of nuclear weapons was and still is a ground breaking policy. It was the first international agreement to limit and outline nuclear capabilities of potential upcoming states. The fact that so many nations in the international community agreed to the landmark legislature has been a dynamic feat. The reason for the creation and signing of this treaty can be seen to create a safer environment for the signatories of this policy but there may be other reasons as to why and how certain nations agreed to this treaty. The current policy of the NPT is agreed and amendments are made in frequent meetings to discuss the new items of nations trying to attain nuclear arms. As the hegemonic state the United States has a unique position to influence certain measures for its security. How the NPT is used by the United States to deal with the possibility of a nuclear Iran is where this essay will start its analysis.

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

This essay will also use the theory of realism to help with the analysis. Also coupled with the theory that is a sub category within realism regime theory will also be used. The idea that the Non Proliferation Treaty is a new regime in which states only entered into a treaty because it is in their best interest for self preservation to agree to a treaty above their own state. This essay will hope to analyze and try to see if the United States tries to use their position as the hegemonic nation to their advantage to influence the NPT to try and hinder Iran's attempt at nuclear technology. The United States can be seen to use methods of self preservation in the chaotic world at the international level, through the means of using the fear of nuclear threats to have a secure international nuclear regime. This is where the essay will form a hybrid of theories from realism to regime theory. It will show the Non Proliferation Treaty is a trend that the United States tries to utilize from the fear of nations trying to protect themselves from nuclear threats.

Methodology:

The method this essay will try and use will be that of a theory fitting method. This method is an exercise in which a case is chosen due to its empirical significance to illustrate a given theory. This theory that is used, realism, will be applied to the case previously stated in the former section of this essay. Fitting or theory infirming case studies investigate to a degree a given case and how it fits to a general proposition. This method to use a specific case in order to show the validity of a theory can be used in order to demonstrate the explanatory power of the theory that is given. (Moses 2007 p.133-134)

This method will be used in order to illustrate the possible avenues of analysis when given the case study of how the NPT affects US foreign policy towards Iran. It will show how looking through the classical theoretical lens of realism is a highly valued theory.

This method will take a specific case study with a single theory. This single case and single theory has an obvious weakness. It makes the paper very narrow. It will only take a look at a single case making it very narrow in the mind set of not looking at other examples to see the broader picture of what can be analyzed or what other examples might have been better to be used and seen. The single theory as well can be at a disadvantage as well because it only looks through one lens of analysis. Since it is a method of a single theory it can be narrow minded with an analysis that is just one sided.

The benefits however seem to outweigh the disadvantageous of having such a narrow method for this paper. The advantageous of having the theory confirming method is that it is very specific to a point where the theory can be used very thoroughly to show in a new thinking how a certain case study fits within the theory. In this sense the result from the theory confirming method will be a clear cut answer to the question that was posed at the start of the essay. The example of the Non proliferation treaty in terms with US foreign policy towards Iran because of the very specific example to show the results of a productive theory. The specific side of having the theory confirming method is to have a narrow concise result from the aim and question posed from the start of the essay. Overall the theory confirming method that this essay has been written in will not only be a positive outcome but it will provide a very narrow result that will produce an answer to our case study.

This section of the method shall also be used to briefly describe the materials that are going to be used and to what extent they can be utilized for this paper. This essay will use the materials of text books that have been issued throughout the study year. Just to highlight also briefly the text books that are to be used will be dealing with the subjects straight from the author instead of a compilation of essays from different authors. The benefits of using these textbooks are that they are writing with the subject that you are specifically writing upon. The negatives could be that it only gives one sided view of what the theory could really be analyzed with.

Other sources that I will use come from a database called JSTOR which is a very large academic writing selection that allows broad selection of writings that allow my sources to have a current and vast amount of writings for this paper. The writings from this database will allow this narrow minded paper to have at least a semi vast amount of writings.

Chapter 2

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

Theoretical framework:

The theoretical framework is the most essential part of any paper. This section will outline the theories that will later be used to interpret what case study has been chosen. The main theory that will be utilized within this essay will be realism.

The theory of realism is one of the most if not the most essential theory that has been used in international relations. The start of the theory of realism is said to have had its roots with the famous written historical document of The History of the Peloponnesian War by Thucydides. This document was said to be one of the first historical documents recorded over a historic battle. The premise of the text was from the 27 years battle between Athens and Sparta in 431 to 404 BC. The part where the document strays from a historical document into the realm of theoretical pioneering is when Thucydides writes on the Melos dialogue. This is the earliest example of political realism ever recorded in a historical document. The Island of Melos was a neutral land between Sparta and Athens. However the Athenians wanted show their military might in the shadow of the Spartans. In the quest for more power and overcoming their enemies the Athenians gave the people of Melos time to join Athens, but Athens invaded this island instead. Why this is considered the origin of realism is the fact that it shows the stronger hegemonic nature of a state. It shows that emotions and morals played no role in the invasion of Melos. It was the interest, and self preservation of a stronger nation in its quest for the acquisition for more power. This example set the tone for future theorists in the field of Realism and the might of the state. (Arnold 2007)

The author that was the first to translate Thucydides from Greek into English was Thomas Hobbes. Hobbes is said to be one of the founders of Realism that has progressed the theory from the Melos dialogue into a theoretical framework in which the political realm can be analyzed. Thomas Hobbes was impressed at the work, in which he translated, admiring the point that states should put its own needs ahead of ethical issues.

Hobbes was a heavy weight in the theoretical framework of realism. He stated that there is a theoretical state of nature in which all humans would find themselves without any semblance of a formal government. That the nature of all men in a primal state is a world of a war against all, and a status of constant taking what one pleases. The nature of man is a self interested quest for power that he can take at his own bidding. However this is where man turns from their state of nature to form what Hobbes calls a "social contract". A social contract is a binding agreement between a people with a common cause or goal. "But finally the combination of numbers and usual natural hazards posed, in a variety of situations: cooperate or die" (Waltz 1959 p.167) It is in the self interest of an individual to seek the common protection of a centralized power over a group of people to ensure their safety in the state of nature. The people give up certain rights to the agreed upon form of government in order to have its way of life protected from any danger that may have threatened them in the past. (Hollis 1990 p. 96-97)

This power that is given to the government by the people that reside within the borders is an essential concept to grasp in the realist framework. This shows that a state above all else is self interested in not only their people's safety but also their interest. The elected government is only in power if it has the interest and self preservation of the people in mind. Once this trust from the people has vanished a new form of government may take its place.

This mind set of the state of nature plays a central role in the next level of realist thinking. One of the greatest thinkers in the realm of political realism is Kenneth Waltz. His writings help define what is the essence of realism. One of the central figures in realism is his writings on the levels of which the world can be analyzed. They are the man or individual at the first level, the state at the domestic internal second level, and the international level is the third. This third level is the realism at its best. Waltz uses Hobbes to describe that the state of nature that man can find itself without any form of central government is where the international system finds itself. Waltz argues that since in the state of nature without a formal social contract there is anarchy and no higher form of governance it is a highly unorganized chaotic form of life. Only when people come together to form a social contract and government does the semblance of normalcy come into play. At the international level there is no government higher than the sovereign state or nation. This in turn creates a situation similar to the state of nature in which every nation is in an anarchic system with no semblance of a higher governmental body. This international system creates a chaotic state of nature among different actors in which all nations cannot be trusted in their actions. (Waltz 1959 p.166-177)

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

This is where the basic pillars of realism come into play. The states of an international system are anarchic and the only point of action they can be relied upon to do is what their social contract binds them to. The preservation of the people that reside within the certain state, the self interest of the state, and the constant acquiring of more power when available are the only logical step of a state within the realist thinking.

