

**THE USA POLICY  
ON IRANIAN NUCLEAR ISSUE  
(2000-2014)**

*Mher Sahakyan\**

After 1953 when the USA's CIA was heavily involved in the coup that toppled Iranian Prime Minister Mohammad Mosaddeq and returned the power to the Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, the USA increased its influence in Iran and stood patron and protector, or at least a reliable supplier of weapons. The USA gave added impetus to Iran nuclear ambitions. USA and western powers like Federal Republic of Germany, France, Britain, and Canada helped Iran develop its nuclear program. In Tehran the USA built Nuclear Research center which was equipped with 5 megawatt research reactor. For this nuclear facility uranium was supplied by the USA. On July 1, 1968 Iran signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and ratified it in February 1970. The USA continued to support Iran in its nuclear program till 1979. Because of the Islamic Revolution, the U.S. partner Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi was toppled by Ayatollah Khomeini and fled from Iran. As a result the U.S.-Iranian strategic partnership collapsed. Americans stopped helping Iran in its nuclear program and used their influence to pressure other countries to halt cooperation with Iran in

---

\* PhD candidate, Institute of International Relations, Nanjing University, China.

the field of nuclear research. Washington started to express fundamental disappointment about Tehran's nuclear plans.

On March 14, 2000, U.S. President Bill Clinton signed The Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000. The act authorizes the President of the United States to take punitive action against individuals or organizations known to be providing material aid to weapons of mass destruction programs in Iran<sup>1</sup>. With this step U.S. Democrats did the first aggressive step to interrupt or delay the Iranian nuclear program. The USA continued its anti-proliferation policy against Iranian nuclear ambitions when Republicans won the elections and came to power. Bush's administration tried to take the Iranian case to the UN SC, but EU took responsibility to solve Iranian nuclear problem starting EU3-Iran negotiations. Russia was against taking the Iranian case to UN SC, because Russia was constructing Bushehr reactor in Iran and planned to build up to five other reactors similar to Bushehr. China was not interested in taking the Iranian issue to UN SC or imposing any sanctions, because of energy and economic interests in Iran.

***The EU 3-Iran negotiations failed:  
aggressive position of the USA***

2003-2006 EU 3 United Kingdom, France and Germany tried to take initiative in the Iranian nuclear issue and started negotiations directly with Iran, but after long-lasting negotiations the parties were unable to achieve the final result. The USA was against these negotiations and called upon EU 3 to end negotiations with Iran and to take the Iranian case to UN SC. This happened when on January 10, 2006 the Iranians

---

<sup>1</sup> Iran Non Proliferation Act of 2000, U.S Department of State, 14 March 2000, available at: <http://www.state.gov/t/isn/c15234.htm> (Accessed on July 11, 2014).

broke IAEA seals at Natanz enrichment facility and restarted the work on their projects there.

The USA was against the Iranian nuclear issue, and the leaders of Washington considered the Iranian nuclear program a nuclear threat to the USA and Israel. American policymakers started to use “Nuclear Holocaust” as a synonym for Iranian nuclear ambitions. USUN ex-ambassador John Bolton in his book quoted Bush’s words regarding to Iranian nuclear program: “I thought we are just beginning to watch the beginning of a Holocaust. There has to be no ambiguity and no rewards unless there is a complete dismantlement.” [1, p. 140]

***Iranian case in the UN SC:  
Resolution 1696***

In 2006 the situation concerning Iranian nuclear program totally changed when IAEA Director General noted that after nearly three years of intensive verification activity, the Agency is not yet in a position to clarify some important issues relating to Iran's nuclear program<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran Resolution adopted on 4 February 2006, International Atomic Energy Agency, GOV/2006/14, available online, at: <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Board/2006/gov2006-14.pdf>.

The document stated the following:

(f) Recalling that in reports referred to above, the Director General noted that after nearly three years of intensive verification activity, the Agency is not yet in a position to clarify some important issues relating to Iran's nuclear program or to conclude that there are no undeclared nuclear materials or activities in Iran,

(g) Recalling Iran’s many failures and breaches of its obligations to comply with its NPT Safeguards Agreement and the absence of confidence that Iran’s nuclear program is exclusively for peaceful purposes resulting from the history of concealment of Iran’s nuclear activities, the nature of those activities and other issues arising from the Agency’s verification of declarations made by Iran since September 2002, Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran Resolution adopted on 4 February 2006, International Atomic Energy Agency, GOV/2006/14, available online at: <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Board/2006/gov2006-14.pdf>

