



## The international system structure and dichotomy in dealing with the nuclear power of Iran and Israel

Mohammad Abolfathi, Bahram Moradi, Ahmad Kazemi, Seyed Reza Barani, Habb Allah Falahi

Department of Political Science, Razi University, Iran

**Abstract:** The main essence of the new reasoning of realists is that access to the nuclear power from the small countries isn't dangerous, but the main danger is from the old powers threatening the international system. So today world is observing a dual behaviour of the great powers with the nuclear activities of Iran and Israel. This process is been performing specially with U.S.A support and partnership of other important powers. The presence article focusing on that subject tries to survey the reason of that behaviour with looking at the nature of current international System. It believes that within current international system, the major countries don't suppose increasing and show of U.S.A power as a challenge to own vital goals, but they find it within the norms and values that their benefits are supplied in bed of those norms.

[Mohammad Abolfathi, Bahram Moradi, Ahmad Kazemi, Seyed Reza Barani, Habb Allah Falahi. **The international system structure and dichotomy in dealing with the nuclear power of Iran and Israel.** *N Y Sci J* 2020;13(4):78-85]. ISSN 1554-0200 (print); ISSN 2375-723X (online). <http://www.sciencepub.net/newyork>. 9. doi:[10.7537/marsnys130420.09](https://doi.org/10.7537/marsnys130420.09).

**Keywords:** nature of current international system, hegemonic realism of U.S.A, the great powers, nuclear power

### 1. Introduction

Kenneth Waltz says that in the international system, all of its Members are willing the power increasing and a member isn't able to Increase own power and overcome on system. Because other members Do so and consequently are defeated (Waltz, Kenneth (Summer 2000). Governments obtain the defensive tools to supply own security, become United with together and even fight together. But these activities can Cause to more insecurity and other governments resort to it in order to Maintain own security against others because of the arms race and the mutual actions. Security has been changed to the most main worry of governments in anarchic, because the survival principle is the main covenant in order to be fulfilled any other goal. So recognizing the nature of the international system can present many facts about abilities and shortages of any unit of international system.

For example why a country such Israel can achieve the nuclear weapon, But Iran confronts with challenge in achieving the certain right of the nuclear peaceful technology will be clarified. In today world there are 31000 nuclear caps that 14000 caps are ready and 441 nuclear Powerhouses are active in producing the plutonium (Norris, Robert S; Kristensen, Hans M (2004). Today world public thoughts with any mental tendency follow the Rational response to that question: Why at this time the nuclear Peaceful activities of Iran is a security subject and it is examined in UN Security council? Why Israel has equipped to the nuclear weapons Out

of the international standards continuing own nuclear activities without any supervision? Why there is no reaction from the great Countries and the international societies in spite of confession of Israel Premier to having the nuclear weapon? Why the great powers try to prevent Iran that is from the oldest member countries of non- proliferation of the nuclear weapons contract following contract obligations about non- diversion of nuclear, to access the nuclear peaceful technology? The security environment coordinates of Iran show a space full of challenge that set of the presence threats is base of reasoning of someone about having necessity of nuclear weapon of Iran, but having the nuclear weapon isn't able to remove the security threats about Iran necessarily and causes vulnerability of that country. In that condition a level of ability can be the important choice in the nuclear program. Also the nuclear program of Iran has provided a Suitable possibility for interaction with the West and has made possible Basically Iran acting in the international level. Now west is ready for Interaction with Iran and the main motive of that will is the nuclear Program of country. At this time the multilateral interaction strategy can consist of the nuclear program the mid-term foreign policy goals simultaneously.

**1- Nature of current international system:** Now we observe lack of Union formation opposing with hegemony of U.S.A. Forming the Powerful economical poles in Asia such as China, Japan and

Iran and In Europe such as Italia, Germany and France in one side and being Negative trade level of U.S.A with those countries and debt growth of that government in other side show the economical competition of those countries with U.S.A in world arena. But we aren't able to consider that condition as losing the position and the first class place of that country. Waltz view having root in realism view, emphasizes on usefulness of the nuclear weapons publication. In his view, in dipolar world, superpowers control together having weapons and the relative peace in that era was from the presence of those weapons. Waltz believes that countries access such as North Korea and Iraq to those weapons is not very important. Because prevention logic acts anyway preventing using those weapons by those countries.

