



The United States' Nuclear Hypocrisy

By [Frida Berrigan](#), [Foreign Policy in Focus](#). Posted [March 8, 2007](#).

The contradictions between what the administration is demanding of Tehran and other powers, and the nuclear capabilities it is pursuing for its own arsenal, are provocative and dangerous.

Tools

The Bush administration is very focused these days on Iran's nuclear program. This focus has only sharpened in the aftermath of the International Atomic Energy Agency's recent report that Iran continues to enrich uranium in defiance of a UN Security Council demand.

"A nuclear-armed Iran is not a very pleasant prospect for anybody to think about," Vice President Dick Cheney told ABC News' Jonathan Karl in Australia. "It clearly could do significant damage. And so I think we need to continue to do everything we can to make certain they don't achieve that objective."

Asked if the administration would continue to pursue diplomacy, the vice president responded that while "we've been working with the EU and going through the United Nations with sanctions ... the President has also made it clear that we haven't taken any options off the table."

In the White House, "options on the table" is code for military action. There have been many media reports of U.S. preparations to attack Iran. But the primary rationale for such an attack -- to prevent Iran from going nuclear -- is deeply problematic.

Not only is the United States beefing up its military in general, it is even planning a modernization of its nuclear arsenal. The nuclear hypocrisy of the Bush administration makes any resolution of the conflict with Iran all the more difficult.

U.S. Military Spending

The new round of hand-wringing and saber-rattling about Iran's nascent but worrisome nuclear program comes just a few weeks after the Bush administration announced its new budget, which included billions for nuclear weapons development.

The Department of Energy's "weapons activities" budget request totals \$6.4 billion, a drop in the bucket compared to the Pentagon's \$481.4 billion proposed budget. But the budget for new nukes is large and growing -- even in comparison to Cold War figures.

During the Cold War, spending on nuclear weapons averaged \$4.2 billion a year (in current dollars). Almost two decades after the nuclear animosity between the two great superpowers ended, the United States is spending one-and-a-half times the Cold War average on nuclear weapons.

In 2001, the weapons-activities budget of the Department of Energy (DOE), which oversees the nuclear weapons complex through the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), totaled \$5.19 billion. Since President Bush's January 2002 "Nuclear Posture Review" asserted the urgent need for a "revitalized nuclear weapons complex" -- "to design, develop, manufacture, and certify new warheads in response to new national requirements; and maintain readiness to resume underground testing" -- there has been more than a billion-dollar jump in nuclear spending.

Included in the \$6.4 billion 2008 request is money for "design concept testing" of two new nuclear warhead designs that officials hope will be deployed on submarine-launched intercontinental ballistic missiles-- even as U.S. warships set their helms towards the Strait of Hormuz to menace Iran back from the nuclear brink.

Costly, Illegal, and Dangerous

Key to revitalizing nuclear weapons is Complex 2030, the NNSA's "infrastructure planning scenario for a nuclear weapons complex able to meet the threats of the 21st century." It is a costly, illegal, and dangerous program aimed at rebuilding the 50-year-old nuclear facilities where the weapons are both assembled and disassembled.

How Costly? The DOE estimates that Complex 2030 would require a capital investment of \$150 billion. But the

Government Accountability Office says that is way too low to fund even the basic maintenance of the eight nuclear facilities currently operational throughout the country.

Why Illegal? Complex 2030 promises a return to the Cold War cycle of design, development, and production of nuclear weapons, runs the risk of a return to underground nuclear testing, and could require the annual manufacture of hundreds of new plutonium pits -- the fissile "heart" of a nuclear weapon. These plans directly contradict U.S. treaty promises in 1968 "to negotiate toward general and complete disarmament."

How Dangerous? Every step the United States takes away from the international consensus on the illegality and immorality of nuclear weapons is a new incentive and justification for other nations to pursue and brandish nuclear weapons.

In a 2006 report, the independent "Weapons of Mass Destruction" Commission estimated the dark likelihood of ten new nuclear powers within a decade. At the end of January, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists advanced the hand of its Doomsday clock to five minutes to nuclear midnight, in part as a result of "renewed U.S. emphasis on the military utility of nuclear weapons."

As the United States surges forward in its nuclear renaissance, the threat of nuclear terrorism and accidental nuclear strikes remains a grave yet under-funded priority. The administration occasionally raises the specter of nuclear-armed terrorists. In February 2004, for example, President Bush warned, "In the hands of terrorists, weapons of mass destruction would be a first resort."