When IAEA director general Mohamed el Baradei visited Iran in mid-February 2003, he was shown an operating 164-centrifuge cascade, and he and the IAEA team saw components for up to one thousand additional centrifuges. Moreover, Iran also revealed it had received UF<sub>6</sub> (the gas used in the enrichment process) from China years earlier, the prior concealment of which obviously violated Iran's Safeguards Agreement [1, p. 135]. In 2006, after long lobbying by the US, the Iranian nuclear issue was brought to the Security Council and at its 5500th meeting on July 31, 2006 the No. 1696 resolution was adopted. It called upon all States, in accordance with their national legal authorities and legislation and consistent with international law, to exercise vigilance and prevent the transfer of any items, materials, goods and technology that could contribute to Iran's enrichment-related and reprocessing activities and ballistic missile programs. It called Iran without further delay to take the steps required by the IAEA Board of Governors in its resolution GOV/2006/14<sup>1</sup>. After voting the U.S. Ambassador John Bolton said "Four months had passed since the Council had called on Iran to suspend its nuclear program. Two months had passed since the EU-3 (France, Germany, United Kingdom) + 3 (China, Russian Federation, United States) had made its generous offer. That diplomatic effort had been preceded by more than three years of Iranian non-compliance with Non-Proliferation Treaty and its International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards agreement. The pursuit of nuclear weapons constituted a direct threat to international peace and security, and demanded a clear statement by the Council in the form of a tough resolution. It sent an unambiguous message to Iran, namely to take the steps

---

<sup>1</sup> Resolution 1696 (2006), UN SC, 31 July 2006. Available online at: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/sc8792.doc.htm>

set out by the IAEA Board of Governors, including full and sustained suspension of all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities, and suspend construction of its heavy-water reactor. Iran should understand that the United States and others would ensure that financial transactions associated with proliferation activities would be impeded.”<sup>1</sup> China urged Iran to practice restraint, earnestly implement the requirements of the resolution and make an early response to the “package proposals”.

***Washington did not believe in Iranian civil nuclear energy:  
Resolution 1737***

In the Council, the U.S. argued that sanctions should be as wide and tough as possible. In general the USA did not accept Tehran’s argument that Iran needs civil nuclear energy, because Washington thought that Iran had huge amount of energy resources and they believed that Iran was going to build nuclear weapons.

Russia and China preferred more limited and less severe measures and certainly not the ones that would affect their economic interests in Iran. It seems that the Europeans are in between these two approaches<sup>2</sup>.

Resolution No. 1696 was followed by Resolution No. 1737 adopted by the Security Council at its 5612th meeting, on December 23, 2006. The UN SC placed a ban on sale and trade of nuclear technologies, which can be used by Iran to accomplish heavy water related activities or to develop nuclear weapon delivery systems. By this Resolution UN SC offered to all states to place voluntary ban on individuals, who were

---

<sup>1</sup>“Security Council Demands Iran Suspend Uranium Enrichment By 31 August, or Face Possible Economic, Diplomatic Sanctions”, Security Council 5500<sup>th</sup> meeting, available online at: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/sc8792.doc.htm>

<sup>2</sup>“Middle East, Iran”, Security Council Report, *Monthly Forecast*, November 2006, Available online, at: [http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/monthly-forecast/2006-11/lookup\\_c\\_gKWLLeMTIsG\\_b\\_2193647.php](http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/monthly-forecast/2006-11/lookup_c_gKWLLeMTIsG_b_2193647.php) (accessed on June 15, 2014).

engaged, associated with or provided support to Iran's nuclear program. The Resolution No. 1737 imposed financial sanctions on individuals and companies engaged with Iran's nuclear and ballistic missile industries<sup>1</sup>.

On February 22, 2007, El Baradei reported that Iran continued to enrich uranium at the Natanz facility and refused to provide details required for verification purposes per IAEA BG Document GOV/2008/8 (February 22, 2007). The U.S. and its partners sought a ban on arms sales to Iran and limits on export credits for firms involved in commercial deals in the country. This posed particular problems for PRC, which had existing contracts to supply the IRI with various weapons, including anti-warship and surface-to-air missiles. China's exports to Iran as a whole had increased dramatically, rising from \$713 million in 2000 to \$7.29 billion in 2007. As a result, on March 9, Wang Guangya said that he did not "see the need to expand [the measures] to an arms embargo" and objected to a prohibition on export credits [2, p. 183]<sup>2</sup>.

***UNSC Embargo on Arms Exports from Iran:  
Resolution 1747***

After the negotiations, on 24 of March, 2007, the Security Council at its 5647th meeting adopted Resolution 1747 (2007) which decided that Iran must not supply, sell or transfer any arms or related materiel. It called upon all states and international financial institutions not to enter into new commitments for grants, financial assistance, and concessional loans, to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, except for humanitarian and development purposes. The new list of 13 entities and

---

<sup>1</sup> Resolution 1737 (2006), UN SC, 23 December 2006, Available online, at: <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/681/42/PDF/N0668142.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on June 16, 2014).

<sup>2</sup> Available online, at: <http://academiccommons.columbia.edu/catalog/ac:132019> (accessed on July 15, 2014).