Also he believes that prevention with the common weapons causes to Defeat, but prevention with the nuclear weapons has been always successful. Stephen Walt as a defensive realism and Jan Mershaymer as a offensive realism confirm view of Kenneth Waltz. Both of theorists in a article in beginning the war against Iraq declared that the nuclear prevention is more cautiously than prevention war (Moshirzadeh, 2004: 837-8). But another theorist called Scott Steichen against Waltz view Mooted hazard of the nuclear proliferation view. He believed that Increasing and distribution of the nuclear weapons not only doesn't Cause the constancy but also because of not follow prevention laws put the presence world constancy at stake. Ike John and Stephen Lee Support that theory (Waltz, 1981). Wohlforth recommends that no doubt the current international system is unipolar and U.S.A in one of other higher great powers, even if we collect the power of other great Countries, the power of U.S.A is higher once more. In addition, U.S.A is only projecting government in today international history with certain dominance on all of power factors i.e. economy-military, Technologic and geopolitical (Wohlforth, 1999, 7-8). Because of lack of the certain enemy such as Cold War era, there are not the certain Demarcating in the international scene. In today world, we don't consider certain and separate poles of power distinguishing them with demarcating. More precisely, being polar has been removed from the international scene. So we conclude that U.S.A after Cold War was successful martially in several wars. So the international system is an one polar system under rule of U.S.A. But U.S.A acts to war, military expedition or other interventions in all of them with support of some regional and international powers. So only that country is able to create union and military coalition against the small countries and the regional powers and that world power acts in the regional crisis with cooperation of other world and regional powers

(McGreal, Chris (May 24, 2010). The object that affects the international system structure may be those international system tissue is one-multi polar that shows the presence of a superpower i.e. U.S.A with some other powerful poles (Hangtinton, 2005:7). Regarding to what mentioned we can elicit from it the meaning of the great powers convergence with hegemonic realism of U.S.A.

## **2- The great powers convergence with hegemonic realism of U.S.A:**

Hegemony of U.S.A formed in context of international developments, not only consists of imposed dinosaur- domination nature, but also consists of Philippines-supremacy nature arose from partnership. U.S.A has shown that problem during Afghanistan, Iraq and Kosovo Crisis knowing the power limitations, power intensity and its pride dangers so much that not want to impose own rule out of defined values of dominant world system. It can be the best justification to express that why hasn't been formed balance in all its forms i.e. mental-cultural, military-strategic and political-diplomatic clearly (Hobson, J. (2000).

What today is important for the great countries isn't security fear, but they fear from shortage. U.S.A hegemony has been accepted because it isn't a security threat. But it is the source of maintaining the constancy providing the opportunity for the higher countries of system to focus on the economical development and comfort topics completely. Indeed, hegemonic government has provided this opportunity for other governments to profit from advantages that hegemony provides for the international economy as general goods called hitchhiker (Beyer, C. (2010)).

U.S.A was successful in making dependent other countries and many people of the great countries in the international system structure via increasing cooperation level and encouraging other actors to accept the liberal order policies (Hobson, J. (2000). According to the new view of governments actors aren't exclusive of the international relations and the national and international organizations and agencies act generally in beam of the higher power influence. For example we can say average 500 milliards government bonds of America has been sold in any industrial country of Europe and any kind of the economical pressure effective on those countries damages European affiliates affecting naturally on the massive economy process of those countries. These considerations have made the great powers to choose cautiously Methods against U.S.A (Agnew, John and Corbridge, Stuart (1995).

Also experience shows that the Most of countries especially the small ones and the regional powers are made to choose U.S.A in choosing that country and

other countries. Arabia and Pakistan behaviour in war against Taliban and Arabic Countries behaviour during attack on Iraq shows this reality. So it may seem very different about the great powers apparently. This behaviour is caused by some factors:

1- The great powers benefits have tied with U.S.A more than the small countries, so they finally prefer to make the greater benefits victim of the small ones.