Kenneth Waltz writes that the international arena is anarchic, and thus no state can be trusted in their actions towards another state. Realist thinkers mostly agree that there is no higher body of power that resides above the sovereignty of a single nation. Since the state of nature of man is similar to the international system then without a higher governing body to keep the balance of the different nations there will always be anarchy in the world. The only thing a state can be relied upon is an act that leads them closer to their own self interest. "A state will use force to attain its goals if, after assessing the prospects for success, it values those goals more than it values the pleasures of peace. Because each state is the final judge of its own cause, any state at any time may use force to implement their policies." (Waltz 1959 p.160)

Many times the self interest of the state is the self preservation of the people that give the power to the state. This interest of the peoples need to be free from fear is the driving force behind most state policy within realism. The self preservation of a people and their way of life is of the utmost importance to the state at large. This is why a state can only be seen to act upon decisions that will continue to push their interests further in the international field. Sometimes in order to achieve an interest which is more likely than not the need of security in an anarchic world states will come together to form what is called a regime. A regime is defined as a "set of mutual expectations, rules and regulations, plans, organization energies, and financial commitments that have been accepted by a group of states." (Smith 1987 p.256) According to Roger K. Smith regimes are a set of norms that act sometimes among and above the state if the need for them is high enough. It is traditionally a liberal mindset that shows that even in an anarchic world the states of the international system still find ways to interact that is not out of interest and competition with others. However Smith goes on to take a middle approach in terms of realism and liberalism meaning that though it is important for the hegemonic state to create a regime among other states it is not enough to use this as an explanation. (Smith 1987 p. 258)

Through the setting of norms and values the interest of many different states, in the anarchic world, realism can be seen for cooperation to take place. Though it takes place from the hegemonic state, other states will form into a regime if it fits into their overall interest of the people that reside within the nation. Joseph M. Grieco argues that the liberal mindset is too harsh on the realist thinking on state cooperation. He says that states may agree to cooperate if they believe that it within their best interest to achieve greater security and benefits from cooperating. This usually means that competition with others states plays a factor in their cooperation having many states only interested to get the better end of the deal. However if a threat is large enough to threaten more than one player in the international arena then maybe a regime can take hold if a hegemonic state wishes to push it through using its influence. (Grieco 1988 p.488)

Chapter 3: Analysis

US Foreign Policy through Realism:

The aim of this thesis was to try and analyze how the Non Proliferation treaty affects the foreign policy of the United States specifically towards Iran. However to first understand how the Non Proliferation Treaty effects the foreign policy of the United States the question that must be first answered is what is US Foreign policy?

The answer can be viewed through the scope of the theory of realism, the chosen framework of this paper. As Thomas Hobbes has stated about the state of nature in which man without a formal government is the guiding point that must always be remembered when thinking about US foreign policy. The main focus is the social contract that is stated to be when man is in fear of his life and wishes, along with others of mutual interest of protection, form a body of government to entrust them with their self preservation. This is the basis for all states that have been formed. That in the anarchic state of man in which there were no laws to be upheld and chaos this ensured a common interest of self preservation was the main call of the people. (Hampton 1988 p.28-37)

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

As a sovereign state with an elected government the nation of the United States has the interest of the people that have given them a social contract to use their power to preserve their self preservation. "A commonwealth is said to be instituted, when a multitude of men do agree, and covenant, every one, with every one, that to whatsoever man, or assembly of men, shall be given by the major part, the right to present the person of them all..."(Hampton 1988 p.165) This commonwealth will stand for nothing less than the progression of their self interest and almost always their security as a whole is linked to this interest.

It is safe to say that part of what drives the foreign policy of the United States is the idea to always uphold the needs of their people which in the state of nature without this government watching over they would turn to anarchy. The international system in which the United States conducts itself is without a formal head and government body. Thus it can also be viewed that the international system is anarchic as the state of nature man has come from prior to their establishing a social contract with a formal government. In an international realm without a higher power and without "social regulation there can be no obligation to respect the interest, rights, and properties of others." (Waltz 1959 p.171) This is the scenario in which sovereign states finds themselves thrown into once a social contract becomes active. They have the interest of the people to keep the security and interest always in mind while at the same time having to worry about the actions of other nations that go unchecked in a chaotic realm.

This is the international politics that the United States has found their nation in. As classic realism goes the quest to stay protected is ongoing, and in a world with new dangers this can never be a more important goal to have in mind. The introduction of the nuclear weapon has brought about a new phenomenon into the international system. A weapon that can cause mass destruction and cripple a nation at a flick of a switch is a threat that has to be measured and monitored. One of the most interesting modern threats to mankind is the threat of nuclear war. "Weapons that kill large numbers of human beings indiscriminately have no moral or legal justification, regardless of who is holding them. The world will best be able to keep such weapons out of the hands of terrorists only when they and their special weapons materials are in the hands of no one." This quote was said by Jayanatha Dhanapala former Under Secretary General of the United Nations on the subject of the nuclear threat and the common call for the disarmament of nuclear arms. This claim from the Under Secretary pronounces the mood that is felt from the entire Western World. The presence of nuclear weapons poses a threat to all if they get into the hands of a group bent on terror. A weapon that can kill huge amounts of people with just one strike not distinguishing between a friend or foe, military or civilian is a threat that cannot be allowed to exist.

This is the fear of threat that the United States now finds itself. The previous trend that had been created by the nuclear weapon came from the threat of nuclear fallout with the former Soviet Union. The utmost fearful thing to the American way of life from the end of WWII to the fall of the Berlin Wall was the spreading of Communism by the former Soviet Union. At this time there was a nuclear arms race between the world's two super powers to see which of the powers could muster up the larger arsenal of the two. There came a tipping point during the Kennedy administration when the Soviet Union tried to build a nuclear arsenal in the Communist nation of Cuba. This is said to be the closest to nuclear war that the world has ever come. The President John F. Kennedy put a shipping block around the island telling the Soviet Union that if any ship tried to make its way past the blockade nuclear fallout was almost guaranteed. Luckily this was a stalemate with both nations able to breathe easy for the moment. (Marfleet 2000 p.545)

This example of how close the world has come to nuclear disaster is the prime example why in the world of international anarchy there is always the need to further ones security. The use of nuclear weapons is a force that can cause mass destruction for the people of a nation. The constant fear of this attack is always felt by the United States. Ever since the Cold War there has been an ongoing search to raise the security of the nation of the United States.

The Non Proliferation Treaty:

So it can be safe to say that the United States foreign policy is that of seeking to secure their safety in an anarchic world. Through the new world phenomenon of nuclear warfare and technology a scare overtook the world that created a cooperation that has been seen little of in the world. In 1970 the worlds leading nations passed a landmark

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

treaty in the hope of avoiding mass destruction from the use of nuclear weapons. "Considering the devastation that would be visited upon all mankind by a nuclear war and the consequent need to make every effort to avert the danger of such a war and to take measures to safeguard the security of peoples..." (IAEA 1970 p.1) The major countries that had brought about the treaty were mainly the ones who had nuclear arms at the time. They were the big five at the time: United States, The former Soviet Union, France, United Kingdom, and China.

