

**THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN
AND ITS NUCLEAR PROGRAMME:
BOOM !**

Another Deadline Is About To Be Missed ?

Once again, the talks between The Islamic Republic of Iran and P5+1 over Iran's nuclear programme have caught yet another crab, in the vernacular of rowers.

This was fully expected by **TARGET** () because, inter alia, for more than two years, this medium has written, over and over again, that the chances of a concrete, comprehensive and lasting agreement, being reached between The United States of America, The Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, The Republic of France, The United Kingdom and The Republic of Germany, collectively known as the P5+1, and Iran, was equivalent to expecting a sparrow to evacuate its bowels into a milk bottle, being held by a child.

Since this medium's last report (please refer to **TARGET** Intelligence Report, Volume XVII, Number 68, published on March 28, 2015) in respect of the progress of the nuclear talks between the P5+1 – all being Permanent Members of the Security Council of the United Nations – and Iran, in a word, the talks have stalled.

Many, if not most, right-minded people have been of the opinion for some time that Iran never wanted the talks to come to fruition, in terms of that which would placate the fears of the five Permanent Members of the United Nations's Security Council.

At the same time, however, from the point of view of the powers-that-be in the theocratic Republic, it would be nice to have the draconian, economic sanctions lifted, and to have the country's money, that has been frozen for more than nine years, returned to its rightful owners.

For the most part, the United Nations's Security Council is far from being convinced that Iran only wants the ability to harness nuclear power in order to be able to generate electricity for its people as well as for other peaceful purposes.

Iran has gone on record, stating that it never had any intention to employ nuclear power in order to produce weapons of mass destruction, such as to fit long-range missiles with nuclear warheads.

This attestation appears to fly in the face of the fact that Russia signed an agreement with Iran, back in 1995, whereby, for an initial period of one decade, it would supply uranium to power Iran's nuclear reactor at Bushehr.

A previous 1992 Nuclear Cooperative Agreement between Russia and Iran stipulated that Russia would supply uranium for the Bushehr reactor for *'the entire life of the nuclear power plant.'*

Thus, it would appear that these agreements tend to obviate the necessity for Iran to continue to enrich uranium at the pace that it, now, claims it is required.

The latest reports from the **International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)** have stated, in categorical terms, that Iran has a sufficient supply of low-grade uranium to fuel at least eight nuclear warheads.

Further, the IAEA has gone on to state that Iran's IR-2m centrifuges – at least 1,000 of which have been installed at the Natanz Fuel Enrichment facility – will facilitate the escalation of the production of weapons-grade uranium.

The IAEA has estimated that, within about 51 days, using some 9,000 IR-2m centrifuges, Iran could produce a sufficient amount of weapons-grade uranium to fuel one nuclear warhead.

One could be a cynic and suggest that Iran is 11 percent of the way home to becoming the latest member to join the international nuclear '*club*.'

On Friday, June 12, 2015, discussions were held in Vienna, Austria, between delegates from Iran and the P5+1.

According to reports from observers, present at these talks, no significant progress has been made.

As far as Iran is concerned – and this was stated, vociferously, by delegates of Iran, during the latest round of the talks in Vienna – one of the many unresolved matters was the assuagement of sanctions and the speed at which one might expect the easing of sanctions.

As far as the Security Council is concerned, what has yet to be resolved is the matter of continuous monitoring of Iran's nuclear facilities, concomitant with verification procedures, in order to ensure that Iran had not, and could not pursue, covert nuclear weapons' programmes.

With regard to Iran's concerns about the lifting of sanctions, the following is lifted from **TARGET's** timeline of sanctions, imposed on Iran, directly and indirectly:

December 23, 2006: The United Nations's Security Council adopted Resolution Number 1737, sanctioning Iran for its failure to comply with Resolution Number 1696, and to halt uranium enrichment. Resolution Number 1737 banned the sales of nuclear-related technology to Iran and froze the assets of key individuals and companies, related to the country's nuclear programme.

March 24, 2007: The United Nations's Security Council adopted Resolution Number 1747. This Resolution banned the sales of arms to Iran.

March 3, 2008: The United Nations's Security Council approved Resolution Number 1803. This Resolution imposed further economic sanctions on Iran.