2- Even if the great powers have the important benefits in developing countries, they must be able to defend it to maintain. Today any great power such as U.S.A isn't able for the military expedition to several areas of world in the large scale (Nye, Joseph (2002).

3- Continuing current international order base of the great powers behaviour: According to Kenneth Waltz, whole international environment must be secure ideologically in order to create security in U.S.A (Vahidi, 2004:2). It is correct about other great powers certainly and so they accepted the benign supremacy theory. Because obtained security under power of U.S.A with an international balance can spread to all countries, even they aren't in direction of balance creating (Wendt, A. (1992).

The great powers have common responsibilities in playing own international-world role. This process has been formed gradually being related to manage the international affairs. So the common responsibility leads them to choose the common positions. Although existing difference of opinion about tools and methods is possible (Waltz, Kenneth N.2000). The great powers in own common responsibility i.e. maintaining current international order consider lack of being bound to the liberalism values the reason of new instability in international scene that means creating very chaos conditions than Cold War era.

We can consider being bound amount of governments to current Liberalism values as criteria and standard of the great powers behaviour against them. Why does non-nuclear war happen with presence of the Nuclear weapons? We must say non-nuclear wars between non-nuclear Countries or according to a strong obligation with a nuclear power haven't necessary obligation and don't consist of the nuclear prevention policy.

So it is impossible in all of the nuclear weapons condition to be able to prevent revolution, civil war, guerrilla warfare and other weak fighting. Evidence of it happened in civil war of Georgia that caused to use non-nuclear in that war. The nuclear prevention is constant according to the rational default, even if we are able to prevent the premeditated nuclear war; we aren't able to prevent the unintentional nuclear war (Zuckerman, M B (1998).

4- Different function of Israel and Iraq for current international system And different look of the

great powers: Relations of U.S.A and Israel Have been unique from being complex, stability viewpoint and its Political affects the internal and world policy of both countries. Indeed, it has been formed according to threat balance in order to face with Governments that are the most threat source in their view (Schweller, Randall R.1997). So hegemony power i.e. U.S.A has left a part of own responsibility to Israel to use the military power in order to create stability in world capitalism system. Also Israel was successful in preventing the victory of nationalist and Islamist movements in Lebanon, Jordan, Yemen and Palestine (Green, 2007:222).

Indeed, union of U.S.A and Israel has been formed according to balance of threat to face with governments that are the most threat source (Schweller, Randall R.1997). In the nuclear promotion treaty between U.S.A and Israel signed in 22 February 2000, the nuclear scholars of Israel were able to use the nuclear technology of U.S.A. In this treaty, both governments were obliged to try in interchange field of equipment's, experiences and other nuclear cooperation. This treaty will not create any change in NPT policy of Israel or other nuclear military programs of this country. According to that treaty, U.S.A declares that Israel for being a sensitive country in the Middle East does not sign treaty of lack of increasing and distributing the nuclear weapons (Posen, Barry.1990).

The military abilities of Israel have provided opportunity for that country to help the meddler forces of U.S.A in the Middle East acting as a military power in order to achieve the Middle East benefits of U.S.A (Mitchell-Bard, 1998, 4-7). The U.S.A have helped Zionism regime in last year in building powerhouses in order To make cold the light water in Nakhal Souric equipping that powerhouse to 50 kg high uranium to enrich.

Also Norway knowing Israel goal to make the nuclear weapon has sold 20 tons heavy water to Israel that it is used to make the nuclear weapon. Israel has over 200 nuclear bombs that they are enough to eradicate humans and plants life in the Middle East (Lennox, Duncan, ed. (2007).

American authorities induce that when laws and safeguards of development and growth prohibition of the nuclear weapons aren't effective and countries such as Iran, North Korea and Iraq called axis of evil following access to massacre weapons, it explains prevention war to prevent their possible attack against U.S.A and its united in the Middle East. Because terrorism topic and massacre Weapons cause to fear of U.S.A and Israel governments.