15 persons involved in nuclear or ballistic missiles activities was added to resolution 1747 that would subjected to financial limitations [11]. If Iran was prohibited to sell, supply or transfer weapons, all other countries were called for “vigilance” in arms sales to Iran and to omit a ban on export credits. What was the problem that USA, though temporary, agreed not to prohibit but abstain from selling weapons to Iran? The reason was Russia and China that could have put a veto if the USA tried to include this point into the resolution text. In this regard the USA, Great Britain and France insured themselves from the possible veto of Russia and China.

China’s ambassador in UN Wang Guangya said that his country had all along supported safeguarding the international nuclear non-proliferation mechanism and opposed the proliferation of nuclear weapons. China did not wish to see new turbulence in the Middle East, and favored a peaceful solution to Iran’s nuclear issue through political and diplomatic efforts and negotiations. He had voted in favor of the resolution, as it basically reflected those views.

However Iran’s foreign minister Manoucheher Mottaki, stated that “Iran’s nuclear program is completely peaceful”<sup>1</sup>.

***UNSC increased vigilance over Iranian banks.  
Calling for voluntarily cargo inspection:  
Resolution 1803***

Movement towards further UN SC sanctions was spurred by an Iranian rocket launch on February 4 that the U.S. and, notably, Russia were concerned might be a test of ballistic missile technology [2, p. 186].

---

<sup>1</sup> Security Council, 5647<sup>th</sup> Meeting (PM), SC/8980, it is available online, at: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2007/sc8980.doc.htm>

On 3 March 2008 the Security Council adopted Resolution 1803 at its 5848th meeting. The resolution decided that all States shall take the necessary measures to prevent the supply, sale or transfer materials which can be used for producing nuclear weapons. It called upon all States to exercise vigilance over the activities of financial institutions in their territories with all banks domiciled in Iran, and their branches and subsidiaries abroad, in order to avoid such activities contributing to the proliferation sensitive nuclear activities,. It also called for voluntary cargo inspections. A new list of officials, individuals and entities involved in nuclear or ballistic missiles activities was attached in Annexes I, II, III in Resolution 1803, that would be subjected to financial limitation [12]<sup>1</sup>. China's representative in UN SC Wang Guangya mentioned that his country welcomed the cooperation between Iran and IAEA, but the report had also stated that Iran had not suspended its enrichment activities, as required by Security Council resolutions, and it had started development of centrifuges. As the impasse had not been broken, the international community was calling for more diplomatic efforts. U.S. representative in UN SC Zalmay Khalilzad said that, instead of suspending its enrichment and reprocessing activities, as required by the Council, Iran had chosen to dramatically expand its number of operating centrifuges and to develop and test a new generation of centrifuges. It continued the construction of its heavy-water research reactor at Arak and it still had not implemented the Additional Protocol. The latest IAEA report stated that Iran had not met its obligation to fully disclose its past nuclear weapons program. He said that, on the core issue of whether Iran's nuclear program was strictly peaceful, the report had not shown serious progress. IAEA had presented Iran with documents

---

<sup>1</sup> Available online at: [http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iaeaيران/unsc\\_res1803-2008.pdf](http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iaeaيران/unsc_res1803-2008.pdf)

detailing Iran's efforts to develop a nuclear warhead and other possible undeclared activities with nuclear material. Iranian leaders, as a first step, must cease enrichment and reprocessing activities and make a full disclosure of all of its weapons-related work, he said. He said the United States recognized Iran's right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The five permanent members of the Council and Germany had offered to help Iran to develop civil nuclear power, and the Russian Federation had supplied fuel for Iran's nuclear power plant in Bushehr. That had exposed Iran's false claim that it needed to enrich uranium for civil nuclear power<sup>1</sup>.

***New offers from P5+Germany:  
Resolution 1835***

On June 14, 2008 Secretary General and high representative of the EU Javier Solana delivered to Iranian government the text of the letter which was compiled by China, France, United Kingdom, Russian Federation, Germany, United States and Secretary General and high representatives of the EU. The six powers offered Iran provision technological and financial assistance necessary for Iran's peaceful use of nuclear energy, support for the resumption of technical cooperation plans in Iran by the IAEA, support for the construction of the light-water reactor, provision of legally binding nuclear fuel supply guaranty, cooperation in regard with the management of spent fuel and radioactive waste, if Iran fulfills the requirements of resolutions adopted by UN SC [14]<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> UN SC, SC/9268, 3 March 2008. It is available online, at:  
<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2008/sc9268.doc.htm> (accessed on June 18, 2014).

<sup>2</sup> Available online at:  
<http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Infcircs/2008/infcirc730.pdf>.  
(accessed on June 20, 2014).

Iran asked to give information in details and UN SC decided that Iran tries to gain time, and adopted Resolution 1835 (2008) which called Iran to comply fully and without delay with its obligations under the above-mentioned resolutions of the Security Council, and to meet the requirements of the IAEA Board of Governors [13]<sup>1</sup>. Long lasting negotiations between P5+Germany and Iran were unsuccessful. The parties could not find new ways for solving Iranian nuclear dispute. A joint statement issued by the G8 countries following a summit in Italy set a deadline for September 15 for Iran to engage in negotiations or face the possibility of increased sanctions. Obama asserted that the U.S. was “not going to just wait indefinitely” for Iran to respond. With Western strategy reverting to a punitive approach, the basis of a diplomatic confrontation with China was laid. Unlike prior cases, which were resolved relatively quickly, it would take nine months for the P5 to secure an agreement on added pressure against Tehran [2, p. 191].