The Non Proliferation Treaty or the NPT today has over 189 signatories and frequent meetings on the current status of nations around the world. The main objective is to limit the number of nuclear states within the world. The thinking is that the fewer nuclear weapons in the world the less chance for nuclear war. At the time of signing the world was on the brink of war. The Cuban Missile Crisis brought the world to the realization of how close they can be brought to the edge of destruction. The timing of the treaty came when the mutual benefit of nations overcame the anarchic system of the international arena. The treaty of non proliferation when accepted by the many members of the nuclear elite is hard to fathom for a realist. Cooperation among sovereign states in a chaotic world is an oddity. "The assumption is that states will always seek to increase their power and capabilities if the opportunity to do so presents itself." (Sheehan 2005 p.16) In the realm of anarchy the self interest of the people is always the foreign policy of a nation; however sometimes the self interest of the state can be furthered when cooperating with others that share a similar interest.

Like in Hobbes theory of social contract the people have a common interest to seek protection. This is mirrored by the cooperation at the state level when NPT is made a reality to have the best intention of security as the main benefit of all nations involved. This fear in the anarchic system of a nation to always look to increase its weaponry has always started conflict in the past. The nuclear arms race however brought the world to the realization that it is mutually beneficial to limit a potential rise in nuclear arsenal of rising states that could cause more chaos than already threatened most nations. Thus the Non Proliferation Treaty regime was born out of necessity and mutual security. A regime is defined as "principles, norms, rules, and decision making procedures around which actor expectation converge in a given issue area." (Smith 1987 p.1) A regime is usually created when a movement within the international community has started and been accepted by different actors. The non proliferation movement specifically in conjunction with the signing of the NPT started what is being called the non proliferation regime by many scholars including Roger K. Smith. The self interest of a state is felt when a regime is created. Through the nations actively looking for means of security against threats in the anarchic system self interest benefits greatly from the non proliferation regime. (Smith 1987 p.265-267)

This is where the United States can be seen using the Non Proliferation Treaty to their self interest. How the non proliferation treaty can possibly affect the foreign policy of the United States is by the enticing benefit of knowing that its largest rivals have agreed to reduce their nuclear arsenals and to actively stop other nations from developing their own. This regime of trying to stop nuclear spread is the outreach from the fear of the major powers through the world in the 1970's trying to look out for the security of its people.

The stance of the signing of the non proliferation treaty is hard at times for classical realism to grasp because of the constant fear of another state cheating and gaining more than another state in a cooperative agreement. However in this regime in which the norms and standards are set by the international community cooperation took place. "Realists understand that states seek absolute gains, and worry about compliance. However realists find that states are positional and not atomistic." (Grieco 1988 p. 487)

Therefore the existence of the NPT was a measure set in place out of the need for the nations of the world to protect their borders from an impending attack of nuclear warfare. At the time of the signing the Soviet Union and the United States were in a constant arms race to see who the hegemonic state would turn out to be the most powerful. When one state is so obsessed with attaining its absolute gains over a rival state it creates a security dilemma in which each nation builds its nation strong but at the risk of other nations doing the same to protect themselves from the first nation. This was happening in the nuclear arms race of the Cold War, even with the signing of the NPT each nation was keen on keeping their side one step ahead of the other. "Yet the game of power politics does not often eventuate in two blocks unalterably opposed and using whatever means come to hand in order to weaken each other." (Waltz 1959 p.205)

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

The Soviet Union lost the battle of supremacy and the United States came out as the hegemonic power of the Post Cold War era. This came as a turning point in world politics in which the United States has had an unrivaled access to power in the international system.

The Regime of the Non Proliferation Treaty and US Foreign Policy:

The regime of the NPT was still up and strong. The United States still holding onto the fear of its self survival even with unbridled power is always keen to out maneuver its way to more power. The NPT started as a neutral policy stance that was not adhered to in the start but the United States saw the potential this posed as an international regime that has been established to be able to take advantage of and use for its own interests. A state usually does anything unless it is within its own interest to do so. The interest of the United States has been a long standing tradition of security and the protection of its people. The social contract from the people establishing a formal government gave the US unrestricted power to do what is in the best interest of the people within the nation. The US came to the forefront of the international arena as the hegemonic power making it easier for its policies to be pushed and accepted by other states. The cooperation of other states in terms of the regimes as a set of norms to be adhered to came from the power framework from what the United States had become. (Grieco 1988 p. 489)

The legitimacy of the NPT was called into question after the fall of the Soviet Union. The world knew a relative peace in terms of threats on a global scale now that Russia's internal issues were more important than its external ones. However even the mightiest hegemonic nations can feel the sting of the anarchic world. The attack by terrorists on September 11th, 2001 was a shock to the international system awakening the fear that was felt within the United States during the Cold War. This was a certain balance of power by a non state actor trying to question the legitimacy of the hegemonic state. A rogue international terrorist organization sought to attack the strongest nation. This reminder knocked the fear back into the US and reminded them that the international system is anarchic and more dangerous than before. This led to a measure of consolidating security wherever the US felt threatened. (Sheehan 2005 p. 19)

Once again the United States was out to eliminate and limit the number of threats that were opposed against the nation. The largest concern especially after September 11th was a mass terrorist or state attack that could seriously threaten the fabric of their very existence. Once again the threat of nuclear weapons was a main source of fear at the international level. The driving force behind US foreign policy in the post 9/11 era is that of actively looking and limiting serious threats to the United States. Nuclear Weapons posed one of the biggest threats. A rogue nation developing a weapon that could cause mass chaos is something the United States cannot have. The United States has a foothold of control on the NPT and can be seen influencing the treaty for its own uses in security means. From the start of the signing of the Non Proliferation Treaty the interest of the international community to abide by the rules that had been agreed upon gave a great thought of safety. However the legitimacy of the regime is only there when the state interest of the nations have interests that coincide with it. The Non Proliferation is viewed as a regime by modern day standards. As we have defined clearly in the sections before that a regime is a set of norms that is dictated by a number of different states. What then can be the benefit of agreeing to an international treaty that can alter the national policy of a single nation? In the case of the United States it was the policy of its national consciences to provide security to the international fear of nuclear weapons. This NPT has been signed by over 180 nations throughout the world. The main reason for this creation in which a separate organization known as the International Atomic Energy Agency, or IAEA to handle the process of monitoring different nations nuclear programs, is to safely ensure that the nations of the world can be provided with a certain sense of safety in the world. As the hegemonic state, it is within the power of the United States to provide a certain sense of protection from harm and other nations see this option as a mutual benefit. As the United States can wield more power and safety from the nations that cooperate in the NPT the smaller nations can be persuaded to instead of pumping money into a nuclear program for protection can look to the United States for protection. This not only boosts the economies of many nations but provides a safe pact among the international community that is the closest to international cooperation in the anarchic system nations can come by. (Tate 1990 p.403)

This mutual benefit is seen by many states to be to the best interest even in the anarchic unstable world. However there is a loophole within the Non Proliferation Treaty in Article 4 subsection 2 states, "All the Parties to the Treaty

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

undertake to facilitate, and have the right to participate in, the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.” This section of the treaty allows for member states to develop nuclear material for the peaceful use and production that it offers from clean energy.