Advantages of Israel for current international system, democratic ideals and common religious heritage of Israel and West have because that w. Bush

calls U.S.A And Israel as sister and brother in democracy family (Gorge, 2000, 1-4). Mrs Albright the former minister of foreign affairs of U.S.A introduces behaviour method of governments with Israel as democracy standard for U.S.A (Jack Donnelly.2000). Her view has caused that the great powers haven't fear from the security results for Israel behaviour in area. Because Israel doesn't deny value and norm bases of liberal order, but it explains own policies within these values. So important powers of world don't make Israel to explain and limit own nuclear activities using the presence mechanisms in these countries. As behaviour of these countries express that they want Iran performance and confronting with its nuclear power in frame that leads to establish the international order and strengthening values of this order. As U.S.A and its allies have removed slightly some threats according to own common benefits with different diplomacy methods, the economical pressures and the military attack, but in view of the strategic allies, today the most important threat of their benefits is Iran that is constant and permanent in access to the nuclear peaceful energy.

But we must say that there is a basic difference between Iran and Israel that is however Israel is bound to current liberalist values, Iran is opposed to them unfairly from rule of those values and superpowers dominance on human as the most important problem of today world and insists on the desired international system that is a justice-oriented system with accepting the rule against nations and the equal rights of humans. So in view of world capitalism system, Iran is an unrest and disturber member and its Islamic revolution ideology has emphasized always on the permanent dispute with the liberalist values governor on the international system. Iran behaves against world system regarding to its ideological nature and wants to disturb the presence condition and disorder in current world system (Beeson, Mark (2003).

As before Islamic revolution of Iran, U.S.A supported completely access topic and using Iran the nuclear technology. American experts believe that Shah had started a research program in the nuclear research centre of Amir Abad in Tehran that was consisting of studies, weapons designing and recovering plutonium from used fuel and laser enriching (Beeson, Mark (2003). Today from West look, Islam is attacking and Iran wants to present the political role to Islam in Muslim countries of area and organizes and manages not only a power block called Islam world via promoting radical Islam in world, but also it tries to play a role as a revisionist in the international stage changing current international order under U.S.A hegemony to challenge. So we can

evaluate the goals of the strategic allies in war against massacre weapons in the Middle East, maintaining excellence, U.S.A and Israel prevention in the Middle East, preventing domino project of the nuclear weapons proliferation in area, decreasing maneuverer power of the challenger states against Israel and U.S.A and also hegemony developing and dominance on energy of the Middle East area (Gilpin, Robert.1998). As in hegemony of U.S.A, world organizations are the strategic will agent of that country and American norms are considered as the dominant criteria in the international system.

5- The nuclear accusations of west against Islamic revolution system of Iran: West countries believe that Iran is studying, testing and producing the atomic bomb and says in own theory: Abdol Ghadir Khan (father of the atomic bomb of Pakistan) and his channel are supplier and supporter of centrifuge programming in Iran and Libya and are designing and performing the nuclear weapons program of Iran.

They claim that Shahab-3 missiles of Iran are able to equip to the nuclear caps. This great problem is expressed with two components:

1- Today Iran is a barrier in the new American Gilpin, Robert.1998 order on our world after Cold War.

2- Power of Iran is increasing rapidly. But what does mean being barrier? It means that the ideological features of the political system of Iran and trends of its foreign policy not only are different, but also opposed to goals and benefits of U.S.A in the Middle East, Persian Gulf and the Middle Asia and Caucasus in any field are imaginable. Americans believe that the furtively nuclear program of Iran and creating establishments of the nuclear fuel cycle is in order to enrich uranium in the high level that is used to make and produce the nuclear weapon.

Goal of Iran from the nuclear weapons is because of the inherent interest of Islamic Republic to disappear Israel and Jewish- Christian civilization (Corsi and Bard, 2005). Certainly, this claim to stimulate the public thoughts and the international organizations and also exporting different declarations in governor's council of the international atomic energy agency and Security Council led to export 1696, 1737, 1747, 1803 under 41 articles of 7 chapter of UN charter in order to establish prohibitions against Iran government and nation and also 1835 and 1929 declarations.

As these declarations were exported, we aren't able to express a legal base for any action of Security Council and interested claims in these declarations are different with the international rights, UN charter and the commander rules.