***Arms embargo:  
Resolution 1929***

On June 9, 2010, the UNSC approved Resolution 1929 by a vote of 12 in favor. Two countries (Turkey and Brazil) opposed, and one (Lebanon) abstained. Like the three resolutions that preceded it since 2006, by the Resolution 1929 UN SC decided that Iran should not acquire an interest in any commercial activities in other States involving uranium mining and must halt its uranium enrichment activities according to IAEA inspection guidelines.

---

<sup>1</sup> Available online at: [http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iaeaيران/unsc\\_res1835-2008.pdf](http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iaeaيران/unsc_res1835-2008.pdf) (accessed on June 20, 2014).

The Resolution decided that all states should prevent the direct or indirect supply, sale or transfer to Iran of any battle tanks, armored combat vehicles, large caliber artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, and missile systems. Resolution 1929 called upon all states to inspect all cargo to and from Iran. The Resolution called upon states to take appropriate measures to prohibit opening of new branches of Iranian banks in their territories which could have any connection with Iranian proliferation issue. The resolution put financial restrictions on some Iranian entities and individuals. The U.S. representative Susan Rice speaking after the vote stressed that the sanctions were not aimed at Iran's right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, but squarely at concerns that it had ambitions to develop nuclear weapons. The measures were tough, smart and precise. The resolution offered Iran a clear path to the suspension of sanctions and reaffirmed the willingness of the United States and other countries to continue diplomacy for that purpose. She praised the work of Turkey and Brazil, but said their proposal did not respond to the very real concerns about Iran's nuclear program. "This resolution does," she said, emphasizing that respect for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons must remain at the centre of efforts to control nuclear weapons [15]<sup>1</sup>. China's UN ambassador Li Baodong stated, that like previous texts, the current one reflected international concerns, as well as the desire of all parties to resolve the matter through dialogue and negotiations<sup>2</sup>. Iran's top nuclear official lashed out at Beijing, warning that "China is gradually los-

---

<sup>1</sup> Available online; at: [http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iaeairan/unsc\\_res1929-2010.pdf](http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iaeairan/unsc_res1929-2010.pdf) (accessed on June 22, 2014).

<sup>2</sup> Security Council, 6335<sup>th</sup> Meeting\* (AM), Security Council Imposes Additional Sanctions on Iran, June 9, 2010, available online; at: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2010/sc9948.doc.htm> (accessed on July 14, 2014).

ing its respectable position in the Islamic world.” But Ahmadinejad was polite in Shanghai. "We have very good relations with China and we have no reason to weaken our relations with China.... The problem is the United States," said Ahmadinejad, who said Security Council countries had been subject to pressure and intimidation, according to the Associated Press [17]<sup>1</sup>.

### ***USA-China contradiction and cooperation in Iranian issue***

In the UN SC the USA plays an aggressive role trying to impose heavy sanctions on Iranian economy. The USA tries to impose sanctions in such a way that China agrees with those sanctions. On one hand China exerts efforts to ease the sanction on the whole, on the other hand, China avoids contradictions with the U.S. and EU3, which is eager to put rough sanctions up to the military involvement. It is important to mention that China purchases most of its oil from the Middle East. China is interested in the stability of the region, so as to get the Middle Eastern energy sources without a risk.

From my point of view China in the UN SC will use veto only if USA tries to put sanctions on import and export of Iranian oil and gas. It is the red line which was drawn by China. Unless the USA does not stand against the interest of China and does not suggest banning import and export of Iranian oil and gas, China will support resolutions. Iran, on its turn, must find new solutions with P5+1, as it is highly possible that China will reduce the imports of Iranian energy sources and increase imports from Russia and Central Asian countries, because of un-

---

<sup>1</sup> Available online; at <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Asia-Pacific/2010/0611/At-Shanghai-Expo-Ahmadinejad-polite-despite-China-s-support-for-Iran-sanctions> (accessed on July 15, 2014).

stable situation in Middle East and because of the importance of Sino-American relations. It may happen that Iran will lose an interested party in the UN SC, which always tries to soften sanctions and exclude embargo on Iranian oil and natural gas. Anyway, it is important to mention that the USA is the first trade partner of China and EU is the second trade partner of China, so in Iranian nuclear issue China tries not to choose any sides, but it is clear that for Iran China will not start confrontations with its first and second most important trade partners. China is interested in maintaining stability in the Middle East and Persian Gulf, so that it can bring energy sources without problems. China is against the proliferation in the Middle East.

