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Your Full Your 4 January Should Iran be Allowed to Freely Carry on with its Nuclear Program? The Nuclear Program of Iran, contrary to popular belief, came into being before the Revolution, during the time of the Shah on the insistence and with the cooperation of the US. However, it is only recently that this issue has become controversial, with polarized opinions being issued left, right and centre. President Obama in his speeches, before he was elected, declared his willingness to engage in peaceful talks with Tehran, without any preconditions, a position that he has since forgone. Despite Israel threatening to take matters into its own hands, generally adopting a belligerent stance on this issue, and the US using IAEA as a tool to pressure Iran, it is contended that Iran should be allowed to carry on its peaceful nuclear program without the interference of the international community.
The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), to which Iran is also a signatory, recognizes the inherent right of the signatories to “ develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination” [emphasis added] in Article IV(1). Therefore, it can be said that not only is Iran within its rights to develop a peaceful nuclear program, but the US and the other international community, by their opposition to Iran’s nuclear program, are in direct violation of the NPT, specifically Article IV(2).
Iran has admitted to enriching uranium at their nuclear research centers. It is worth noting that enriched uranium can be used for the production of both energy and nuclear weapons. Admitting that it is not possible to determine the exact use this enriched uranium will be put to, it is contended that Iran’s stated stance of developing a peaceful nuclear program should be taken at its face value, as, so far, there has been no concrete evidence given to contradict it.
Nuclear energy would benefit Iran a great deal; it is a renewable source of energy, as opposed to oil and gas, both non-renewable energy resources. If Iran is allowed to carry out its nuclear energy production, it will, thus, save its oil and gas reserves for other more useful purposes (polymer and plastic production, for instance). Moreover, the negative impact of burning oil and gas on the environment and, by extension, human health, calls for looking into alternative sources of energy, one of which is nuclear energy. Though nuclear reactors also have problems, for instance, accidents that might occur therein and the storage and protection of nuclear waste, however, these are considered to be manageable.
Lastly, the allegation that Iran’s manufacture of nuclear weapons will cause destabilization in the region is just that: an allegation, with no tangible proof given in its favor. Even if Iran develops the technology to manufacture nuclear weapons, it will be foolish on its part to try to attack Israel under any pretense. Israel possesses, roughly, 400 nuclear warheads, and it will be naïve to presume it will not retaliate when, and if, Iran attacks its territory. This fact would not be remiss on Iran; therefore, it will provide a deterrent in case Iran does harbor any such ideas or any such nuclear technology.
It is ironic that the same countries using nuclear power plants within their territories and, in some cases, stockpiling immense nuclear arsenal, are forcing Iran to shutdown its peaceful nuclear energy program. It is, hereby, asserted that these countries should abide by the NPT and refrain from interfering with the Iranian nuclear policy.
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