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Abstract

The Iranian nuclear program is considered as one of the main concerns of the USA and other European countries as well as the Gulf countries. This study tries to analyze the effects of the Iranian Nuclear program on the security and stability of the Arabian Gulf countries taking into consideration that if Iran obtained the nuclear weapon, the whole region would be threatened by Iran's policy. The study also tries to answer these questions: What are the motives beyond Iran's obtaining nuclear weapons? To what extent can Iran threaten the security and stability of the Gulf region? What strategies do GCC countries apply in order to avoid war in the Gulf and maintain good relations with Iran? The study has used two methods to tackle these issues. Historical analysis approach and content analysis approach. The paper also traces Iran’s growth as a regional power and its sustained pursuit of nuclear weapon technology. The goals and the tools of both US and Iran that every side employed to resolve the conflict which discussed in this study. The study focuses on the Israeli strategy which tries to abort all Iranian efforts to develop its nuclear program and press the USA to launch military strikes against Iran. The research highlights both the US options and Iran’s options in this respect. Finally, future scenarios are presented and discussed in this study. The study concludes that confrontation between the USA and Iran is imminent because the international community has utilized many tools to resolve the conflict peacefully but nothing has deterred Iran from achieving that goal. The impact of the confrontation will be stronger on the GCC countries which will face painful consequences.
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INTRODUCTION

The world has witnessed some turning points that will determine a lot of international situations. It is also facing many issues and crises which threaten security, peace and global stability. Some of these issues are international terrorism, financial crises, ethnic conflicts and conflicts related to armament. An example of these issues is the threat to use nuclear weapons as exemplified by North Korea, Iran and Israel. To confront such threats, the USA and other Super Powers have established certain fronts, especially after the growth of tribal and ethnic fanaticism in many countries. Following the tragic events of September 11, 2001, the USA and many countries in the world have intensified security measures in order to prevent any terrorist attacks. Since North Korea and Iran are among the countries that threaten the interests of the west; they have become the prime target of the West. The two countries' constant pursuit to develop their nuclear capabilities and eventually obtain nuclear weapons has led to a mounting confrontation which may bring the world to the brink of wide war. Many scenarios to defuse such a crisis have been introduced.

IMPORTANCE OF STUDY

The importance of study stems from trying to understand the attitude of American diplomacy towards the Iranian nuclear crisis. In this study we will discuss the souring relations between Iran and the West and their repercussions, the impact of Iran's nuclear crisis on the American interests in the Arab region,
Iranian–Arab relations Also Arab national security and finally Iranian hegemony and its threats to neighboring countries. The study will try to analyze the tense political situation in the region and the potential perils of Iran's sustained pursuit to obtain nuclear weapons. It also reveal the Persian intentions of expansion in the region which arouse worries among Arab countries and the West. The study tries to understand the Iranian perspective regarding its nuclear energy program and the impact of this on the Arab nation which is suffering from lack of national security and failure to achieve the least development in even peaceful nuclear programs. Options and recommendations concerning deterring Iran from developing its nuclear program are introduced in this study.

STUDY PROBLEM
The problem in this study lies in understanding the nature of the Iranian nuclear crisis and the new perspective of the West regarding the Iranian issue. Israel has escalated pressure against the Iranian nuclear project which will threaten its security. The USA and other European countries have pressed the Iranian government for negotiations to resolve the conflict and abandon its uranium enrichment program.

Study Aims:
This study aims at:
A- Understanding Iran’s strategy regarding developing its nuclear program.
B- Analyzing USA attitude towards the Iranian nuclear program.
C- Analyzing the impact and repercussions of the Iranian nuclear program on stability and security of Arab countries.
D- Introducing some possible scenarios about the Iranian nuclear issue