This provides a problem for the United States because the creation of nuclear material has been used from peaceful energy means to be developed into weapons as exemplified by Pakistan, and India. This possibility for nuclear weapons to be developed is a loophole in which nations may strive to develop their own weapons. The international agency of the IAEA is set in force to provide the monitoring capabilities for production of peaceful materials and transfer from and to different nations of these materials. These safe guards are set in place to try and ensure the limitations of nuclear weapons from spreading through the international community. The transfer of safe nuclear technology through the IAEA can be considered a way the United States controls the situation in which it entices different nations that the mutual benefit of giving up nuclear ambitions for technology and protection is too good to pass up. This in realist terms is again the US spreading its influence in its quest for security. The knowledge that with superior firepower and control over nations through the creation of an international agreement the United States can almost always ensure the safety for its people.(Tate 1990 405)

The regime of the Non Proliferation Treaty has evolved into an international regime in which rules decided upon by an overwhelming 180 nations seeks to secure the safety of many states from the threat of nuclear war. The United States is the driving force behind the NPT allowing the IAEA the safeguards necessary to ensure the monitoring of different nations with the development of nuclear technology and weapons. This is the ultimate in security regimes. The nations have agreed for terms of mutual protection from the US and also the highly valuable technology that the US could possibly provide for their nation. This regime affects the US foreign policy in the sense that the US uses their hegemonic status as the driving force in their quest for international security with the NPT as their main policy towards limiting others from possessing the technology.

The Neo-Conservative Movement

This perspective is a movement called the “Neo Conservative” movement within the policy makers in the United States. The neo conservative movement was a group of elite policy makers within the US government during the start of the 2000's. Their whole idea behind the foreign policy of the United States was to be the guiding light of the world in terms of setting an example of what a true Democracy is supposed to embody. The sense of power came to full swing right after the attacks on September 11, 2001. This is when the neo conservatives pounced on the opportunity to control the US policy makers crafting policies that were meant to seek out and destroy the Islamist terrorist factions in the Middle East that may possess weapons of mass destruction. Clear to the lines of realism the protection of a nation is the top priority in the eyes of any governing body. However this strays a little from the typical realist path when dealing with non state actors. The neo conservatives were heavily responsible for the invasion of not just Afghanistan but also Iraq. In Iraq the search for nuclear weapons was the main reason of invasion to keep the United States from another terrorist attack from already dangerous factions for the state. (Hudson 2005 320-324)

The danger of the threat of nuclear weapons has been a relevant threat for many years. The neo conservatives during the Bush administration knew this fear that was felt through the attacks on the US following the events at 9/11. Anything that could threaten the US at a larger scale than what had been already done was something that had to be sought out. This led to an era of US foreign policy that is still felt through today. The US once again while trying to secure its nation based on threats of another nation have sought to continue the tradition of these policy makers and seek to try and halt the production of Iranian nuclear materials. According to the neo conservative movement the US must strive to secure Democracy throughout the entire world, because of its position as the hegemonic nation. This has brought the foreign policy of the US to seek out every possible avenue to stem the flow of possible threats to US destruction. Coupled with the constant rhetoric of terrorist leanings and the non cooperation with IAEA the neo conservatives would make Iran target number one in relation to volatile nations towards the security of the US. So as we can see through the influence of the neo conservative movement the US foreign policy makers would use the already set up Non Proliferation Treaty as a means to inhibit Iran from further developing nuclear weapons that could threaten the region. Their argument would be because it would cause even more chaos in the Middle East and it is the job of the United States as not only the hegemonic nation but also bringing its Democratic values to the world.

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

(Hudson 2005 p. 329-333)

The anarchic system once again can be seen to fuel the fire of fear from the policy makers that have been labeled as neo conservative. Through this movement they view the world in realist terms such as every nation may pose a threat to the United States. Also the advancement of the interests of the United States was always a top priority from the policy makers stand point. They deemed the Middle East as an interest the US would need for the future. The rhetoric that has been used was to bring Democracy to the volatile region and this solution was to rid the terrorists from the breeding ground of hate towards America with the idea to eliminate dangerous weapons they might also possess. So through the neo conservative movement the United States can be viewed to use the NPT and the IAEA as trying to eliminate Iran from developing a nuclear arsenal that could pose a threat to the very existence of the United States.

Why States Build Nuclear Weapons?

All the rhetoric and development of the NPT is very well established but some nations still actively pursue weapons of mass destruction even with safe guards by the IAEA backed by the United States. It is the result from the loop hole that is found in the Non Proliferation Treaty in which a nation may use nuclear technology to pursue peaceful means for the use of nuclear technology. This means the development of a nuclear program to the point of clean energy for the people within a nation. However when a nation has the nuclear reactor the material to build a bomb is very easily attained and a nation has little to do in terms of development because the same process of achieving nuclear energy can be easily converted to produce nuclear material necessary to produce a nuclear bomb. This loophole has provided a number of nations an excuse to build a nuclear facility for constructing weapons. Their claim is that it is for building nuclear facilities for electricity for the good of their community. Even with the establishment of the IAEA and the NPT nations have been known to develop nuclear material for weapons. Some examples are Pakistan, India, North Korea, and more recently Iran. (Gartzke 2007 p.169-172)

Though we know nations seek to build weapons why do they develop them. It can be argued that the idea behind this is to provide their nation with protection against the nations that might have developed weapons already. This idea is one of balance of power. A nation can see another building up its arsenal of weapons and feels the need to develop their own in order to protect their nation in a potential attack from another nation. This is a result of the anarchy that the international system find itself thrown into. The uncertainty that a rival nation will try and gain more than the other, and the idea of an unwarranted attack would prove perilous pushing a nation on the brink without protection. This assurance of protection that a nuclear weapon can bring is something of a brink of war tactic. The threat of retaliation with nuclear weapons would be enough to avoid an attack from another nation. This had been the result of the Cold War with the United States and Soviet Union afraid of the others use of nuclear warfare put both nations at a stalemate not willing to put their nation in danger of being attacked. This idea of nuclear freedom from attack would make many nations motivated to develop their own. (Sagan 1997 p.47)

There are other reasons for why states may want to develop nuclear weapons. There are many determinants of whether states will lean towards developing nuclear arms. A state has to have certain qualities in order to proceed past the idea of violating international norms of the Non Proliferation Treaty. A nation that is not aligned with any certain Western powers are to be the more likely to develop the weapon. This is because with no particular agreements or strategic importance. This is a quality that is with the thinking that a nation not under a protection of a larger power has no obligations with any western powers, and they also have to provide their own protection. A nation must also have a sound economy before they go in search of nuclear weapons. This is an important aspect for nuclear capability in the future because once a nation actively searches for avenues to make a weapon of mass destruction there will be scrutiny and economic sanctions brought on them by the international community. The Western nations have a policy to stop any trade and agreements with nations trying to develop nuclear arms. The idea is to burden the economy of the country to a point where it is just too expensive to continue on their nuclear capabilities. That is why a decent size nation with a strong economy is the prime candidate for developing their nuclear weapons. Once they start they will have no aid from other countries and without a strong economy the nation would surely fall. (Gartzke 2007 p. 175-176)

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

However there is one other very important reason as to why a nation could possibly undergo certain economic hardship for a weapon that might not be necessary. It is the public opinion of their domestic politics that is at stake. A nation that is under a huge amount of stress from internal conflict may resort to the nuclear weapon as a source of national pride. This is very dangerous because of the implications that go along with this avenue of production of nuclear weapons. It means that a state has become weak to the point of risking their economic and international standing in order to win the support of the people who put the government into power. The nuclear weapons nations are among an elite group in the world that achieved such a status that only a few have acquired such a weapon. This is a motivation for weak nations who have not heard the cries of their people, and think that if they take their nation into such a level of international recognition then the people would rally behind their government and have the support they yearn for. These are the unstable governments that the international community is afraid of who might attain the nuclear capability. A weak government ready to make a nuclear weapon just to appease their people. (Sagan 1997 p.66-67)

The Non Proliferation Treaty Regime and US Foreign Policy in Relation to Iran:

The establishment of what the regime of the Non Proliferation Treaty is has been defined as a set of norms that have been set into place by various nations whose purpose is to limit the spreading of nuclear weapons. This had been set into motion as a result of the mutual benefit felt by the international community to limit their chances at instability and damage that might have been caused had a nuclear arms race gone off in other parts of the world. It has affected the United States foreign policy in the area of international security by using its influence to control the ebb and flow of the NPT.