### *A look from Washington*

The USA plays crucial and important role on Iranian nuclear crisis. The U.S. involvement and position has a direct influence on Iranian nuclear program. In our opinion the U.S. policy can be divided in 3 periods:

1. The first period can be outlined from 1950 up to 1979, when USA was supporting Iran to research nuclear technologies and to build nuclear facilities.
2. The second period can be outlined from 1979 up to 2000, when after the Islamic revolution in Iran the relations between the newly formed Islamic Republic of Iran and USA deteriorated and Americans stopped supporting Iran in its nuclear program and started to pressure on other states which would like to cooperate with Iran in the nuclear field.
3. The third period can be outlined from 2000 to present. During the third period U.S. diplomacy on Iranian nuclear program can be described as “coercive diplomacy”.

In this part of the paper the third period will be considered and an attempt will be made to answer the following questions: Why does Washington think that Iranian nuclear issue is a threat for USA and Israeli security? How does the USA try to stop Iranian nuclear problem? Which is the U.S. strategy in the UN SC?

For many decades USA was trying to control Middle East because this region has rich energy sources and it is an important communication bridge between East and West. In the Middle East the U.S. strategy can be described as follows: U.S. tries to help the political or religious parties which have pro-American stance and can increase the American influence in the whole region. The U.S. policy makers think that developments in the Middle East can pose a threat for the USA and its allies because this region changes very fast and can become an anti-American and anti-Israeli hotbed, where extremist anti-American Islamists can take over. For this reason U.S. continues to help governments of Israel, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and other countries that help the U.S. to maintain influence in the Middle East. The U.S. thinks that any government in the Middle East which does not play according to the rules designed by USA is dangerous and must be eliminated. In the Middle East Syria and Iran have their independent policy and they do not care about “U.S. style democracy” and for this reason they are still in the U.S. list of so called “rogue states”.

The developments around Iran influence the energy security of the world. Iran controls Persian Gulf, which is the main “energy road” for export and import of the Middle Eastern energy resources. Thanks to financial gains Iran’s influence spreads over Lebanon, Syria and Palestine. Iran helped Shia Muslims to come to the power in Iraq, and Tehran exerts its influence in Afghanistan. Iran also has influence in po-

litical developments in Bahrain and Yemen. Like other international political players, Iran struggles for a political power to achieve its goals; it makes investments in certain political forces in the Middle East, Latin America, Africa. The Persian Gulf is the pulse of the energy trade and it is in the hands of Iranians. The so-called Iranian threat seems to be more realistic, when Iranian officials threaten to close Strait of Hormuz or totally eliminate Israel. The above mentioned arguments are the reasons, why the Iranian nuclear program is a real headache for the international community.

***How does the U.S. try to stop Iranian nuclear ambitions?***

USA tries to prevent Iranian research on nuclear technologies and stop enrichment of uranium using sanctions and coercive diplomacy. The American scholar Robert Jervis believes that “U.S. policymakers could also stop publicly expressing their reluctance to use force and instead emphasize that they think an attack on Iran would benefit the United States. They could claim to expect that a U.S. strike would deal a dramatic blow to Iran’s nuclear effort, serve as a powerful warning to other potential proliferators, strengthen the United States’ global reputation for resolve, and possibly even trigger an Iranian revolution.” [3, p. 47]

From time to time U.S leaders threats Iran that they have an opportunity to stop nuclear program using force, if diplomacy fails. On September 25, 2012, U.S. President Barack Obama told the UN General Assembly. “America wants to resolve this issue through diplomacy, and we believe that there is still time and space to do so. But that time is not unlimited. We respect the right of nations to access peaceful nuclear power, but one of the purposes of the United Nations is to see that we harness that power for peace. And make no mistake a nuclear-armed

Iran is not a challenge that can be contained. And that's why the United States will do what we must to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon." [16]<sup>1</sup> The U.S. decision makers believe that if Iran gets a nuclear bomb they will start so called "nuclear holocaust" and Israel will be destroyed. The American troops located in the Middle East and in the U.S. allied countries close to Iran will be in dangerous situation as well. American scholar Matthew Kroenig believes that Iran could choose to spur proliferation by transferring nuclear technology to its allies -- other countries and terrorist groups alike. Having the bomb would give Iran greater cover for conventional aggression and coercive diplomacy, and the battles between its terrorist proxies and Israel, for example, could escalate [5]<sup>2</sup>. We completely disagree with Kroenig, because we believe Iran just needs to restore the disturbed balance of powers in the Middle East. For this reason Iranian government wants to make nuclear weapons and to restore the balance between Iran and Israel. We believe Iran will not provide nuclear technologies to any terrorist organization because during the last decades Iran also suffered from terrorist attacks. As Syrian developments show, it is very hard to calculate when and against whom terrorist organizations will use weapons. Maybe they will use it against the one they were intended for, but maybe they will use it against the one who provided them with these very weapons.

The U.S. hawks like to say that there is still time to attack Iran, because Iran does not have nuclear weapons, yet. They think that if

---

<sup>1</sup> Available online at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/09/25/remarks-president-un-general-assembly> (Accessed on 8 July 2014).