Despite its rhetoric, however, the administration has done nothing to accelerate efforts to destroy and safeguard loose nuclear weapons and bomb-making materials, allocating about \$1 billion a year to these crucial non-proliferation efforts (roughly the same amount that the Bush administration has been burning through each day in Iraq). At this rate, it will be 13 years before Russian nuclear material is secured.

The contradictions between what the administration is demanding of Tehran and other powers, and the capabilities it is pursuing for its own arsenal, are provocative and dangerous -- a pernicious form of nuclear hypocrisy.

Dick Cheney is right -- a nuclear-armed Iran is not a pleasant prospect, and we have to do something. But the most effective option is the hardest to swallow. Under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the United States agreed to an "unequivocal undertaking" to "eliminate" its nuclear weapons arsenal.

Honoring that commitment -- and encouraging other declared and undeclared nuclear states to do the same -- would undercut Tehran's arguments about why nuclear firepower is necessary. Oh, and by the way, it would also make the world feel a whole lot safer.

 [Digg This Story](#)

Tagged as: [nuclear proliferation](#), [nuclear weapons](#), [iran](#)

FPIF columnist Frida Berrigan is a senior research associate at the New School.

Story Tools: [EMAIL](#) [PRINT](#) [39 COMMENTS](#)

[ForeignPolicy »](#)



STAY IN THE LOOP. GET ON THE LIST.

AlterNet sends email newsletters almost every day to keep you up to date. To sign up, just enter your email address:

Advertisement

Comments

[Give Us Feedback »](#)

Tools: [\[Post a new comment\]](#) [\[Login\]](#) [\[Signup\]](#)

View:

Hebrewnomics 101: Economic Strangulation

Posted by: Aufklaerung_Baboon on Mar 8, 2007 1:03 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

[U.S. 'warns' other nations not to do business with Iran](#)

The United States said Wednesday that foreign companies should think twice about striking deals with Iran, after a German company announced that it is in talks to buy liquid natural gas from Tehran.

The warning comes as western countries discuss tightening sanctions against Tehran and despite calls from the US for Europe, and particularly Germany, to diversify its supply of gas to stem Russia's growing monopoly in the market.

"We are in a time now where it should not be business as usual in terms of exchanges, business exchanges with Iran," McCormack said. **"I'm not saying that we are trying to cut off business exchanges with Iran,** but companies need to look closely at what their interactions are and with whom they are dealing."

McCormack said that the potential for tighter economic sanctions **posed a risk** for companies thinking about business dealings with Iran.

"If there is an increased risk involved in some of those transactions, I think it only stands to reason that some of those businesses are going to choose not to do business with the Iranian government," he said.

AND WHAT WOULD THOSE RISKS BE? BEING BLACKLISTED MAYBE?

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

[» Hebrewnomics plan put forward by Tom Lantos](#) Posted by: rwa

[» THANKS FOR THE LINK](#) Posted by: amacd

Comfort Level

Posted by: edith on Mar 8, 2007 1:36 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

Dick Cheney says that he's not 'comfortable' with an Iranian nuclear capability? How does he think Israel's neighbors feel with her nest of several hundred (at least) nuclear warheads. Any futile hope that Tel Aviv is rational flew out over the Mediterranean when the zionist regime launched an unprovoked massive assault on Lebanon.

When Israel surely assaults Syria and Iran after the spanking Israel suffered last summer, its nuclear spear will be wielded, either in fact or as a threat, by the zionist machine.

What will be Pelosi's response, let alone Bush and Cheney? Write off more zionist debt, I suppose.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [What Will Be Pelosi's \(And Other Democrat's\) Response? To Cheer And Blame The Victims!](#) Posted by: Douglas

» [How can an article on this subject not address Israeli nukes?](#) Posted by: rwa

» [Very Good Point! Not Addressing It Is Disinformation And One-Sided Propaganda!!](#) Posted by: Douglas

» [RE: Very Good Point! Not Addressing It Is Disinformation And One-Sided Propaganda!!](#) Posted by: pingoo

» [RE: Not Addressing It ----- It, being the global Empire, doug?](#) Posted by: amacd

» [Acutally...](#) Posted by: timebomb734

» [There are no serious allegations that Iran is developing ICBMs to reach the U.S.](#) Posted by: rwa

» [RE: Acutally...](#) Posted by: edith

Quite logical!