June 9, 2010: The United Nations's Security Council adopted Resolution Number 1929. This Resolution imposed further sanctions on Iran, the fourth round of sanctions, in fact. By the adoption of this Resolution, it tightened financial measures on Iran and expanded the arms embargo.

July 26, 2010: The European Union (EU) passed sanctions that banned technical assistance to Iran's oil and gas industry.

May 23, 2011: The EU imposed sanctions on more than 100 individuals and companies, closely associated with Iran's nuclear programme.

May 24, 2011: The United States sanctioned seven foreign companies, involved in supplying Iran with refined oil.

January 23, 2012: The EU imposed an oil embargo on Iran, with effect from July 1, 2012.

July 12, 2012: The United States imposed new sanctions on Iran with regard to so-called '*front companies*' and banks that were known to have been linked to the proliferation of nuclear and missile programmes of Iran.

October 15, 2012: The EU imposed new sanctions on Iran in respect of the financial, energy, trade and transport sectors of its economy.

December 13, 2012: The Treasury Department of the US Government imposed sanctions on seven Iranian companies and five individuals for '*proliferating weapons of*

mass destruction', pursuant to Executive Order Number 13382.

December 21, 2012: The Treasury Department of the US Government froze the assets of four Iranian companies and one executive in respect of having links to Iran's missile and nuclear programmes.

February 6, 2013: The Treasury Department of the US Government imposed new sanctions on The Central Bank of Iran as well as other financial institutions. The idea of these new sanctions was to restrict Iran's ability to spend its oil reserves.

February 11, 2013: The Treasury Department of the US Government imposed new, non-proliferation sanctions on entities and individuals from Belarus, the People's Republic of China, Iran, Sudan, Syria and Venezuela. The US Government maintained that it had evidence that the entities and individuals had transferred to, or acquired from, Iran, North Korea or Syria equipment and technology related to Iran's weapons programmes.

June 3, 2013: The United States imposed sanctions on Iran's currency, thus making the rial unusable outside of Iran.

July 1, 2013: The US Government imposed sanctions on Iran, banning sales of gold or trading in gold with Iran.

February 6, 2014: The Treasury Department of the US Government announced new measures against more than 12 companies and individuals for *'evading US sanctions against Iran, aiding Iranian nuclear and missile proliferation, and supporting terrorism.'*

Will President Obama Impose More Sanctions?

In the event that the June 30, 2015 deadline, comes and goes, having not resulted in the signing of an Accord between Iran and the P5+1, US President Barack Hussein Obama has promised to impose further sanctions of Iran.

Quite a number of the members of The Congress of the United States have wanted, for some time, to impose further sanctions on Iran, regardless of an Accord, being signed.

These members, no doubt, still recall the statements of the Ultimate Leader of the country: Ayatollah Ali Hoseini-Khamenei.

On January 14, 2014, the Ultimate Leader of Iran, whose power goes unchallenged and is never questioned, and who has the last word in all matters, relating to politics, stated that the United States of America had shown, time and again, positive active and typically mutual hatred or ill will toward Iran.

He said, among other things:

'We (Iran) had announced previously that on certain issues, if we feel it is expedient, we would negotiate with Satan (The United States of America) to deter evil ... the nuclear talks showed the enmity of America against Iran, Iranians and Muslims.'

In **TARGET**'s previous report with regard to Iran and the saga of the Republic's nuclear talks between members of the United Nations's Security Council and highly placed members of Iran's Government of the day, this medium stated that Iran loves to invoke vagueness at meetings because it is a platform from which to launch transmogrification when it is deemed convenient so to do.

In George Orwell's book, entitled, simply, *'1984'*, he introduced a new word to the world: *'Doublespeak'*.

The definition of this word is generally accepted to be a word or language, used to deceive through concealment or misrepresentation of truth.

It is similar, in some respects, to the word, *'gobbledygook'* which could be defined as being unintelligible or meaningless speech or writing.

It appears that senior officials of Iran's Government are well versed in the use of both doublespeak and gobbledygook; and, the longer that the nuclear talks continue, the stronger will be Iran's position at the negotiation table – especially when it is accepted by one and all that the country, de facto, has just joined the international nuclear 'club'.

-- E N D --

*While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published,
TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.*

*If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in
TARGET, please feel free to e-mail your views to editor@targetnewspapers.com. TARGET
does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the
laws of libel.*