**Table 1:** Exported declarations of Security Council against the nuclear activity of Islamic Republic of Iran from 2006 till 2010

row	Number of declaration	Date of issuance	Number of votes
1	1696	31 July 2006	Gathering of 15 members of security council
2	1737	23 December 2006	Gathering of 15 members of security council
3	1747	24 Mars 2007	Gathering of 15 members of security council
4	1803	3 Mars 2008	14 members of security council and the blank vote of Indonesia
5	1835	27 September 2008	Gathering of 15 members of security council
6	1929	9 June 2010	12 members of security council, the blank vote of Lebanon, the negative vote of Turkey and Brazil

If Iran doesn't act against U.S.A supposedly, only existing and stability of existing political and theological perspectives in Iran will not allow that U.S.A performs own ambition programs in the sensitive area of the Middle East. When Americans call Iran as a wicked and rebel country, they point exactly to not being adapted Iran with the final image of American world. Because they suppose that if Iran accesses to massacre weapons, this country probably will equip Hezbollah of Lebanon, Islamic Jihad and Hamas to those weapons. There are different views in Iran about the nuclear program that we can divide them to main three groups:

- 1- Supporters of access to the nuclear energy.
- 2- Supporters of the nuclear weapons ability.
- 3- Supporters of access to the nuclear weapons.

In Iran the last group has less supporters and majority of Iranians such as elites and state authorities support the first and second view. There are different reasons and factors to explain lack of will and attempt of Iran to have the nuclear weapon such as:

1- Danger of munitions competitions appearing: Access of Iran to the nuclear weapon can encourage Iran neighbours and other countries of area to travel same way (Brower, Kenneth S (February 1997). Attempt of area countries in having the nuclear weapon can change the area to insecure area having the nuclear arsenals instead of moving in area devoid of the nuclear weapons causing munitions competitions appearing (Russell- 2010:99).

2- As Iran access to the nuclear weapon and doing same action from area countries and neighbours, the common superiority of Iran arose from existing elements such as the common weapons, population, the geographical space, geopolitical position and so on will become weak.

3- Access to the nuclear weapon equally needs to have the nuclear defensive ability, as lack of command structure; control and developed

recognition can cause irreparable damages for country.

4- The nuclear terrorism appearing: In addition to possibility danger of other countries attempt for access to the nuclear weapons, danger of access extremist groups and terrorism to those weapons is a separate and more dangerous threat.

5- It causes threat feeling of the small countries of area from Iran and leading them to the more closeness with U.S.A and it can strengthen and establish U.S.A position in area.

6- Producing and maintaining the nuclear weapons cause to spend considerable costs. According to study of Bookings organization in 1998, U.S.A has spent nearly 5/5 trillion dollars for the related costs to the Nuclear weapons (Atomic Audit, 1998: 191).

7- Cooperation council countries of Persian Gulf in result of threat From Iran review in the security priority and move to buying the new weapons and strengthening own military power (Khaitous, 2010:193).

8- Vulnerably from the political, social and international costs: It on the one side causes the social and internal dissatisfactions and on the other side leads to increase dispute potential in area and aggravation possibility of the international pressures.

9- The internal oppositions: Individuals, groups and different conducts in government and society body oppose to access to the nuclear weapons as a high leverage that passing them will be difficult and expensive for government

10- The religious prohibition: According to interpretations of Islam, massacre weapons are prohibited in Iran and it has been mooted by leader of Iran Islamic Republic repeatedly and clearly.

6- U.S.A and its ally pressures (5+1) about the nuclear activities J.A of Iran: With becoming mooted the nuclear activities J.A of Iran in the international system, positioning, pressures and threat of U.S.A and Israel about the nuclear file of Iran began. As the main decisions of governors council weren't from the

technological affairs in file, but they were from the political pressures and threat about sending the nuclear file of Iran to council of security. Beside these pressures, Israel has threatened always J.A of Iran to the military attack on the nuclear establishments as a preventive attack. Professor Mojtabehzadeh manager of research institute of Euro Service of London says that sending principle of Iran nuclear file from the international agency of the atomic energy to council of security is contrary to the international laws and hasn't the legal legitimacy. We aren't able to prohibit a country economically for using the nuclear Knowledge (Mearsheimer, John J. 2001). U.S.A and Israel have decided that if the political and economical pressure be ineffective, they use the military tools against Iran. Chossudovsky quoted from Zebingnu Berzhinski says:

Israel is like a dog that U.S.A wants to loosen its collar to attack on Iran and Israel attack on Iran behalf of U.S.A (Chossudovsky, 2005). We must say this psychological warfare is a part of Israel movements to cover breaking obligations related to the nuclear disarmament. Because this country not only doesn't act N.P.T treaty, but also it has been changed to only owner of nuclear weapon in the Middle East by supporting U.S.A and Europe and having at least 200 nuclear caps. In view of Israel, Iran ability in access to the atomic weapon and producing it is like access Soviet to this weapon against U.S.A that caused to disappear the nuclear monopolizing of U.S.A (Buchanan, 2005). It seems that two governments wanted to create the international and regional gathering against the nuclear program of Iran. One of other dual approach of the international system in the nuclear program of Iran Islamic Republic is Determining method of materials balance areas. In this field with growing the electronic knowledge and using it to recognize and tracking of the nuclear isotopes, inspectors of agency were successful in designing and using the sensors that record any movement of those materials carefully, installing those sensors in entrances and exits of Iran nuclear Establishments provide this possibility that without presence of inspector, transportation of the nuclear materials or fuel rods in this country are recorded very carefully. This technology causes to create a constant supervision by agency on transportation of the nuclear materials in establishments that is behind of the first legal obligations of Iran and leading to more severe the applied well tested mechanisms in Iran. Now it has over 800 cameras connected to over 400 supervision systems that are controlling and protecting over 170 under Supervision establishments such as establishments of Iran, (Jessica Matheason, and 2003: 14). In spite of fear of Israel and U.S.A from access Iran to creating ability of the atomic bomb, the heads

of these regimes are worried and aware about changing the political process of Washington since that Barak Obama became president. They are worried that access Iran to nuclear knowledge damages the nuclear monopoly of Israel. The more important worry of Israel is that White House and European capitals listen some own old politicians and recognize officially nuclear Iran. They are hopeful that they are able to create some changes in Iran behaviour. They know well that new government of U.S.A never accompany them for air attack on the nuclear establishments of Iran: because Obama prefers to be friend with Tehran and for it prevents any military actions. The main goal of Israel is cutting or slowing the nuclear researches process of Iran of course without confronting with any condition leading to the public war. However according to head of information service of Israel "Mousad" any similar action or air operation against the nuclear establishments of Iran from Israel is little. One of the main of U.S.A new policy was using the regional actors role to solve the important international policy problems such as solving the regional crisis and combat against extremism and terrorism within intelligence power strategy. Regarding to this strategy, Obama tries to intermediate in the nuclear file of Iran and solving it via diplomacy with Turkey and Brazil encouragement.

## 2. Discussions

This fact isn't deniable in relation level between the great powers or relation between developed and undeveloped countries that current liberal order is within desired values and norms of U.S.A government. U.S.A wants to create a ideological deleterious in nature of the international system to make obliged all of actors to move within own desired rules and ideology and in this regard, any government that doesn't act agree with current values of structure will be punished by U.S.A and it gets no portion from own certain rights. The international pressures performed on non-aligned countries with current international order from the great powers coordinated express that they are enable to create balance between own position and goals and U.S.A and other great powers have proved the political and international goals of U.S.A leaders this fact is clear that the top of the international system having capability of challenge with U.S.A find performance of U.S.A within values and norms that their benefits are supplied in its bed. So it finally accompanies U.S.A against the challenger governments of current liberal order and supporting the defender governments of that order. We can observe reaction of such accompany in governors council declarations of the international atomic agency and UN security council against the atomic peaceful activities of Iran the also another example of

this accompany is observable in silence of current powers and the international societies against the military-nuclear activities even after deviation of that regime from the nuclear ambiguity policy.

#### Acknowledgements:

Authors are grateful Department of Political Science, Razi University, Iran for financial support to carry out this work.