STUDY METHODS
This study uses two approaches of scientific research:
A- Historical approach:
   This approach depends on using historical information and events in order to analyze political issues since it is very difficult to understand or evaluate any political issue without referring to its historical background and the repercussions of this on its present situation. It also helps us to predict the future of Iranian nuclear crisis.
B- Content Analysis Method
   It concentrates on the right understanding of the latest local, regional and international developments with regard to the Iranian nuclear crisis and it analyzes the possible consequences of the Iranian nuclear program on security of the Arab Gulf countries. This method also analyzes the conflicting interests of both Iran and USA in the Middle East.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND
Both Britain and Russia had shown their interest in Iran since the mid 1800s. Yet, USA replaced Britain as the British power in the region started to fade. Having realized that Iran’s geographical location was significant in containing the USSR and that Iran possessed large amounts of oil and gas, the USA planned to establish a regime in Iran that would serve its political and economic interests. During the Shah’s rule (between 1950 and 1979), USA and Israel maintained friendly relationship with Iran. But the collapse of the Shah’s government in 1979 caused a dramatic shock to USA which lost a strategic ally in the region. The exiled Ayatollah Khomeini returned to Iran and established the Islamic Republic of Iran. He was strongly opposed United States. The relations between Iran and US got worse when pro-Khomeini force attack and the US embassy and captured 53 American Hostage for 444 days. Surely that was a
distressing and unforgettable experience for United States and many experts think that incident marks the first introduction to extremist Islamic politics. Henceforth, a new era of souring relations between Iran and US started. Americans would look at Iran as a hostile country, while Iranians saw US as “the Great Satan”.

When the Iran–Iraq war erupted in 1980, United States supported Iraq. Nevertheless, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait changed US strategic policy in the region. US considered both countries as threats to its interests.

After the events of September 11, 2001, the United States relations with Iran deteriorated with Iran being included in the ‘axes of evil’ countries. The revelation in 2002 that Iran was building two nuclear facilities worsened the relations between the two countries.

IRANIAN NUCLEAR PROGRAM

Although the United States stands now against the Iranian nuclear program, it previously supported Iran’s plans to build a nuclear-energy capacity. In 1978 USA and Shah’s government signed an agreement in which United States pledged to send Iran equipment and material that would help Iran search for uranium. After the collapse of Shah in 1979, the Islamic Revolution discontinued its nuclear project.

During the first Gulf War, Iraq hit the two Iranian nuclear reactors under construction in Bush her, but with the end of the war Iran decided to continue with the project. In 1995 Iran reached an agreement with Russia to finish the reactor in Bushehr. The agreement included also Russia’s commitment to provide Iran with technical assistance. In parallel with its efforts to complete its nuclear reactors, Iran has been developing ballistic missiles that can reach all the Middle East and Eastern Europe. These missiles capabilities have increased both of Israeli and USA fears of Iran’s power in the region.

BEGINNING AND ESCALATION OF CRISIS

The present conflict between Iran and the USA started when Mujahedin–Khalq (an opposition Iranian group) revealed that Iran concealed a uranium enrichment facility at Natanz. Iran claimed that it was developing a nuclear program for peaceful purposes. United States, however, accused Iran of planning to produce nuclear weapons as it has abundant fossil fuel reserves and, therefore, does not need energy from nuclear reactors. France, Germany and Britain tried to defuse the crisis by sending their foreign ministers to Tehran in October 2003. They asked Iran to stop enriching uranium and facilitate IAEA mission. They offered economic concessions if Iran responded to its conditions. The proposal was appreciated by many countries in the world but Iran rejected it. In 2005 Iran continued its uranium conversion at its Isfahan plant and the IAEA declared that Iran was violating the non-proliferation Treaty terms. In January 2006 Iran reopened its Natanz facility and announced that it had continued its uranium conversion at Natanz. The UN Security Council unanimously adopted 1737 Resolution calling for Iran o suspend all enrichment–related and re-processing activities and to abide to the IAEA demands. Nevertheless, Iran did not respond and continued with its enrichment experiments. The Americans believe that the major interests of USA are threatened by Iranian ambitions. Iran exports oil to Russia, China and Turkey and it can hinder the transportation of oil in the Gulf. In addition, Iran supports Hamas and Hezbollah whom the United States considers as terrorist organizations. Furthermore, the Iranian nuclear program poses a threat to Israel, the main ally for the United States. The Iranian interference in Iraq which supports Shia group threatens the American presence and interests in Iraq.

Iran’s Perspective

The main concern of the Iranian leaders in Tehran is to conserve their regime. This is why it is very difficult to understand Iran’s intentions and goals. Perhaps the American aggressive attitude towards the Iranian regime has driven Iranian leaders to act in secrecy. Many analysts believe that Iran’s plans to obtain nuclear weapons are due to US policy in the region. By invading Iraq and Afghanistan, the US
destroyed two of Iran’s traditional enemies and opened the way for Iran’s rise as a regional power. Iran, therefore, started to face the US policy in different ways: supporting Hamas and Hezbollah and instigating the Shiite in Iraq.