The very existence of the treaty does not stop the production of nuclear weapons however. As what was established before the reason as to why nations build nuclear weapons and what nations are most likely to try and achieve such an outcome have been set. The criteria being a nation that is not particularly in the protection of a western state especially the United States so that they may try to use the weapon as a means of protection, a nation that has a strong enough economy to withstand economic sanction against them, and a nation that has domestic issues that cannot be solved without developing nuclear arms to appease their population. "From this sociological perspective, military organizations and their weapons can therefore be envisioned as serving functions similar to flags, airlines, and Olympic teams." (Sagan 1997 p.65)

These requirements satisfy a handful of states but one in particular is that of Iran. Iran satisfies a number of requirements that are also not among the list. Not only are they not aligned with the United States government they are almost in every way the opposite with the policies that the US has produced. One of the largest conflicts of interest with Iran is their leanings and interests with terrorist organizations. Such as the Hamas whose sole objective is to tear down the nation of Israel an important ally of the United States. The fear of Iran getting a nuclear arsenal is something that has implications too unnerving for the US to anticipate. Iran has been developing nuclear technology for years now. The international community has little cooperation with the state government. In a recent United Nations Assembly the members discussed the agreement that the Security Council of the United Nations, specifically the United States, are willing to give Iran is that when cooperation is received then cooperation will be used. The state of Iran must fulfill the requirements of the IAEA about their nuclear programs in the claims that they are for peaceful means only, and then the United Nations will not only allow Iran to develop nuclear technology but aid them in their endeavor. (United Nations 2007 p. 3-5)

This is where the Iran has failed to cooperate with the international community. The production of a nuclear program in Iran has been feared by the United States. The fear that Iran may take a peaceful nuclear program to a level in order to produce nuclear arms is the fear that takes the US to the brink in trying to protect their security measures. The Middle East is one of the most high risk regions of the world that the United States fears for its safety post 9/11. It is an area of volatile state and non state actors that prove to question the legitimacy of the survival of the United States. The United States has such a problem with Iran because of the reason they have been trying to develop a nuclear program. In the past the United States has claimed that Iran is trying to use the peaceful means of the aspect of nuclear production in order produce a nuclear arsenal. (Tarock 2006 p. 645-648)

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

The region of the Middle East is an important resource for the United States in more ways than one. After they had been attacked the war on terror resulted in the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq. In order to pursue terrorists the US needs to work in cooperation with the regional governments to have stability in the region. The idea behind the security threat to the United States is again relating to the realist idea that the international system is anarchic and the preservation of your state and the people that have the social contract with the nation are the top priority. The Middle East was singled out by the United States as a region that is unstable and could cause further attacks on their interests. Iran poses a problem to their national interests at preserving their ability to live above fear felt from a possible future attack. Iran is the biggest problem because of their capability for the production of nuclear weapons and especially the motivations of the leaders that control the state of Iran. (Edelman 2011 p. 66-67)

The Non Proliferation Treaty is enforced by the United States in the sense that they are the hegemonic nation in the world that can provide security for nations in exchange they don't produce nuclear weapons. This realm of protection let the United States have an unprecedented control over the region in agreements such as oil and military bases. This interest for increasing their economic security and military security is the largest reward when dealing in the anarchic realm. (Tarock 2006 p.650)

However if the state of Iran does produce a nuclear weapon it will undermine the legitimacy of the United States as the hegemonic power that they try to perceive others they are. Iran could persuade other nations in the Middle Eastern region to lean towards Iran who have the nuclear arms to protect crucial nations to that are important for the US endeavor to have a secure region. Nations like Saudi Arabia provide the United States with an important ally in two ways in the international realm. With the theory of realism that has been constantly referred to in this essay shows that even through anarchy "...cooperation can still take place." (Greico 1988 p.487) Saudi Arabia provides the United States with oil production and an important ally in the Middle East, just as the United States provides security and economic stability. If the nation of Iran produces nuclear weapons the status of the United States hegemonic position in the world is questioned by nations who use their influence. Then nations such as Saudi Arabia would choose Iran that may share political ideals and share regional proximity. This undermining of the US calls their power into question and could prove fatal in the future as other nations see the US as weak. This potential problem poses a dilemma for the US because the lack of allies within the US leaves them without a hand in security in the region and a loss of economic stability. Today's hegemonic state will do whatever it can to ensure their survival and interests in the anarchic realm. (Edelman 2011 p. 70-72)

The hegemonic status that the United States has attained is a vital tool when dealing with other states at the international anarchic level. The actions of other states cannot be predicted and one nation can only think that others are always looking to do what is in the best interest of their own nation. That is why using influence as a means of cooperation to get what is in the best benefit of the US is what has taken place in the Middle East. Non state actors had threatened forcefully their nation and the US will not take any threat lightly. That is what is different about Iran. Iran knows that any force that is shown publicly will be reason enough for the US to be wary and maybe use force. Iran is smart in the way that it uses non-forceful means to gain interests that it finds will further their own cause. The Non Proliferation Treaty has been failing with Iran because they will not cooperate fully with the IAEA or any other international organization. The very idea of the production of nuclear arms presents a threat to US hegemony because Iran will not attack another so easily but use it as a persuasive tool. The United States could lose very valuable recognition if Iran even thinks of developing nuclear weapons. The current policy of the US has been economic sanctions and proposals through the IAEA to monitor the current status of their nuclear program. The anarchic system will be unbearably unstable if the US loses influence in such a volatile area. Through controlling and using its influence in the NPT the United States is looking to form a proposal to constantly monitor Iranian movements through nuclear production. This measure is seen to be handled through the IAEA but it is always within the foreign policy and best interest of the United States population that such actions are undertaken. This increase of monitoring and economic sanctions should increase pressure enough on the nation of Iran that they will be too hard pressed to further any more nuclear weapons production. (Lindsey 2010 p. 33-46)

The unstable region that makes up the Middle East is a good example of how the international system can be so unpredictable. The region is littered with tensions and instability that breeds conflict. One of the largest points of conflict in the Middle East has come from the creation of Israel, and its very existence today. The majority of Arab

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

nations believe Israel to be the very essence of evil, and one of the major enemies of Israel is the state of Iran. This poses another issue for the US interests in the region because a major proponent of US foreign policy is the assistance of Israel. Israel has accrued a number of nuclear weapons themselves, but it is unofficial in its existence. The United States has created a situation of don't ask don't tell of nuclear situation in Israel. America "does not want to see Israel go down the drain and makes an absolute commitment that he will see to it that Israel always has 'an edge'" (Gilinsky 2011 p.9)

The very existence of nuclear weapons in Israel presents a very unique position for the US to have the mutual benefit to provide Israel with economic stability coupled with a military agreement, and having Israel perfectly placed within striking distance of any nation in the Middle East without having to use the US having to use their own weapons. Iran has openly suggested their leanings towards terrorists groups such as the Hamas that are bent on the destruction of Israel. The United States also fears that when Iran try to develop their own nuclear weapons they will also try to give parts of this new technology to groups such as the Hamas. (Jenkins 2006 p.33-45)

This situation will lead to an inevitable event in which Israel will feel the need to advance its already large arsenal of nuclear weapons to stay ahead of Iran if they happen to create a nuclear weapon. This will lead an arms race, because in the anarchic world the states exist the protection of your borders from an enemy force is the highest priority. It is a concept within the international relations field called balance of power. This situation is when a nation can see a rival nation building its military or in this case their nuclear arsenal and to make sure the other nation does not gain an upper hand they must match or even create more to combat a potential attack. This would be the reality if Iran were to create nuclear weapons. Israel would feel threatened to a point that they would increase the production of their arsenal as well. This would create a dangerous spiral effect until on nation would break and attack the other. (Sheehan 2005 p.19) This is precisely the reason that creation of the NPT was put into existence by the United States. It is to try and maintain order for its interests in securing themselves. A nuclear weapon produced by Iran would spiral into a somewhat of a mini Cold War that would have devastating results.