<sup>2</sup> Available online at: <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran>.( Accessed July 11, 2014)

they attack Iran they can destroy nuclear facilities and deter Iran. The United States already have a large presence encircling Iran. Forty thousand U.S. troops are stationed in the Gulf, accompanied by strike aircraft, two aircraft carrier strike groups, two Aegis ballistic missile defense ships, and multiple Patriot antimissile systems. On Iran's eastern flank, Washington has another 90,000 troops deployed in Afghanistan and thousands more supporting the Afghan war in nearby Central Asian states [6]<sup>1</sup>. It is reasonable to think that if the USA starts a war against Iran to prevent final development of nuclear weapons technology, such decision will be dangerous and adventurous, because in this case Iran will try to close Persian Gulf and will bomb tankers transporting energy sources. Military actions can provoke global energy crisis, this war will shape the interests of whole world and can be reason for dangerous and long-term confrontation. For instance, China buys oil from Iran and in the UN SC Beijing agreed to vote for sanctions only when Chinese diplomats had eliminated any possible sanctions against Iranian energy production. China, EU and other countries buy oil and gas from countries located in the Persian Gulf, so they will be against to any possible war in the Persian Gulf as well. USA strategists can argue that their military naval forces can defeat Iranian naval forces in a short period of time and open the Strait of Hormuz, but Iran has already developed Long Range missiles and can strike U.S naval forces approaching the Iranian coast, and Tehran would definitely strike Israel.

Some specialists think that if the USA sends many troops to the Middle East, Iran will be intimidated and will make concessions, but it does not seem to be the right direction to solve the problem. We agree

---

<sup>1</sup> Available online at: <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran>. (Accessed July 12, 2014)

with Robert Jervis that “But bulking up U.S. capabilities against Iranian missiles in the eastern Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf might also send the opposite signal—that the United States is preparing not to attack, but rather to live with (and deter) a nuclear-armed Iran. Canceling the deployment of systems designed to defend against Iranian missiles, in fact, would be a strong and dramatic signal that the United States has no intention of allowing a nuclear Iran and is willing to strike preventively to head off such a prospect.” [3, p. 49] It appears plausible that if the USA continues to threaten Iran with military invasion, Tehran definitely will have a good reason to build nuclear arsenal to deter USA.

Iran also could not have failed to notice that the United States did not attack North Korea as it developed its nuclear weapons, even after having repeatedly issued strong threats that it would do so. Moreover, Washington has been trying to coerce Iran into giving up its nuclear program for decades now, to little avail, making it hard to instill a sense of urgency in its current efforts [3, p. 46].

*What about sanctions?*

*Are there any results?*

After the Iranian Islamic Revolution, the U.S. started to pressure states and entities which had connections with the Iranian nuclear program. The U.S. imposed sanctions on companies, persons and Iranian governmental and non-governmental organizations affiliated with Iran’s nuclear program. On 2006, after long term negotiations with EU3, China and Russia, the U.S. was able to achieve its goal and Iranian issue appeared in UN SC. From 2006 to 2010 the UN SC adopted resolutions 1696, 1737, 1747, 1803, 1835 and 1929, which imposed heavy sanctions on Iran’s military, economic, financial systems. Though Iranian leaders

like to mention that sanctions are not a problem, but the Iranian economy has been effectively hit hard by these sanctions. Iranian economy was mostly declined when EU member states imposed an oil embargo on Iran. China also reduced its average oil import levels from Iran in a disagreement on Iran's nuclear program. The depreciation of Iranian Rial, reduction of oil exports and shortages of foreign currency have created hard social-economic situation in Iran. So sanctions are working and maybe it was the main reason why Iran agreed to the Interim agreement<sup>1</sup>. Iran agreed to change its nuclear policy which will give an opportunity to suspend heavy sanctions on Iranian economy and will save Iranian political system from a final collapse.

---

<sup>1</sup> *What has Iran voluntarily committed to undertake as a first step?*

As a first step, Iran commits to undertake measures in the following areas, to address the international community's most pressing concerns regarding Iran's nuclear activities:

- Suspend enrichment above 5% everywhere in Iran
- Freeze its enrichment capacity (i.e. no installation of new centrifuges, no new centrifuges with natural uranium, production of centrifuges only for replacement of damaged machines)
- Reduce significantly its stockpile of enriched uranium (all the 20% enriched uranium stockpile needs to be converted or diluted; all newly enriched below 5% uranium will be converted to uranium oxide).
- Make no further advances in the development of the Heavy Water Reactor at Arak (no commissioning of the reactor, no installation of further components, no production and testing of fuel, no transfer of heavy water to the reactor).
- No reprocessing or construction of a facility capable of reprocessing.
- Allow enhanced monitoring and verification measures which go beyond the current level of cooperation with the IAEA (provision of information about their nuclear facilities to the IAEA, more access for IAEA inspectors to key nuclear sites).