THE ATTITUDES OF RUSSIA, CHINA AND TURKEY TOWARDS THE IRANIAN NUCLEAR CRISIS

Russia’s Attitude
There are three basics that have determined the Russian attitude towards the Iranian Nuclear Crisis and played a significant role in deciding Russia’s options concerning this crisis either in seeking peaceful solutions to the crisis or in imposing economic sanctions on Iran. The first basic is represented through the close cooperation between Russia and Iran regarding developing the nuclear program and other economic interests. Russia is contributing largely in developing the Iranian armed forces by supplying Iran with the latest sophisticated weapons. It also built the nuclear reactor at Bushehr.

On the other hand, Russia, though it has vital economic interests in Iran, is not in favor of Iran’s obtaining nuclear weapons because this might disrupt the strategic balance in the world. Yet, Russia does not agree with the US policy towards the Iranian nuclear program and rejects the proposals of the West to stop supplying Iran with nuclear equipment to develop its nuclear reactors. The West believes that Russia plays a significant role in escalating the Iranian nuclear crisis since it is committed to supply Iran with nuclear fuel.

China’s Attitude

The Chinese attitude was clearly announced when the Chinese President declared on 15th August 2007 that China calls for non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and seeking peaceful solution to the Iranian nuclear crisis through negotiations.

Since the first Gulf War (1980-1988) Chinese oil companies have started their investments in Iran because China needs oil and gas for its industry. Meanwhile, Iran needs Chinese technology and . Therefore, oil is the core of the mutual relations between China and Iran. Iran is the second biggest exporter of oil to China. It is not strange, then, to see that the Chinese are very interested in Iran’s nuclear program and support the legitimate rights of Iran to develop its nuclear program for peaceful purposes. China steadily calls for solving the Iranian nuclear conflict through negotiations and through the (IAEA) and opposes resorting to military strikes against Iran.

Turkey’s Attitude

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union Turkey has sought to build a nuclear reactor in Aqoyo Gulf in the south of the country. It has been one of ten nuclear reactors Turkey intends to build by the year 2020. Turkey has maintained good relations with Iran and made some agreements related to energy and natural gas. Israel warned that these agreements encourage Iran to obtain nuclear weapons and thus threaten stability in the Middle East. The USA also criticized the agreement of cooperation between Iran and Turkey in 2007. Turkey believes that Iran should develop its nuclear program for only peaceful purposes such as generating electricity. Israel, which has strategic ties with Turkey, still, thinks that Turkey can play a significant role in preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. The Turks realize that they can not be isolated from the EU so they are keen that their attitude towards the Iranian nuclear program should be in accordance with the EU attitude. They even adopt any decisions taken by the EU regarding the Iranian nuclear program. Nevertheless, Turkey would not give any facilities to Israel if the latter launched a military attack against the Iranian infrastructure because it fears that such support would arouse the anger of its own people, Arabs and Muslims throughout the world.
MOTIVES BEYOND IRAN’S PURSUIT FOR NUCLEAR POWER

The ideological differences between super powers and developing countries determine the differences in the motives of obtaining nuclear power. Undoubtedly, the desire to acquire power is the right of any nation, yet the concept of power differs relatively according to the culture of the nation and its characteristics.

1. Survival
Countries usually seek power to survive and avoid any foreign attacks. Therefore, Israel in its direct deceptive media claims that its acquisition of nuclear power is a vital guarantee of its survival, especially after the alleged holocaust and the successive wars with the Arabs which aimed at the elimination of the Jewish state. Fears related to survival, in case of Iran, are not justified since Iran does not have a direct enemy that threatens its existence although the Iranians think that a war may erupt between them and the USA. Nevertheless, the Iranians are sure that such a war will not lead to the elimination of their nation.

2. Nuclear Deterrent
Deterrent means convincing the enemy that the country has the military capability to abort any foreign attack, even before it starts. It has become the key strategy in the twentieth century. It is based mainly on possessing nuclear weapons in order not to use them but to deter any possible aggressive attack. Former USA Secretary Of State Mouski once clarified that the aim of nuclear deterrent is to prevent any possible nuclear war. Henceforth, one of the basic aims which drive Iran to possess nuclear weapons is to create certain level of fear among its supposed enemies and to practice political pressure on Middle East countries, especially the Gulf countries. Therefore, decision makers in Iran have become strongly convinced that traditional armies are no longer efficient in deterring any possible attacks on the country.