This situation once again has brought the US to make it a priority to make the non proliferation regime a reality in accordance with Iran. According to the tradition of realism there is the ever persistent concept of the idea of international anarchy. This overriding idea among nations provides a very unstable environment. "Since this is the case, the absence of an authority above states to prevent and adjust the conflicts inevitably arising from particular wills means that war is inevitable." (Waltz 1959 p.182) There is no higher authority in the international system to provide laws that a state must abide to in order to keep the peace. Just as a state acts as the authority for the people that reside within them through Hobbes social contract the people come from chaos and violence to culture and a sense of peace. This government resides above man because of the power instilled in them to conquer the state of nature. The state of nature still resides outside the state because of the lack of a higher power to try and control the actions of the state. Since there is no higher actor above a state telling a nation what is right or wrong, then each will live in a state of fear of attack. This is the constant violent cycle that the United States has tried to prevent. By using the Non Proliferation Treaty to their advantage the United States has grouped together to the closest thing to a binding agreement that exists above the state. Without the essence of a higher power in the anarchic world the closest thing are regimes that try to arrange a sort of norms that are more or less accepted instead of a higher ruling body. This has been a very intelligent move by the US because by taking advantage of the fear that arises from the threat of nuclear weapons the US has more or less become the driving force that influences the tide of international politics at least in the way of non proliferation. The non proliferation regime is an "authoritative arrangements between international actors that facilitates the accomplishment of specific goals through a process involving coordination and expectations and the modifications of certain behavior patterns." (Tate 1990 p.402)

The specific goals that the United States uses the Non Proliferation Treaty for is the accomplishment of having a comfortable international system that secures their own security for their nation. This is why the IAEA had been set up so that it may seem that it is not a hegemonic state constantly overseeing your actions when dealing with nuclear technology but an international arrangement that is meant to make sure there is no production of nuclear weapons. This is the genius behind the United States using the NPT as a means to stall the production of materials in Iran. It is driven by the fear that a nuclear weapons production in Iran would lead to the instability of the sphere of influence that has been built by the hegemonic nation of the United States.

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

The fears that have been felt by the United States are numerous in the ways of what the outcome of a nuclear Iran could do for the international system. In the number of things that have been listed previous in this section of the paper the idea of a nuclear Iran would have too many devastating outcomes. Such as the arms race scenario that could envelop the Middle East in a power struggle. The United States has influenced the Non Proliferation Treaty to a point in which they could dictate and forgo a situation in which this may never hopefully become a reality. Since in the international system there is no higher power above the state the only cooperation that can be done between one state or another is to be in the best interest of the majority of nations. The NPT is the closest thing to a higher organization in which they can maneuver their interests in other nations for security without using force onto others. This is not only the best interest of the US not to expend economic resources on futile efforts to secure the world's nuclear weapons, but it is seen as a best interest on numerous nations around the world to rid the world of nuclear arms. So in the cooperation of other nation the United States can enforce their interest through a sort of soft power politics scenario.

The Non Proliferation Treaty is an organization and treaty that has evolved into a set of norms and values that is agreed upon by numerous nations. Since this is an accepted norm of the international community the majority of nations are expected to act within a certain way whether they have sign the NPT or not. The United States has taken on a unique position in their foreign policy towards Iran in terms of what actions to take and to proceed to take within the future. The NPT provides the proper international recognition and tools for the US to oversee what exactly the threat of Iran can be towards the hegemonic state. The nuclear weapon problem that Iran poses is one of mass destruction in the world. Iran is constantly questioning the hegemonic state and strong states within the world that influence mostly western foreign policies. In the realm of the anarchy of the international system are certain measures that a state must do to ensure not only the continuing safety of their people but also the continuation of their power. This fear of losing power is something that a nation will stop at nothing to make sure that will never happen. Especially in the sense of the United States as the lead hegemonic state of the world at the present moment, their influence within the NPT showcases their desire to seek out potential threats to their position in international politics. This is the nature of every state to attain more power at any chance that presents itself and progress their interests to the forefront of their respective foreign policies. Due to the power transition theory that is a subtext within realism it tells of the constant sliding scale of power in which the hegemonic nation wishes to maintain their power, while smaller nations contest their leadership. While building their arsenal a state has the aim to become even stronger in either their influence or military until the point the state becomes equally as powerful or more than the hegemonic nation. (Wohlforth 1999 p.19-25)

This is something that can be seen by the actions taken by the United States in the form of the IAEA taking measures against Iran making claims at a conference stating that the nation is not cooperating to a point where they could determine whether their nuclear materials production was of a military purpose. This lack of cooperation fuels the fear of a weapon in the progress of being made because of the lack of communication between the IAEA and Iran. The United States has some form of legitimate claims that Iran is producing a weapon intended for mass destruction. (IAEA 2010 p.1-2)

These claims from the IAEA are fueling the fire of the US claim to try and stumble the production of Iranian nuclear materials. The United States does not want to lose their pole position as the hegemonic nation in the anarchic world. The production of nuclear weapons in Iran can be viewed as a questioning of the leadership of the hegemonic state. It is the building of an arsenal that would threaten the United States. It would not only threaten the US but it would more than likely question the influence that it exudes over the region of the Middle East. This power region cannot be lost, because if the nation of Iran questions the US by attaining the nuclear weapon despite the pressure put upon the state of Iran it would undermine the authority that the hegemonic nations needs desperately when dealing with other nations in relation to power and their interests. The very obvious threat to the hegemony of the United States is a threat that the nation will not take easily. The power transition theory in which a smaller nation builds and grows strong enough to question the authority of the anarchic world will eventually lead to war. This event is something that the United States will try at all means to avoid. The only reason that a conflict would arise from Iran would be because of the production of the nuclear weapon. This is why the United States wishes to halt the process of making the nuclear technology for an Iranian nuclear arsenal. The impending conflict that could erupt would cost lives, economy, and above all power that the US is not ready to give up.

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

This is how the NPT influences the foreign policy of the United States in accordance with Iran. It is because of the threat to its security of just the simple fact that a nuclear weapon brings about mass destruction to not only its own nation but the interests that the nation holds as well. It poses a problem with the power and influence that the United States has in the region of the Middle East in terms of military bases, oil, and etc. The NPT is a treaty that is a regime in which many nations of the world find a benefit to sign. The threat once again of the possibility of many nations having a nuclear arsenal is too much of a dangerous aspect in the anarchic world that each nation finds themselves thrown into. As the hegemonic nation of the world the United States has a unique position in global politics to actively influence the workings and doings of the international organization that had been formed to oversee the production of nuclear materials the IAEA. This set up international organization has the tough job of seeking out potential threats especially to US interests in terms of what could damage its standings and power base. This is accepted as an international treaty so not only will the interests of the US be heard but also the acceptance of the many nations who have signed the treaty as well.