#### Corresponding Author:

Mohammad Abolfathi

Department of Political Science, Razi University, Iran

#### References

1. A.H Cordesman, Security Cooperation in the Gulf: ACTIONS- RATHER Than Works and Good inten Retrieved july 30,2010.
2. Agnew, John and Corbridge, Stuart (1995), *Mastering Space: Hegemony, Territory, and International Political Economy*, Routledge, London.
3. Beeson, Mark (2003). "Resisting Hegemony: The Sources of, and Limits to Anti-Americanism in Southeast Asia", paper for *Globalisation, Conflict and Political Regimes in East and Southeast Asia*, August 15th-16th, 2003, Fremantle, WA.
4. Beyer, C. (2010). *Counterterrorism and international power relations: The EU, ASEAN and hegemonic global governance*. London: IB Tauris.
5. Brower, Kenneth S (February 1997), "A Propensity for Conflict: Potential Scenarios and Outcomes of War in the Middle East", *Jane's Intelligence Review* (special report) (14): 14-5.
6. Buchanan, Patrick (2005) "Is the Iran Crisis for Real? ", August 15, 2005, <http://www.antiwar.com/pat.html>.
7. Candidate Gorge. W. Bush on Israel (May 22, 2000). On Line at. [www.us-Israel.Org / AICE](http://www.us-Israel.Org/AICE).
8. Chossudovsky, Michel (2005) "Planned US-Israel Attack on Iran", May, 2005, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/html>.
9. Coris, Jerom (2005) " Atomic Iran: How the Terrorist Regime Bought the Bomb and American Politicians", Nashville, Tennessee: WND Books.
10. Council, Conclusions, on Irans Nuclear Programme, Retrieved july 27,2010.
11. Gilpin, Robert.1998. "The Theory of Hegemonic War." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*. Vol. 18, 4. (Spring 1988). 591-613.
12. -Hobson, J. (2000). *The state and international relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Jack Donnelly.2000, *Realism and International Relations* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 11.
14. Jessica, matheason, General overview of the Monitoring system of the Agency, vinna: Iaeapub,2003.
15. Lennox, Duncan, ed. (January 2007), *Strategic Weapons Systems* 46, Jane's, pp. 82-3.
16. M.D Kellerhalls, Concern Grows Owner Potential For Middle Easttrn Nuclear Arms Race, Retrieved july 27,2010.
17. McGreal, Chris (May 24, 2010). "Revealed: how Israel offered to sell South Africa nuclear weapons". *The Guardian* (London). Retrieved May 24, 2010.
18. Mearsheimer, John J. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York, London: W. W. Norton Company.
19. Mitchell G. Bard. *Roots*. (1998 (Of The U.S-Relationship. <http://WWW.US-IsraelRelation>.
20. Norris, Robert S; Kristensen, Hans M (November/December 2004). *U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe, 1954-2004*. Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Retrieved June 11, 2009.
21. Nye, Joseph (2002), *The Paradox of American Power*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
22. Pedrorski, Borise, "IAEA Inspector, my personal Interview, Vienna,10june3 2009.
23. Posen, Barry.1990. "Command of the Commons: The Military Foundations of US Hegemony." *International Security*. Vol. 28, 3. (June 1990), 5-49.
24. Russel, Richard, off and Running, *The Middle East Nuclear Arms Race*. JFQ/Issue 58,3d Quarter 2010 Nupress.
25. Schweller, Randall R.1997. "New Realist Research on Alliance: Refining, Not Refuting, Waltz's Balancing Proposition." *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, 4 (December 1997) 927-930.
26. Waltz, Kenneth (Summer 2000). "Structural Realism after the Cold War". *International Security* 25 (1): 5-41. Retrieved 13 December 2012.
27. Waltz, Kenneth N.2000. "Structural Realism After the Cold War," *International Security*. Vol.25, 1. 5-41.
28. Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics. *International Organization*, 46(2), 391-425.
29. willian c wohlforth. (The stability of a unipolar). "In International security massa chusetls": the mit press journal ( summer 1999). Vol.24, no.1.

30. Zachariah – Israel – Special Weapons Facilities", *Weapons of mass destruction*, Global security, retrieved June 4, 2011.
31. Zuckerman, M B (1998) "A Second American century", *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 77, Number 3, pp 18-31.

4/28/2020