Posted by: Temporary on Mar 8, 2007 3:59 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

If i had a gun, i surdenly wished my neighbour wouldn't have one! It would make my more of a "man" if i was the only guy in the entire city with one;=)

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [RE: Quite logical! ----- and right on Target!](#) Posted by: amacd

» [RE: Quite logical!](#) Posted by: MartianBachelor

The 10 zillion dollar question

Posted by: kepstein7777 on Mar 8, 2007 4:27 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Why can the US have nukes and tell all the other countries who can and who can't have them?

It reminds me of the peasant scene from Holy Grail. King Arthur's sense of Divine Right is such that, from his perspective, arguing about it is an absurd waste of time.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [Where's my 10 zillion dollar prize?](#) Posted by: amacd

» [\[Cont.\] Where's my 10 zillion dollar prize?](#) Posted by: amacd

MORE Nuclear Hypocrisy-and going to the root

Posted by: wawa on Mar 8, 2007 4:52 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

Bruce Laingen, the former charge de affaires for the U.S. Embassy in Iran and one of the Americans who was held hostage from 1979-1981 in Iran wrote:

"The United States and Iran must talk. Not with the mutually negative public rhetoric that for the 27 years since the 1979 hostage crisis has eroded the trust needed for any diplomatic exchange; not indirectly, as we do now on the nuclear issue through our Security Council and European Union colleagues; but frontally and frankly as responsible powers with shared interests in a critically important part of the world."

"The absence of dialogue has made no sense on any count—strategic, human, historic, political, cultural. It has complicated our relationships with every other country in the region. We alone among the powers have chosen to signal in this way our reservations about Iran's conduct in the world arena."-The New York Times, Jan. 13, 2007 letter to editor

On Feb. 10, 2007, I attended a SABEEL [Arabic for THE WAY] Conference in Alabama , USA. Among the many truth tellers who spoke was Dr. Phyllis Bennis, a secular Jew, journalist, prolific author, Mid East analyst and Co-founder and Co-Chair of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation who said:

"Iran has signed the NPT, which allows them the right to have nuclear power and to enrich uranium. The 185 non-nuclear states have agreed to give up the right to have nuclear weapons and the five nuclear powers that signed the NPT agreed to get rid of their nuclear weapons... Iran is not in violation of the NPT, but America is! The USA has been in violation ever since the day they signed it. The USA is acting like a rogue state."

On pg. 19, March 2007, WASHINGTON REPORT ON MID EAST AFFAIRS:

Israel has been leading the attempts to characterize the Iranian regime...and its presumed ambitions for nuclear weapons...[because if they did] "it would kill the Zionist dream without pushing a button; for most Israelis would not come here with their families and [would live abroad]."-Ephraim Sneh, Israeli General and Olmert's Deputy Defense Minister.

"Israel is encouraging the USA to attack-simply because a nuclear armed Iran would make Israel a less attractive place for Jews to live, lead to increased emigration and tip the demographic balance in the Palestinians favor."-Jonathon Cook www.electronicintifada.net 12/14/06

There is NO WAY the Iranians would nuke Israel! Some of Islams HOLIEST sites are in Jerusalem.

"It has been said the Israelis don't love this land; they just want to possess it."-Jeff Halper, American Israeli, Founder ICAHD and Nobel Peace Prize Nominee,
Chapter 2: "Memoirs of a Nice Irish-American 'Girl's' Life in Occupied Territory"

WAWA:

<http://www.wearewideawake.org/>

[\[<< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >>\]](#)

Hmmmmm

Posted by: WhatNow? on Mar 8, 2007 6:25 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

President Bush warned, "In the hands of terrorists, weapons of mass destruction would be a first resort."

A honest statement from bush again. He lets the truth slip out occasionally. He's talking about his administration again and the deeds to back up the words are his administrations desire to upgrade the first strike capability of their nuclear arsenal.

How can anyone believe anything these thugs say? When they are truthful it is taken out of context. They've cried wolf too many times.