3. International Prestige
The assumption that Iran is seeking a kind of international fame or prestige does not contradict the previous motive of possessing nuclear deterrent which will enable it to become a key player in the Middle East issues, especially the Arab–Israeli conflict. This motive also satisfies the Islamic Revolution desire to lead the Islamic world.

DIRECT AND INDIRECT CONSEQUENCES OF IRANIAN ARMAMENT ON THE GULF COUNTRIES

Most studies of international politics indicate that countries which possess weapons of mass destruction tend to be more aggressive in their foreign policies since they have various capabilities of maneuvering and defense.

A vivid example of this is the Pakistani rush to occupy part of Kashmir in May 1999 which would not have happened if Pakistan had not obtained the nuclear weapon in 1988. Another example is when Iraq (after acquiring chemical and biological weapons during the last years of its long war with Iran) invaded Kuwait in August 1990. Henceforth, nuclear Iran might become more aggressive in its seeking to achieve its national interests in the Gulf and in its demands to end the foreign military presence, raise oil prices and take strict policy against Israel. Yet some analysts believe that nuclear Iran can be very helpful to Gulf countries, especially in facing Israeli aggression. They also support Iran’s rights to possess nuclear weapons for Israel has had these weapons since a long time and threaten Arab and neighboring countries.

On the other hand, Gulf countries are aware that Iran represents a great danger in the Gulf but they pretend that they are not worried about this fact. It is believed that the Iranian threat is not less dangerous than the Israeli threat because both countries threaten Arab security. Therefore, Arabs must not be too optimistic about the Iranian nuclear program.
and its benefits in supporting Arab issues and the Palestinian cause. Yet Arab countries may utilize
the Iranian–Israeli conflict to keep balance in the region and avoid the danger of both countries.
If we focus on the Arab–Iranian relations we notice that they are characterized by recurrent disturbance
which is due to many factors. First, this conflict goes back to the time of the Persian Empire. Second, the
long disputes between Iraq and Iran and the regional Iranian greediness to have sovereignty over a lot of
Arab land and water in the Gulf. This can be witnessed in the Iranian occupation of the three UAE islands,
the Iranian support to the Shiite in Iraq and Bahrain. Therefore, the worries of the Gulf countries
regarding Iran military armament are justified. Furthermore, what makes Iran more dangerous is its
pragmatic approach in dealing with regional issues. This approach was exemplified in its facilitating
the American invasion of Afghanistan and in its disappointing attitude towards Iraq during the second Gulf
War. The successive declarations released by Gulf Cooperation Council Summits hinted to the countries
fears of the Iranian ambitions in the region. In the Riyadh Summit in 2006, leaders of the Gulf Council
expressed their worries concerning the Iranian Nuclear program. The Gulf countries will be victimized
by any military confrontation between Iran and the American forces in the region. Even if economic
sanctions are imposed on Iran, Arab Gulf countries might be harmed because they have booming trade
with Iran.
In 2005 a Kuwaiti Parliamentary Committee discussed the potential dangers of the Iranian nuclear
experiments and dumping nuclear waste on the power stations and desalination plants in the Gulf
Countries.

POTENTIAL DANGERS OF REGIONAL INSTABILITY IN THE GULF:

1. Threatening stability in the Gulf region:
The Iranian acquisition of nuclear weapons can threaten stability in the Gulf region in two ways:
A- Consolidation of the state of imbalance in power between the countries of the region.
B- The eruption of a military confrontation between Iran and the West which may lead to disastrous
consequences such as instigating Hezbollah to attack Israel and thus escalate tension between Israel
and neighboring countries. Iran may also attack the American bases in the Gulf countries and
consequently the Gulf countries might be involved in a long war.
2. Difficulty in reaching mutual formula of Gulf security:
Iran thinks that the security of the Gulf is exclusively the responsibility of its countries. This belief
contradicts the policy of Arab Gulf countries which sees the foreign military presence in the region as a
fundamental support to their security. Yet Iran’s insistence on obtaining nuclear weapons may hinder
reaching a future formula of Gulf security for the following reasons:
A- A nuclear race may exist between not only the Gulf countries but also all the countries in the Middle
East.
B- Arab Gulf countries must seek guarantees from the international community to maintain their security
and protect them against any threats from nuclear Iran.
C-Iran’s possession of nuclear weapons may lead to the collapse of all efforts exerted by Gulf
Cooperation Council countries and Iran to build trust and promote mutual interests and abandon resorting
to force in solving regional problems.
3. Environmental dangers
Arab Gulf countries will be directly harmed by the Iranian nuclear reactors for Bushehr reactor is about
280 kms away from Kuwait and it depends mainly on Russian technology which lacks the appropriate
nuclear safety measures needed in case there is a nuclear leak or fault.
4. Gulf countries impasse: Most reports of the American Administration indicate that the war against Iran
is imminent because the US will not allow any nuclear power except Israel to rise in the Middle East. In
August 2004 President Bush declared that the military choice is possible if Iran does not stop enriching
uranium. The GCC countries would face a real impasse if war erupted in the area because it might lead to
unpredictable repercussions. Although these countries are strategic allies to the USA, it is unlikely that they would provide logistic facilities or support to any military operations against Iran because they might encounter rebellious movements from their Shiite citizens or be exposed to terrorist attacks. It is worthwhile to emphasize that most Gulf countries are bound by mutual economic, cultural and political interests with Iran. Saudi Arabia, for example, leads the opposition campaign against the Iranian nuclear program, yet it strongly rejects any military action against Iran. Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Faisal once blamed the West for the escalation of the Iranian crisis since it has allowed Israel to obtain nuclear weapons.

GCC STRATEGIES IN DEALING WITH THE IRANIAN CRISIS:

The main perspective of the GCC countries is based on reaching a regional agreement which involves all the countries in the Gulf and nuclear Israel and aims at announcing the Middle East as weapon free zone area. The GCC countries will adopt the following strategies:

1. They will try to develop their defense system and promote military cooperation as they have financial support from oil revenues, and Saudi Arabia which has strategic geographical location can lead this defense system. Yet, this strategy is rather difficult to be applied because security cooperation between Gulf countries is slow and the US would not allow these countries to exclude its significant role in protecting the Gulf region.

2. Complete dependence on the intensive American presence in the Gulf and supporting the US policy in dealing with the Iranian crisis. This strategy could escalate tension between some Gulf countries and Iran and force them to provide facilities to the USA and even to Israel to launch war against Iran.

3. A strategy which is based on an efficient Arab role in maintaining Gulf security. This role can be played by Egypt and Syria in addition to Turkey and Iran. The main aim is to establish joint security arrangements and reach settlements to any disputes through peaceful talks. Unfortunately, this strategy can not work because both the US and Iran oppose any Arab role in establishing Gulf security.

The USA OPTIONS

1. Diplomacy:
The USA has desperately employed diplomacy in order to stop Iran’s nuclear program. Negotiations which lasted many years have failed. Even Europe’s efforts to negotiate with Iran to suspend uranium enrichment have led to nothing. The UN resolutions including 1696, 1737, 1747, and 1803; have not deterred Iran from developing its nuclear program. President Obama employed a new strategy based on negotiations and sanctions. Iran agreed to a series of talks with the USA in October 2009 and an agreement was reached. Yet, Iran never accepted the proposal to stop its nuclear program.

2. Economic sanctions:
Obama’s administration urged the UN Security Council to impose sanctions against Iran and cooperated with Russia and China to prevent any veto for a resolution China is, however, opposed to this option because Iran is its main source of oil. The Chinese believe that the conflict could be resolved through negotiations. The United States still believes that economic sanctions can be very effective if they are employed together with political and psychological means.

3. Military option:
The failure of peaceful negotiations with Iran may lead to a military confrontation. Israel adopts and instigates this option. Yet, many analysts believe a military action against Iran would be a terrible mistake because it would strengthen Iran’s intentions and bring severe consequences. Oil transportation could be disrupted, American interests in Iraq may be hurt and Israel may be targeted by Iran’s long range missiles.

4. Psychological Option:
The USA has utilized three weaknesses in the Iranian regime to raise questions about its legitimacy through the media. First, the Sunnis are denied equality by the Shia regime. Second, the Persian elite has more privileges than other sects in the country. Thirdly, economic problems, high unemployment and inequality are dominant in the Islamic state.