Development as a Means of Security:

This section of the essay will try and relate an alternative perspective that has similar merit with the theories and concepts that have been discussed within this essay but only to give a different area of thought to the research question posed.

The idea that will be briefly touched upon in this section is that of development in terms of security. This is an idea more or less that deals with a strong effort by a separate nation in the international community providing development for another in order to bring about security. The idea behind this is all about security as is with realism. The region in question in this case has been that of the Middle East. Such a harsh region of the world has been a relative breeding ground for anti western powers such as the United States. This anti western mentality has produced attacks such as 9/11, and an attack such as this has warranted policy makers such as the neo conservatives to take control of the situation and stop this resentment at the source. The areas that are least developed like many nations throughout the Middle East fail to provide their people with little in terms of security. Many times Anti- Western feelings arise because the governments blame others instead of trying to correct the issue themselves. If a strong western nation such as the United States would provide assistance to the region in terms of infrastructure and above all education the feelings of resentment would be less. This is the whole thinking behind developing a nation that threatens another nation's security. (Duffield 2007 p.111-117)

The United States has a threat of a nation that fails to provide human security for its people in the form of Iran. The anti American rhetoric that is used in Iran is felt by the government to the US by the simple fact of not cooperating with the IAEA is enough to know that it is a nation that could pose a threat in the future. The answer is something that is written by in the Non Proliferation Treaty that states that a nation may use nuclear technology as a technology for peaceful means and energy. This is the development that is needed to be provided by the US and the IAEA. The IAEA has complained of the lack of cooperation that Iran has showed to the international organization. If enough pressure by the NPT nations towards Iran to show the IAEA their nuclear facilities the United States can agree to provide nuclear energy for the development of the potential threat of a nation. If the United States were to have cooperation by Iran and nuclear technology was agreed to take place within Iran then the United States can not only oversee the development of their nuclear technology and have a peace of mind for their security, they also gain a good image in the minds of the people who think them to be their enemies.

Through the development of Iran's nuclear technology for peaceful means the anarchic world would be much safer. The United States can be seen here to be using the NPT once again as means of a protection to their security. The absolute realist idea of making ones nation more secure in the anarchic world can be seen through a possible effort for the US to cooperate with Iran. Most nations through the world welcome the new technology that is brought by the cooperation of the NPT and IAEA with the peaceful means of nuclear technology. The bringing of nuclear technology to Iran or providing the nation with a program that can assist them in the production of clean energy that is a very efficient technology. However this is precisely the reason that the US is almost afraid of what Iran currently has in their possession, it is the lack of cooperation. Even in the face of economic hardship through the trade embargos put upon them through the NPT mainly the US. The question that the United States has to ask will be if the nation of Iran is so

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

anti American that they will forgo the benefits of a free nuclear technology and further endanger their peoples economic security for nothing more than to stand against the US? This question is a fine one because in the international system where anarchy can only thrive when a nation that is not among the strongest in the world sometimes has to agree to their mutual benefit to advance their standing in the international system. (Chafetz 1996 p.727-730)

This can only raise questions about the actions of the nation within Iran. Again in true realist thinking there is no higher authority above the individual state. Thus the non cooperation of the nation of Iran towards the US can be due to the fear of an outside nation taking over its policies from Iran's national interest to that of the US. So if the United States can somehow manage to make Iran cooperate maybe through more economic pressure, they can over see the nuclear program that has caused them so much fear. Through the development of the highest risk nation with peaceful nuclear energy the United States can make sure of their security and influence to be spread through Iran. However the key word would be "if" they can get Iran to cooperate.

Chapter 3: Conclusion

The start of this essay had set out to answer one particular research question which was how does the Non Proliferation Treaty Affect the Foreign Policy of the United States with the focus on Iran? Now in the end of this essay we can assess if this question has been fully analyzed and answered.

The aim of this essay was to use the theoretical framework of realism for the majority of the paper to answer the research question. The method which was a theory fitting process was meant to provide a single theory a case study under certain circumstances to fit the theory to the given case study. This narrow perspective through the essay has given a focused view that would have otherwise gone to broad.

The analysis which started with the defining through the theory of realism what exactly the foreign policy of the United States could possibly be. This was answer first started with the idea of a social contract from Hobbes in which the anarchy of the state of nature that is what man finds themselves without a formal governing body, and in the state of nature every person has the right to do whatever one pleases without repercussion of breaking any laws. In this situation man finds himself unable to secure safety for himself, so in the name of safety and security a number of people form together in the mutual idea to organize a formal governing body to provide the people a freedom from fear. With this the people give up certain rights in which laws are constituted so society may have security. This formal government has the objective to provide the best interest of their people. Since there is no higher power above the state there can be nothing higher that governs the state, therefore the international system is anarchic. Thus the security of a nation is the top priority of most foreign policies in the international anarchic system. (Waltz 1954 p.160-170)

This is the foreign policy of the US, the safety and self preservation of its nation in the anarchy that is the global community. The biggest threat to the security of the US is the nuclear weapon. This is the driving force behind the foreign policy that has been analyzed in this essay. The Non Proliferation Treaty was created through the fear of an attack of a nuclear weapon. So through the NPT and the IAEA the US tries to enforce their goal of security in the international system. This is the way in which the NPT influences the foreign relations of the United States. It is through the constant need for protection in the international system that the nation actively tries to snub out every threat that questions its very existence. This is the nuclear weapon, and through the IAEA the United States can influence the international community.

The NPT has been stated in the analysis section as a regime. A regime is a simple set of norms and values that is set and agreed upon by one or more states. In this case it is the idea of not spreading nuclear weapons and technology. This threat for many of the world's nations has been put at such a high priority that many nations agree that the threat to international anarchic society is the threat of any nation to be able to freely develop nuclear weapons. This would make the anarchic system even more chaotic. This possibility has almost scared the international community to agree on a set of norms that all can agree to. This security concern for United States to yet again preserve their state has risen to a point in which their interests can be agreed on by an international community rather than just

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

themselves. So through the need of mutual protection and security the US has risen as the hegemonic state in the world to use their interest to influence the NPT and the IAEA. This has been analyzed through realist terms in the case that in examples of mutual benefits states will look to other nations to progress their interests. This mutual benefit turns into a regime or a mini social contract that lies within the sole hegemonic state to influence the regime with its own interests. (Grieco 1988 p.488-492)

We can see that the United States uses the NPT to their benefit and interest of self preservation in the thought of limiting a future state that poses a threat to well being of the United States. The events that had taken place after 9/11 was an attack that gripped the United States in the fear of another terrorist attack. This was the perfect moment for the neo conservative movement to push their policy of securing and riding the world of threats that risk the interests of the United States. One of the main threats after the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq was Iran. This nation has terrorist leanings with a reportedly very active nuclear program. This program was the largest risk of a nuclear attack so out of the need to have self preservation the United States used the NPT once again as a means to put pressure on the nation of Iran and the nuclear program. The policy of the Neo Conservative policy makers made it a priority to actively search and limit the threat of threats to US interest. (Hudson 2005 p. 329-333)

It had been established as well why states build a nuclear arsenal. What was said was the fact that a nation has to be a somewhat isolated state geographically in terms of being protected under certain military agreements. This promotes a nation to develop its own military. A nation with a strong economy to withstand the pressure of outside trading that would create an embargo to try and stem nuclear production. A weak government leads to the development of a possible nuclear arsenal because of the national pride that might be felt by the people of a nation. Instead of looking for a means of securing human security for their people they look for a sense of pride instead through a nuclear weapon. (Gartzke 2007 p.169-172)

All of these requirements lead to the nation of Iran in the eyes of the United States. The United States actively tries to use the NPT and the IAEA as a means for self preservation in the effort to try and limit the efforts of Iran in producing a nuclear weapon. Some of the threats would be that it could create a certain arms race with the other nuclear power in the Middle East and ally to the US: Israel. This would lead to a mini arms race in which each nation would put all of their resources to try and build more weapons than the other. It is a means of balance of power. This would surely lead to nuclear conflict, and at least a more unstable environment in the Middle East. The nation of Iran attaining a nuclear weapon would also undermine the legitimacy of the US to be effective as the world's hegemonic nation. This would lead many nations in the Middle East to potentially turn towards to Iran to protect them instead of the US.