Here's another truthful statement that most people take out of context. "Our enemies are innovative and resourceful, and so are we. They never stop thinking about new ways to harm our country and our people and neither do we." I can't wait till these lunatics(bush administration) are gone so they won't be able to think of new ways to harm us or our country.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

[» Well put! Nuclear terrorism is the cause of proliferation.](#) Posted by: rwa

[» RE: Hmmmmm ---- have you really thought about the guileful global Empire?](#) Posted by: amacd

IMPEACHMENT

Posted by: Lynnigolon on Mar 8, 2007 6:27 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

I pray for IMPEACHMENT NOW. I am tired of our priorities not being straight. I've lost my faith and trust, and I am tired of giving the benefit of the doubt. I was watching at 2am, or 3am in the morning, as the American people slept, as a small handful of Democrats gave speeches on the Senate floor and tried to prevent our Administration from preemptively going to war. I knew what was happening... and in my gut, felt it was wrong. In the days, weeks, and months to come, however, I was NOT a Bush basher. I supported our President. I gave the benefit of the doubt. Somehow, my RESPECT and UNDERSTANDING of the men and women in our Armed Services was REAWAKENED. That anyone could DEDICATE THEIR LIVES, and have such COMMITMENT that they would give their lives to save ours, and support humanity's FREEDOM, is INCREDIBLE. (They must believe in DEMOCRACY and HUMANITIES INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY.) I believed and still believe that Mr. Bush has been doing what he believes is best, given the mindset and framework he has grown up with. However, it is the mindset, the militaristic mindset, that scares me. The stakes are high, and we better reevaluate our priorities. I'm afraid the recent budget proposal is yet more proof that OUR Administration does not have OUR appropriate priorities in mind. What are the COMMON DENOMINATORS for ALL OF HUMANITY??NEEDS?? WATER, FRESH AIR, FOOD, SHELTER and FREEDOM FROM OPPRESSION (in whatever form it takes.) Individually, everyone has to take stock of what their priorities are once and awhile. NOW, IT IS PAST TIME TO GET OUR PRIORITIES STRAIGHT. It comes down to this a choice between LOVE and FEAR. HELL NO, WE DO NOT WANT A NUCLEAR ARMS RACE! PLEASE>>>>REEVALUATE AT THE ROOT LEVEL!! WAKE UP!!! LET US START WITH OUR COMMON GOALS- It is a new world every day; IT is going to be what we make it.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

Middle East Cold War

Posted by: cinattra on Mar 8, 2007 7:01 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

I think Iran's nuclear ambitions start with Israel. Israel has them and Iran want's them to counter the threat. The two countries are too close to each other geographically to have a MAD standoff ala Cold War. In their case the guy to

push the button second might not get to push his button at all.

What happened to Japan should never ever happen again.

As far as US hypocrisy. Tell us something new we don't know about. We definitely need to do a better job with helping Russia secure their nuclear sites and we need to spend some of that money here too because our nuclear sites are probably not that much better off.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

The rest of the world asks...

Posted by: footman on Mar 8, 2007 7:07 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

I'm sorry but, what the PHRACK are you people doing?

Isn't it about time you people stopped moaning on internet forums about it, and kick these lunatics out of office?

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

[» RE: The rest of the world asks...](#) Posted by: woodford54

Wes Clark:

Posted by: rwa on Mar 8, 2007 9:01 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

So I came back to see him a few weeks later, and by that time we were bombing in Afghanistan. I said, "Are we still going to war with Iraq?" And he said, "Oh, it's worse than that." He reached over on his desk. He picked up a piece of paper. And he said, "I just got this down from upstairs" -- meaning the Secretary of Defense's office -- "today." And he said, "This is a memo that describes how we're going to take out seven countries in five years, starting with Iraq, and then Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and, finishing off, Iran." I said, "Is it classified?" He said, "Yes, sir."

Raw Story:

The Bush administration continues to bypass standard intelligence channels and use what some believe to be propaganda tactics to create a compelling case for war with Iran, US foreign policy experts and former US intelligence officials tell RAW STORY.

One former senior intelligence official is particularly concerned by private briefings that Vice President Dick Cheney is getting from former Office of Special Plans (OSP) Director, Abram Shulsky.

"Vice President Cheney is relying on personal briefings from Shulsky for current intelligence on Iran," said this intelligence official.

Shulsky, a leading Neoconservative and member of the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), headed the shadowy and secretive Department of Defense's OSP in the lead-up to the Iraq war -- helping to locate intelligence that would support the Bush administration's case for war with Iraq...

But the stories of Iran attempting to purchase uranium from abroad leave many experts highly concerned.

"Why would Iran import U-238 when it mines it itself?" The official asked Raw. "This makes no sense whatsoever."