*What have the E3/EU+3 voluntarily committed to undertake as a first step?*

In response, the E3/EU + 3 will undertake the voluntary measures as specified in the Joint Plan of Action. This includes measures at the level of the EU and the US, as well as the commitment not to pursue new nuclear-related UNSC sanctions:

In this context, the European Union will undertake the following measures:

- Not pursue new nuclear-related EU sanctions. This commitment will be without prejudice to the full implementation of the restrictive measures which will remain in force.

### *U.S. Coercive Diplomacy*

American strategists chose a very interesting way for negotiating with Iran. Some scholars called it a coercive diplomacy. Long-term Iranian diplomacy could win the time for its nuclear program. It seems that every time Iran is ready to imitate negotiations, but after a long time Tehran can withdraw without any final results. Thus, on one hand they were negotiating with EU3 or with P5+1 and on the other hand they would continue their research in the field of nuclear technologies. In trading it is a very common way to do so in the Iranian culture. Iranian sellers will never say to a buyer that they do not have the product the buyer is looking for. They will negotiate with the buyer until they find the product and sell it to the buyer, or, if they not find it in a short period of time, they will ask the buyer to give them more time so that

- 
- Suspend certain nuclear-related sanctions (petrochemicals and gold and precious metals). The EU will suspend the prohibition on the import, purchase or transport of Iranian petrochemical products. The suspension will also cover the provision of all related services such as financing, financial assistance, insurance and reinsurance, including for third States. The EU will suspend the prohibition on trade in gold and precious metals with the government of Iran, its public bodies and the Central Bank of Iran, or persons and entities acting on their behalf. The suspension will also cover related services such as transportation. The items concerned are listed in the EU legislation.
  - Facilitate financial transfers for non-sanctioned trade, including for humanitarian purposes, such as food and medicines.

EU will increase tenfold all the EU authorization thresholds with a view to allowing more financial transfers to and from Iran to be processed without authorization requirements and therefore facilitating non-sanctioned transactions.

- Oil sanctions

The EU will suspend the prohibition on the provision of insurance and transport in relation to Iranian crude oil “E3/EU +3 nuclear negotiations with Iran: Terms of the agreement on a Joint Plan of Action, including measures to be undertaken by the European Union”, European Union External Action System. Available online at: [http://eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2013/131219\\_02\\_en.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2013/131219_02_en.pdf)

they could find the product and reap the benefits. This appears to be the reason that USA changed the negotiation style. The USA used its influence and was able to impose sanctions in the UN SC, and additionally the USA and its allies imposed many bilateral and multilateral sanctions on Iran as well. After the sanctions, they continue to negotiate with Iran, but this time only one side is losing time and money, which is Iran. The sanctions coerce Iran to announce about its aim to make a nuclear weapon and at the same time prevent Iran from the final step of developing nuclear bombs. In Iranian nuclear issue the U.S. coercive diplomacy is an effective one.

It is important to mention that negotiations between USA and Iran are very hard. Simply put, the United States and Iran do not trust each other. This is evident from their behavior for the last 34 years since the Islamic Revolution. Mistrust is so deeply rooted in both sides that it has often threatened to make any serious negotiations impossible. The United States needed to see the Iranians take meaningful steps to stop their pursuit of nuclear-weapons capability as reassurance that Iran was ready to give it up as part of a comprehensive agreement. Similarly, Iran needed some sign that the West (particularly the United States) would be ready to provide Tehran with meaningful relief of sanctions in exchange for major concessions on its nuclear program [3, p. 73].

Some specialists try to find similarities between nuclear programs of the DPRK and Iran, though the former had demonstratively declared about its withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, whereas Iran several times announced that it functions in correspondence with the NP Treaty and Iran's nuclear program is completely peaceful. In this regard Iranian foreign minister Mohammad Javad Zarif mentioned: "Israel and the United States seek to delegitimize

Iran by portraying it as a threat to the global order. Israel and its American benefactors, who seek to “securitize” Iran—that is, to delegitimize the Islamic Republic by portraying it as a threat to the global order. The main vehicle for this campaign is the “crisis” over Iran’s peaceful nuclear program—a crisis that, in Iran’s view, is wholly manufactured and therefore reversible.” [4, p. 56] Zarif also stated that “Iran has no interest in nuclear weapons and is convinced that such weapons would not enhance its security. Iran does not have the means to engage in nuclear deterrence—directly or through proxies—against its adversaries. Furthermore, the Iranian government believes that even a perception that Iran is seeking nuclear weapons is detrimental to the country’s security and to its regional role, since attempts by Iran to gain strategic superiority in the Persian Gulf would inevitably provoke responses that would diminish Iran’s conventional military advantage [4, p. 58].