So once again the United States needs to use the method of soft politics to persuade Iran to cooperate. This will be from the benefit of the US making the nation of Iran efficient in terms of clean nuclear power instead of making weapons. This is the ultimate solution for the United States because not only is the threat of nuclear weapons neutralized through the NPT but also the US can oversee the production of nuclear materials in Iran. This foothold in the culture of Iran would be huge to influence a nation that has always had ill feelings towards the US. The development of Iran could mean good results for the US. (Duffield 2007 p.110-116)

So the start of the essay stated that the research was to analyze through the theory of Realism how the Non Proliferation Treaty Influenced the Foreign Relations of the United States towards Iran. Through the theory of realism the essay has found that the US has found itself as the hegemonic state with the world. As the hegemonic power in the anarchic world there are certain measures that the state must do to ensure their safety in the chaotic international system. These measures are focused on the biggest threat to the US that is the nuclear weapon. The limiting of nuclear capabilities of enemies of US interest is of the highest priority for the US. So through the Non Proliferation Treaty the US can monitor along with the IAEA and over see nuclear production in many nations in the name of their security. In terms of Iran the US has deemed that this nation is of the utmost priority. In the very volatile region of the Middle East the US uses the NPT to try and limit Iran from developing nuclear material for a nuclear weapon. In the realm of realism self preservation is of the utmost importance. The US has just simply used the NPT to try and secure its safety from a possible attack from the nation of Iran. This is the current and future foreign policy in terms of nuclear weapons for the United States.

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

Resources

Arnold Thomas, Dale Henry (2007) (Thucydides), *The History of the Peloponnesian War*, The University of California digitized 2007 publisher Harper & brothers, 1873

Chafetz, Glenn Abrahmson, Hillel Grillot Suzzette (1996), *Role Theory and Foreign Policy: Belarussian and Ukrainian Compliance with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime*, Political Psychology Vol. 17, No. 4 (Dec., 1996) International Society of Political Psychology

Duffield Mark (2007), *Development Security, and Unending War: Governing the Worlds of Peoples*, Polity Press Cambridge, UK

Edelman Eric, Krepinvich Andrew, and Braden Montgomery Evan 2011, *The Dangers of a Nuclear Iran: limits on Containment*, in Foreign Affairs Magazine January 2011 volume 90 number 1 Council on Foreign Affairs New York, USA

Hampton Jean (1988), *Hobbes and the social contract tradition*, Cambridge University Press

Hershberg Jim(1995), *Anatomy of a Controversy: Anatoly F. Dobrynin's Meeting With Robert F. Kennedy, Saturday, 27 October 1962*, THE COLD WAR INTERNATIONAL HISTORY PROJECT BULLETIN Issue 5, Spring 1995

Hollis Martin, Smith Steve (1990), *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*, Oxford University Press New York, United States

Hudson C, Michael (2005), *The United States in the Middle East*, International Relations of the Middle East. Ed. Louise Fawcett. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press

Gartzke Erik, Jo Dong-Joon (2007), *Determinants of Nuclear Weapons Proliferation*, *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Feb., 2007)Sage Publications, Inc.

Gilinsky Victor (2011), *Casting a Blind Eye: Kissinger and Nixon Finesse Israel's Bomb*, Carnegie/NPEC Seminar Washington January 27, 2011 http://www.npec-web.org/article_file/Casting_a_Blind_Eye_Kissinger_and_Nixon_Finesse_Israels_Bomb_260111_1642.pdf

Grieco Joseph M.(1988), *Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism*, International Organization Vol. 42, No. 3 (Summer, 1988), pp. 485-507 MIT Press

IAEA (2010), *Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement and relevant provisions of Security Council resolutions 1737 (2006), 1747 (2007), 1803 (2008) and 1835 (2008) in the Islamic Republic of Iran*, (This document has been derestricted at the meeting of the Board on 10 June 2010) <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Board/2010/gov2010-28.pdf>

International Atomic Energy Agency: IAEA (1970), *TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS*, INFCIRC/14022 April 1970 The text of the Treaty, taken from a certified true copy provided by one of the Depositary Governments.

Jenkins, Bonnie (2006), *Combating Nuclear Terrorism: Addressing Nonstate Actor Motivations*,

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science Vol. 607, *Confronting the Specter of Nuclear Terrorism* Sage Publications, Inc. in association with the American Academy of Political and Social Science

Lindsey M James, Takeyh Ray (2010), *After Iran Gets the Bomb: Containment and its Complications*, Foreign

The Non Proliferation Treaty: Its Effect on US Foreign Relations towards Iran

Written by Jonathan Alexander

Affairs Volume 89 Number 2 March/April 2010 Council on Foreign Affairs New York, USA

Marfleet, Gregory K (2000), *The Operational Code of John F. Kennedy during the Cuban Missile Crisis: A Comparison of Public and Private Rhetoric, Political Psychology*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (Sep., 2000), pp. 545-558, International Society of Political Psychology

Moses W Jonathon, Knutsen L. Torbjorn (2007), *Ways of Knowing: Competing Methodologies in Social and Political Research*, Palgrave Macmillan New York, New York

Sheehan, Michael (2005), *International Security: An Analytical Survey*, Lynne Reinner Publishers Boulder Colorado

Sagan D Scott (1997), *Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? Three Models in Search of a Bomb*, compiled within Brown E Michael, Cote Owen R JR, Lynn Jones Sean M., Miller Miller E (2004), *New Global Dangers: Changing Dimensions of International Security*, MIT Press Cambridge Massachusetts

Smith, K. Roger (1987), *Explaining the Non-Proliferation Regime: Anomalies for Contemporary International Relations Theory*, International Organization Vol. 41, No. 2 (Spring, 1987), pp. 253-281 MIT Press

Tarock Adam (2006), *Iran's Nuclear Program and the West*, Third World Quarterly Vol. 27, No. 4 Taylor and Francis LTD

Tate McMorris Trevor (1990), *Regime-Building in the Non-Proliferation System*, Journal of Peace Research Vol. 27, No. 4 Sage Productions

United Nations Security Council (2007) Resolution 1747 (2007) Adopted by the Security Council at its 5647th meeting on 24 March 2007 http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iaeaairan/unsc_res1747-2007.pdf

<http://www.un.org/en/conf/npt/2010/>

Wohlforth, W.C (1990), *The Stability of a Uni Polar World*, International Security Magazine 21/1

Written by: Jonathan Alexander

Written at: Malmo University

Written for: Steven Marr

Date written: 05/19/2011