Several sources suggested that the Iranian Directorate, as did its predecessor -- the OSP, may be cherry picking, manipulating, and even planting intelligence abroad that would support a case against Iran in the minds of the public.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

Brilliant

Posted by: DaBear on Mar 8, 2007 9:17 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

A great piece on the U.S. and nukes hypocrisy and whadda we get? Antisemites on the loose. Swell, Israel is the great satan, death to the joos, sweep 'em into the sea, out-demographic us until we're once again exiled from our homeland, feed our trauma, feed your own, whooppee... typical perverts stroking themselves.

Meanwhile the only nation on earth to ever use nukes in war is dictating terms to everyone else. For the anti-Israeli crowd, you can deal with Israel's actual transgressions more effectively once you deal with the big *machers* runnin' the whole show, the USA.

But that isn't what you really want, is it—you just want no more joos. Every other ethnic group on the planet can have their own land, especially "historic homelands," but just not the joos, even if we clean up our act and behave nicely (which we're not doing yet, granted, but you keep forgetting there's more of us trying to fix that than you want to recognize, because you love to hate us). It's Okay, we're used to your shitstorm and we survived the last big attempt last century.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [RE: typical pervert stroking yourself?](#) Posted by: rwa

» [RE: Brilliant what?](#) Posted by: symcokid

» [RE: Brilliant what?](#) Posted by: drmfloida

The problem with negotiations

Posted by: timebomb734 on Mar 8, 2007 10:08 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

The US is in no diplomatic stance to be talking to Iran. Not only are our leaders hesitant about it, but Iran's President Ahmadinejad has been quite opposed to US talks. That's why we've been dictating our demands through the EU-3 in a sort of indirect negotiation. People need to recognize that before Ahmadinejad and his fringe party took power, we had some opportunity to bargain. There were many moderate Iranians that were hoping for reconciliation. However, our hardline stance got a hardliner elected and now we must sleep in the bed we've made.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [The problem with U.S. refusal to negotiate](#) Posted by: rwa

The U.S. is far more frightening than a Nuclear Iran

Posted by: Darrell Kern on Mar 8, 2007 10:59 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

We have a red-neck-backwoods, failure-to-launch, unsuccessful in business, religious fanatic, gammy-handed, lame brain, trigger-happy, alcoholic, immature, bully running our country. I do not think he is a lessor evil than the Iranian leader.

The sad fact remains that if the world does not capitulate to what the U.S. demands (world domination), our fearful leader would most likely strike them (everyone else in the world) down.

Frankly I am surprised he hasn't launched missiles to Iran and North Korea already. Kim Jong Il did an amazing fundraiser for his country with a miniature poof bomb. I say good for them- maybe some of the North Koreans will end up with food on the table, rather than having to carve up and serve one of their own children for dinner.

It is downright disgusting what is going on out there and we are the leader of the pack.

If every citizen in this country and business refused to pay their taxes all at the same time we could easily put our murdering administration out of business. I believe that once we stop being assholes to our neighbors- they will stop being assholes to us.

Afterall, we started all this crap in the first place!

What do you expect- he's a Texan!

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

[» RE: The U.S. is far more frightening than a Nuclear Iran and so is ISRAEL!!!](#) Posted by: symcokid

INACCURATE ARTICLE...

Posted by: EagleMB on Mar 8, 2007 11:36 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty does allow the U.S. and four other nations to have nukes. Furthermore, the disarmament section of the treaty requires that the parties reach an agreement for complete disarmament, which has yet to be done.

So I agree that the best result would be for everyone to get rid of their nukes, but since that is not going to happen, it behooves the U.S. to maintain its arsenal.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

[» RE: INACCURATE ARTICLE...](#) Posted by: drmfloida

[» RE: INACCURATE ARTICLE...](#) Posted by: HeroesAll

Archie1954

Posted by: Archie1954 on Mar 8, 2007 11:46 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Nuclear-Those that live by the sword shall die by it.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

- [Home](#)
- [Top Stories](#)
- [Columnists](#)

- [Video](#)
- [Blogs](#)
- [Discuss](#)
- [RSS/XML](#)
- [About](#)
- [Search](#)
- [Donate](#)
- [Contact Us](#)
- [Advertise](#)

Reproduction of material from any AlterNet pages without written permission is strictly prohibited.
© 2007 Independent Media Institute. All rights reserved.