Iran’s Options:
While the USA looks at the Iranian regime as a threat to its interests in the region, Iran itself strongly believes that the Americans are the greatest threat to the Islamic state. Iran has two main interests: to safeguard its Islamic state and to become the dominant power in the Middle East. Therefore, the Iranian leaders have four options. First, they have to resume negotiations with the USA and reach a settlement, which seems unlikely because previous negotiations have led to nothing. The second option is to withdraw from the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and reject IAEA inspections. The third option is to suspend building a nuclear weapon. The fourth option, which might be the greatest challenge for Iran, is to build a nuclear weapon. Such an option would lead to instability in the region, threaten many countries like Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Turkey, and start a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

IRAN’S RELATIONS WITH GULF COUNTRIES:
The American policy to isolate Iran regionally and internationally and the occupation of Iraq have pushed Iran to seek improving its relations with neighboring countries in order to keep stability in the region and attract foreign investments. Fear of Israeli economic and military expansion, especially after the destruction of the Iraqi power, and realizing the significant role of oil in deciding the Iranian and Arab Gulf policies have also urged Iran to cooperate with Arab Gulf countries. Besides, the fact that Iran is an Islamic country and a member in the Islamic Conference organization has led to more talks on important issues such as oil production and prices.

Factors that keep Iran at a distance from Gulf countries
1. The dispute over the three Emirati islands: Iran occupied the three islands (Abu Musa, Tunb Al Sugra, and Tunb Al Kubra) in 1971 and has refused since then to negotiate with the UAE to reach a peaceful solution on this issue.
2. Sectarian Differences: Most Arab countries adopt the Sunni doctrine while Iran adopts the Shiite doctrine. These differences have aroused a lot of controversy, particularly after the occupation of Iraq in 2003. Iran tends to support the Shiite in both Iraq and Saudi Arabia.
3. Although a third of the population in Iran is Sunni, Sunni people do not have the same rights as the Shiite: they do not occupy any rank or position in the government and there is no single mosque for the Sunni in Tehran, for example.
4. Iran frequently conducts military exercises and maneuvers near Hormouz Strait so as to provoke Arab Gulf countries.
5. Iran has indirectly reinforced the American presence in the Gulf under the pretext of safeguarding Gulf countries against any Iranian threats.

Future Scenarios of the Iranian Nuclear Program:
Any potential threats of the Iranian program would not exist unless the program carries military purposes. If the program aims at achieving peaceful purposes such as generating electricity; it will be for the benefit of the whole region.

1. Peaceful Scenarios:
A- Negotiations: Some analysts believe that negotiations between the USA and Iran can resume, and an agreement that could resolve the nuclear issue is possible. The European Union will play an important role through the International Atomic Energy Agency to mend fences between Iran and the USA. This scenario is appreciated by many Iranian reformers within Iran’s regime.
B- Escalation of Crisis: Iran would withdraw from the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and refuse further IAEA inspections. Thus, Iran could put increasing pressure on the West and win political victory.
This scenario can be possible if negotiations are finished before Iran acquires nuclear weapons capability. Iran might use time of negotiations to develop its nuclear program.

2. The Israeli scenario: Perhaps the main aim of the nuclear strategy of Israel is not to allow any power in the region to surpass Israel and threaten its security. Israel claims possess long–range missiles that could reach its territories. If Iran obtained nuclear weapon, Israel would attack Iranian nuclear plants as it did when Israeli planes destroyed the Iraqi nuclear plant in 1981. Israel even would instigate the USA to adopt the military option against Iran.

3. Nuclear Iran:
In this scenario Iran would seek more support from China and Russia to develop its nuclear program. It might conduct nuclear experiments earlier than expected so as to avoid any American military attack on its nuclear plants. This situation would change the whole balance in the region. Iran would be capable to deter any American or Israeli attacks and could pose a threat to neighboring countries. It could close the Straits of Hormuz and cut off much of the global oil supply. Iran would also support Shiite in Iraq against the United States or fund and arm Hezbollah and Hamas to stand against Israel. If Iran succeeded in its nuclear tests, it would threaten the security of Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Turkey and would start an arm race in the region.

4. Military Intervention: Although the USA and the European Union have repeatedly demanded that Iran return to international talks over its nuclear program, Washington keeps the option of a military strike open. The main aim of this military intervention would be to change the regime. Yet, this option is the least option on the table, especially in the light of the American experience in Afghanistan and Iraq.

