

The Leadership Institute's **50% Off** August 2-5
Future Candidate School Arlington VA
[Register](#)

Human Events™
 Leading Conservative Media Since 1944

YOURS FREE!
[CLICK HERE](#)



- [Home](#)
- [RedState](#)
- Video**
- [Contributors](#)
- [About Us](#)
- [Bookstore](#)
- [Subscribe](#)
- [Search](#)

Human Events  [twitter](#)  [@HumanEvents is now on Twitter - Follow Us Today!](#)

6 Comments [Share](#) 0 tweet [ShareThis](#) 3

Deterring Iran?
 by [Daniel Gallington](#)
 08/02/2010

[Recommend](#) Be the first of your friends to recommend this

Don't be surprised when—it doesn't seem to be a matter of "if"—President Obama, or someone in his administration, announces that Iran's development and acquisition of nuclear weapons, while dangerous, is nonetheless addressable by deterrence, and therefore not worth going to war over.

In other words, we will accept—but don't like—the reality of Iran with nuclear weapons. Getting our begrudging acquiescence for their nuclear weapons program has been the primary goal of Iranian diplomacy for at least the last ten years—they will rejoice at the news and "rub it in" as proof of weakness by the United States.

There are a number of political and real dangers associated with this policy determination, not the least of which is the faultiness of the basic assumption that Iran can or will be deterred from using nuclear weapons, or transferring them to a third party.

Nonetheless, the policy

Related Articles

Stonings and Nuclear Weapons
 by Wendy Wright

France Rightfully Bans the Burqa
 by Rachel Marsden

Lazio Seeks Probe of Ground-Zero Mosque
 by Mark Impomeni

Hezbollah's American Pep Squad
 by Erick Stakelbeck

What Muslim Scientific Achievements?
 by Andrea Billings

determination will serve primarily as the reason to justify not going to war with Iran over their nuclear weapons development and acquisition program, which has been ongoing for at least the last 30 years.

Second, and perhaps just as important for the Obama Administration, they will assume that it will thereafter be more difficult for future—i.e., Republican—administrations from changing the policy, even as Iran develops more sophisticated nuclear capabilities.

Deterrence, the idea that someone will not do something they may want to do for fear they will be net losers—perhaps even destroyed—if they do it, is an age-old concept and applicable to many kinds of conflicts.

The idea gained prominence as a nuclear doctrine during the Cold War, and the underlying assumptions were probably best explained by a the late Russell E. Dougherty, an Air Force general and former commander of the Strategic Air Command (SAC).

General Dougherty said that deterrence—at best an uneasy relationship between adversaries—was conditioned on two things: “Capability and will”. Which meant that if your adversary determined—either correctly or incorrectly, and it didn’t matter which—that you lacked either of these essential requirements, you were in serious danger of being attacked, because your enemy would no longer be deterred. In a nutshell, if your enemy no longer believed you, you were in real trouble.

Unsaid—because it didn’t need to be said in those days—was that your adversary was both (1) rational, and (2) known, in that you would be able to attribute events to him that were attributable to him—whether he wanted you to or not.

So, how much of the Cold War “deterrence” model applies to Iran, and the underlying idea that somehow it will be acceptable for them to have nuclear weapons?

None of it—and when the Obama Administration begins to talk about deterrence in context of Iran, we should be extremely concerned about our safety.

Here’s why:

First, what is there about Iran that could possibly lead us to believe that they are “rational? All the evidence since the 1978 Islamic Revolution is to the contrary—in fact,

by Andrea Drapeo



The Leadership Institute's

Future Candidate School

50% Off

Register

More by This Author

Affirmative Action President

by Daniel Gallington

Find us on Facebook



Like

20,889 people like Human Events

they are the epitome of a radical state, comparable to any radical regime the world has had to deal with, e.g., Stalin’s Russia, Hitler’s Germany, Mao’s China or Tojo’s Japan.

Second, and far more dangerous than the first, Iran has led the rest of the radical Muslim sphere of influence to favor terrorism—which often is unattributed to a nation-state—in its “wars” against the non-Muslim world. So, we have no guarantee we would “know” who our future nuclear attacker really was. What nation-state did we hold primarily responsible for the 9/11 attacks—for example—and based on what? What if the 9/11 attacks had been nuclear—whom would we have retaliated against?

In sum, if we decide to “deter” Iran’s use of nuclear weapons (rather than taking the action to prevent them from getting nukes in the first place) their very predictable reaction will be to use an anonymous surrogate as the primary “strategic-delivery system” for their nuclear weapons. It will encourage the unattributed use of nuclear weapons against us by state sponsors of terrorism. Terrorists do not respond to “deterrence” any more than the kamikazes’—or the 9/11 attackers—did.

Daniel Gallington is a Senior Fellow at the Potomac Institute for Policy Studies in Arlington, Va.

Kristir Jose



Facebook social plugin



Reader Comments: (7)

Here are a few of the comments submitted by our readers.

[Click to view all](#)

Please remember the opinions expressed by our readers are in no way those of Human Events, nor are they condoned by us, and we reserve the right to remove abusive posts.

[Report Abusive Post](#)

EVERYTHING IS NONSENSE
Iran warns Israel and US not to raid nuclear facilities.

Iran's UN representative Mohammad Khazaee warned Israel that if it attacks Iran’s nuclear facilities, Iran would set Tel Aviv and New York on fire. In other words, incinerate the city.