### *A look from Tehran*

I have traveled to Iran many times for field work and research. I can testify that till 2010 Iran was a country the government of which was in confrontation with the U.S., but Iranian people liked the USA and American dream. This situation has changed when through U.S. great efforts the UN SC, EU adopted heavy sanctions against Iranian economy and after these sanctions caused hyperinflation, currency crash, and product shortages that hit ordinary Iranians and deteriorated their lives. Iranian government could make a propaganda point that all Iranians’ difficulties are coming from the U.S. In 2012 when I was in Iran, people’s attitude towards USA has totally changed. Ordinary people like to mention that after the sanctions government or ruling elite still live very well and only the Iranian people suffer from these sanctions.

If Iranians halt their nuclear program, after the elimination of sanctions they can buy modern weapons, solve the economic and social problems. Which are the main reasons of Iranian discontent? Why does Iran think about nuclear weapons?

The main problem for Iran is the nuclear arsenal of its main opponent Israel and the next one is the American threat. The balance between the powers in the Middle East had been upset, when Israel became a member of the “nuclear countries’ club”. Tehran considers the Israeli nuclear weapons a security threat. Iranian government strives to develop nuclear weapons, because they want to solve their national security problem with the help of nuclear deterrence. If they develop the technology of making nuclear bombs, they believe it will keep away USA and Israel from military operations against Iran.

### *Conclusion*

What if we consider that U.S final goal is to eliminate Iranian political system by the help of sanction? It is reasonable to think that for now it would be very dangerous. The wars in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and Palestine have created a real chaos in the Middle East. It is important to mention that in Iran there are many ethnic and religious minorities which are located in their own areas and populations of above mentioned minorities (Azerbaijanis, Kurds, Balochis, Lurs, etc.) count in millions. If the Iranian political system is weakened, interethnic and interreligious clashes might start. And if due to IAEA and UN SC sanctions any revolution or war starts there are nuclear technologies, it will be very hard to control the movement of Iranian nuclear technologies and enriched uranium, as it was after the collapse of Soviet Union. Also intervention to Iran will not be an easy task. Possible nuclear war be-

tween Iran and USA/Israel will cause the millions of deaths, and such war may cause an economic crisis and will create irreversible environmental problems. If Iran makes nuclear weapons, nuclear arms race will start in the Middle East. This step of Iran will be followed by Turkey and Saudi Arabia. They will start to search ways to find technologies for nuclear weapons. It is worth mentioning that these two are the main opponents of Iran in the Muslim world. Other countries that have limited financial and scientific capabilities and not able to finance their own nuclear weapons program will suffer greatly from the possible nuclear arms race. In addition, the sovereignty of the small states with limited capabilities will be in danger because of the nuclear threat from their neighbors. The main task for the international community is to encourage superpowers to cut down their nuclear arsenals and to avoid such developments. Peace and stability in the Middle East is possible if international community presses Israel and Iran to take steps to eliminate or not make nuclear weapons. Thus balance between powers could be stabilized and the nuclear arms race in the Middle East will be stopped. Countries will start to see the solution of their security problems without nuclear weapons. So if the USA really wants to prevent proliferation of Middle East, it must first start negotiations with Israel for dismantlement Israel's nuclear arsenal as well. I think the best option for solving Iranian nuclear issue is diplomacy.

*June 2014*

## References and Literature

1. *John Bolton*, *Surrender Is Not An Option; Defending America At The United Nations And Abroad.*, New York, Threshold Edition, July 2008.
2. *Joel Wuthnow*, *Beyond the Veto: Chinese Diplomacy in the United Nations Security Council*, Columbia University 2011.
3. *Gideon Rose (ed.)*, *Iran and Bomb 2: A New Hope*, Council on Foreign Relations, 3 February 2014.
4. *Mohammad Javad Zarif*, *What Iran really wants*, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 93 No. 3, May/June 2014.
5. *Matthew Kroenig*, "Time to Attack Iran." *Foreign Affairs*, 1 January 2012.
6. *Colin H. Kahl*, "Not Time to Attack Iran." *Foreign Affairs*, 17 January 2012.
7. *Iran Non Proliferation Act of 2000*, U.S Department of State, 14 March 2000.
8. "Middle East, Iran", Security Council Report, *Monthly Forecast*, November 2006.
9. Resolution 1696 (2006), UN SC, 31 July 2006.
10. Resolution 1737 (2006), UN SC, 23 December 2006.
11. Resolution 1747 (2007), UN SC, 24 March 2007.
12. Resolution 1803 (2008), UN SC, 3 March 2008.
13. Resolution 1835 (2008) UN SC, 27 September 2008.
14. IAEA Information Circular INFCIRC/730 , 1 July 2008.
15. Resolution 1929 (2010), UN SC, 9 June, 2010.
16. *Barack Obama*, "Remarks by the President to the UN General Assembly, United Nations" headquarters, New York, 25 September 2012.
17. *Peter Ford*, "At Shanghai Expo, Ahmadinejad polite despite China's support for Iran sanctions", 11 June 2010.
18. "E3/EU +3 nuclear negotiations with Iran: Terms of the agreement on a Joint Plan of Action, including measures to be undertaken by the European Union", European Union External Action System.