5. Regime Collapse: Some analysts believe that the Islamic regime in Iran might be overthrown by opposition group’s. The United States would support these groups and the nuclear program would be therefore abandoned. This would ease the tension between Iran and the West. This option might seem less costly but it would be unlikely to happen because the opposition is weak and incapable of sustaining a revolution. Besides, there is no guarantee that the opposition leaders would change Iran’s strategy regarding the nuclear file.

RESULTS OF STUDY

This study has resulted in the following:

1. The Islamic Republic of Iran plays a significant role in the security of the Gulf region, a role that can not be denied by any regional or international power. In fact, Iran is considered as the main pillar of stability and security in the Gulf region and even in the Middle East. Therefore, the efforts of the USA and Israel to minimize the role of Iran actually reflects the desire of these countries to create instability in the Gulf region.

2. The Islamic Republic of Iran is facing nowadays a blatant threat of using military force against it. It is threatened by enemies who have the biggest military arsenal of conventional and non-conventional weapons in the world including the nuclear weapons. Therefore, Iran has the right to use all means to defend its national security and strategic interests and deter any possible military attack on its land.

3. The country which has greatly supported the Iranian nuclear program is Russia. It has provided Iran with experts; nuclear equipment and materials. Bushehr complex is genuinely Russian-built. It has also defended Iran’s right of developing its program emphasizing that the program has peaceful purposes.

4. The Iranian insistence on the uranium enrichment program can not be denied. Iran will reach the stage of depending completely on itself in operating its own nuclear reactors. According to Fars News Agency, Iran is actually conducting final tests at its first nuclear power plant in Bushehr and is expected to start generating electricity at the end of this year (2011). Besides, Iran has abundant
reserves of uranium in its land and it has the experience to treat it in order to produce nuclear fuel which can be processed into plutonium.

5. It is unlikely that Iran will use the nuclear weapon to attack any country, especially Israel and the USA because if it started any attack, it would bear heavy human losses. Moreover, the Iranian ballistic missiles lack precision in hitting their targets.

To sum up, Iran will never adopt an attacking nuclear strategy.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The researchers introduce the following recommendations that may help ease the tension and solve the conflict created by the Iranian nuclear program:

1. Iran must return to international talks over its nuclear program and prove to the world that its atomic intentions are peaceful. It has to join the 1996 Convention on Nuclear Safety and allow IAEA inspections to its nuclear facilities.

2. The EU can play a significant role in bringing reconciliation between the US and Iran and in persuading Iran to abandon its nuclear weapons program.

3. The USA should ease pressure against Iran and stop tarnishing Iran’s image in the world.

4. Gulf countries should improve their relations with Iran and try to reach any settlements to their disputes through peaceful talks in order to keep stability in the region and avoid any possible confrontation.

CONCLUSION

Many analysts believe that the Islamic regime in Iran is trying to revive the glorifications of the past Persian Empire which subjected many parts of the region under its rule. It is not strange, then, to see Iran nowadays as an ambitious powerful state possessing nuclear capabilities and trying to expand beyond its borders. Although the United States has tried to isolate Iran since the Islamic Revolution, Iranian power and influence have increased in the region.

It is very difficult to predict exactly the goals of the Iranian nuclear program, but it is obvious that Iran’s main aim is to develop its nuclear capabilities as soon as possible. International Atomic Energy Agency released reports in 2008 which confirmed that Iran had made substantial progress in its nuclear capacity and had sought the assistance of some foreign countries. The Bushehr plant is expected to start generating electricity in August 2011. Natanz uranium enrichment plant is at the core of Western concerns about Iran’s nuclear intentions since the country has no current civilian use for enriched uranium. Western leaders believe Iran secretly aims to refine uranium to the high degree suitable for atomic bombs. The fact that the uranium enrichment program could also make fissile warhead material has increased the concerns of the West. According to confidential letters obtained by the Associated Press in May 2011 Iran wants a new round of talks with six world powers to discuss many issues including its rights as a nation instead of international fears that it is building a nuclear bomb.

The fear that Iran might acquire the technical capability to make the bomb has escalated the crisis. If diplomatic efforts fail, the crisis could lead to a war that nobody wants and the Middle East would bear its consequences.
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