On the other hand, in September 11, 2008t, the Washington Institute for Near East Policy stated that a U.S. raid probably would draw a proportional response from Iran.

Mr. Khazaei speculated that even if Iran ended its nuclear development, its enemies would continue to confront it.

A study by the Institute for Science and International Security concludes that a raid on Iranian nuclear facilities probably would not delay Iran's nuclear development and probably would induce it to develop nuclear weapons.

A fellow at Harvard's Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, Caitlin Talmadge, warned that Iran could the strait with mines, not only missiles. "It could take many weeks, even months, to restore the full flow of commerce, and more time still for the oil markets to be convinced that stability had returned." (IMRA, 7/31/10.)

So, if Israel attacks a military-industrial target, Iran threatens to respond by attacking Israeli civilians, i.e., by terrorism. That would not be the proportional response that the Washington Institute thinks Iran would make to a U.S. raid.

If Iran really ended its military nuclear development, wouldn't the U.S. remove sanctions, and wouldn't Israel have no nuclear facilities to raid?

Iran's ability to plant a sufficient number of mines to prohibit oil shipments for months is a daunting new prospect. It raises the stakes.

Aug 02, 2010 @ 03:29 AM

clownsandliars, washington

[Report Abusive Post](#)

Hitler nor Tojo were irrational, they were forced into an unnecessary war by that liars Churchill and Roosevelt.

The true enemy were the communists, and not the Empire of Japan and the Third Reich.

The only winners of World War Two were the communists.

Cid , Commun ist Gehenna Aug 02, 2010 @ 05:18 AM

[Report Abusive Post](#)

Cid, you're an IDIOT.

Hitler told the world in Mein Kampf that he meant to start a war in the East for the purpose of Lebensraum.

According to a special edition of Der Spiegel, a mere FOUR DAYS after Hitler was named Chancellor on January 30, 1933, he gathered the generals and told them to get ready for war.

According to his adjutant Oberst (Col.) Hossbach, in minutes he recorded, on November 5, 1937, Hitler -- who since 1933 had totally consolidated his powers and now was the total dictator -- Hitler told his generals to get ready for war. Hitler couldn't predict precisely when it would occur, but told them it wouldn't be too much later.

Hitler believed it was racially healthy for a master race to maintain its vigor and superiority with periodic blood-letting of its own. Furthermore, Hitler was in a hurry because he feared he wouldn't live to a ripe old age, and feared that none of his successors would have his resolve to go to war.

In Mein Kampf, he also warned us of his determination to recover ALL lost German territories by any means possible and necessary. Among other such lost territories were Alsace and Lorraine, which France recovered after WWI. While France might have been willing to cut a deal with Hitler over the Sudetenland, a place in which it had no pressing interest, it would NEVER meekly give up Alsace-Lorraine. Even Frenchmen would fight to retain that.

When Hitler became Chancellor, war became inevitable. Simple as that.

And I haven't even yet mentioned Hitler's need to go to war to get at all the Jews...

Aug 02, 2010 @ 05:47 AM

James A. Nollet, Miłkowice, POLSKA

[Report Abusive Post](#)

Nazi Jew-hating lackeys such as Zayde Johnny in PEE-waukee and Tom der Spinner von Glasgow have assured us for many months that Iran is absolutely not building nuclear weapons.

This LIE was uncovered by none other than Achmadinijad

himself when he ADMITTED that Iran has already enriched to 20%.

Now I HOPE that Iran finishes the job and Obama Osama has to eat humble pie and publicly concede that, yup, Iran's got 'em, but there's nothing he's gonna do about it.

Aug 02, 2010 @ 05:58 AM

James A. Nollet, Miłkowice, POLSKA

[Report Abusive Post](#)

James, you are wrong.

Hitler wanted to restore the lost pride of the Germanic tribe, a loss which occur due to the Versailles treaty.

The disarmament of Germany made her venerable to her neighbors.Hitler never had global ambitions.He only wanted the lost region of the Sudetenland.

He wanted the Germanic regions of Poland.

Stalin used Roosevelt and Churchill to whip the Western masses into a frenzy to wage a brutal and unjust war against the progressive and hardworking peoples of Germany and Japan.

World War Two embolden Communist China and Russia, and we are still suffering under the folly of Churchill and Roosevelt.

Russia would not be able today to arm Islamic states such as Iran if it was not for World War Two.

Cid, Communist Gehenna Aug 02, 2010 @ 06:22 AM

[Report Abusive Post](#)

The author of this pantload should be weaned off Israel's payroll. Why such a steaming lump of factoids should pass for truth on these boards is one of life's great mysteries. The real reason Israel wants Iran attacked is that Iran thwarts Israeli expansionism. Iran is the winner of the Iraq war; it gains a vassal state [Iraq], with a modern armed forces trained and equipped by the world's most expert killers [USA].

Thanks, Bush/Cheney,

Ian, Springfield

Aug 02, 2010 @ 06:37 AM

[Report Abusive Post](#)

More war propaganda from the Israel Lobby.

Aug 02, 2010 @ 07:59 AM

Friend of Liberty, Free Northwest

[+ Show All Comments](#)

Share Your Comment

Your Name:

Your Location:

Your Email: (will not be made public.)

Remember Me.

Enter Your Comment:



[Advertise](#) | [Manage Your Account](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)
Copyright © 2010 HUMAN EVENTS. All Rights Reserved.