



# Werkgroep Eurobom

PENN/Netherlands

## FACTS AND REPORTS

---

September 2004 – No. 38C – Aanvulling bij no. 38A en no. 38B

---

### IRAN (2C) Recente ontwikkelingen

#### DOCUMENTEN

##### State Department

##### **State Department noon briefing**

by spokesman Richard Boucher – 15 September 2004

[...] QUESTION: Can you bring us up to date on what's happening in Vienna? And would the U.S. accept a resolution that did not contain a trigger?

MR. BOUCHER: I don't think it's appropriate for us to speculate from here as to the final outcome. We are -- we have made clear what our view is. The Secretary has made clear that we have pushed the view that this needs to be referred to the Security Council, and that we would see whether there's a consensus. That process is still underway. We're -- how far we will get to, whether we can get it or not, still don't know. But there are consultations going on among Board members in Vienna. We're trying to seek agreement on a text that addresses the Board's concerns about Iran's nuclear activities. The Board, we think, is united in the view that Iran must cooperate fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency, must come clean about its program, and suspend all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities.

The Board has called on Iran repeatedly to take those steps since last year. We remain deeply concerned that Iran continues to defy the Board's requests. So those consultations are ongoing, and, at this point, I can't predict exactly where they'll come out.

QUESTION: Yesterday, in an interview, Secretary Powell said that there had been some progress. Can you describe specifically what the progress has been?

MR. BOUCHER: No. Again, the process is underway. We think -- I think Under Secretary Bolton, when he was in Geneva last Friday, and as I said Friday, acknowledged there have been tactical differences between the Europeans and us about how to proceed. We have been making efforts to close those gaps, and thought we were making some progress on that. But whether -- I can't -- it's an ongoing thing. I can't try to define it precisely at this moment.

Teri.

QUESTION: Has Secretary Powell yet begun to make phone calls trying to reach consensus on the text, or is it too early for him to be pushing on that?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, he's been talking for a couple weeks already, really. Remember, there was one day when he called all three of the major European --

QUESTION: Right.

MR. BOUCHER: -- British, French, German.

QUESTION: But since then --

MR. BOUCHER: It's been a subject of discussion with other foreign ministers. I don't -- I wouldn't say he's made a new round of calls on the subject, but it has been something that's come up in his discussions with other foreign ministers. [...]

## State Department

### **State Department noon briefing**

by spokesman Richard Boucher – 16 September 2004

[...] QUESTION: Back on Iran. A senior official is being quoted as saying that this site, I think called Parchin, demonstrates Iran's intent to acquire a nuclear weapon. Is that the State Department's view? Do you have such a sort of unequivocal view that what you know about this site demonstrates that intent, or is it not so clear cut?

MR. BOUCHER: I have to say, I'm not in a position to really go into any information about this. I'm not in a position to share any information about, I guess, what was reported as a possibility of nuclear-related activity at an Iranian high explosive facility.

Obviously, our view is that Iran should cooperate in every way with the International Atomic Energy Agency and that Iran should try to reassure the world and its neighborhood that they are not doing any work that's related to nuclear weapons. That's what this is fundamentally all about. But specifically what might be going on or not going on at this site, I really am not in a position to go into.

QUESTION: Okay. Can you say -- and I'm not trying to get you to discuss something that I realize you are going to have a hard time discussing, but can you say whether you have certainty about Iraq's pursuit, because -- of nuclear weapons, because of this site? Iran, excuse me, Iran.

MR. BOUCHER: I would not -- oh.

QUESTION: They did have certainty about Iraq, too. (Laughter.)

MR. BOUCHER: I would not -- I would not be able to relate that kind of conclusion to any specific site. But I think it has been very clear, we have made very clear, that Iran's activity, that activity has been reported by the IAEA, that activity that we have talked about for many years, in our view, is ample evidence that Iran has a nuclear weapons program and that these activities, many of these activities Iran has conducted, point in that direction. [...]

QUESTION: Back in Vienna, anything to report on the resolution? The word is that Germany was one of the obstacles holding back full agreement by the EU-3, for example. Can you say whether any progress has been made on that?

MR. BOUCHER: I really can't because it's a moving game and there are ongoing consultations. We feel the process in Vienna has been constructive. We are trying to work with other governments, particularly with a delegation from the European 3 nations, to try to come to agreement on a resolution that expresses what we think are concerns that we all share about Iran and Iran's nuclear activities and the insufficient cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

QUESTION: So, if you don't have agreement yet from the EU-3, can you confirm that it's still -- that Britain and France are on board and Germany's holding out?

MR. BOUCHER: No, I wouldn't want to identify any particular nation during the course of these discussions because, as I say, it's ongoing negotiations, ongoing consultations in Vienna, and this is a fast-moving game that I couldn't pretend to put my finger on at a single moment. [...]

## State Department

### **State Department noon briefing**

By deputy spokesman Adam Ereli – 17 September 2004

[...] QUESTION: Can you explain what happened in Vienna, why last night people were saying that the resolution would be tabled and acted upon today, and now there's a delay. Can you enlighten us as to why that happened?

MR. ERELI: I would say what is happening in Vienna, because as you suggest, discussions are -- or the process of discussing the resolution is continuing. Last night, the United States, the EU-3 and Canada and Australia agreed on the text of a -- a draft text of a new resolution. The plan was to present it for consideration by other board members today. That was done. The board adjourned -- the board members did discuss the draft today. They have adjourned and will meet again tomorrow to continue their discussions. We think that the text that

we've worked at, I think, very -- we've worked at very diligently with our partners, is a good text. It shows the spirit of compromise and it keeps the pressure on Iran and sets up the November board meeting for important decisions.

QUESTION: Are you under the impression that there is opposition to this? Is that why -- I mean, as far as I understand, it was not debated at all today. It was -- you presented it, but you had --

MR. ERELI: Presented it and discussed it with various members.

QUESTION: But you had expected it to be acted upon today, no?

MR. ERELI: I don't know that that's the case. I think, you know, we've been through this process enough to know that you don't -- not to get too far ahead of ourselves. We agreed on a text with our EU partners, Australia and --

QUESTION: Canada.

MR. ERELI: -- Canada. We presented that draft text to others to say that -- to presume when the whole Board is going to agree on it, I think, is, again, getting out ahead of ourselves.

[...]

QUESTION: Has Iran, to your knowledge, made any kind of a new effort to stop its centrifuge or --

MR. ERELI: We haven't -- frankly, we have not seen anything that would lead us to believe that Iran has met its commitments to the IAEA with respect to its centrifuge program or its enrichment process. And that's the crux of the issue. They say they're going to do something, they don't do it, they come up with, you know, temporary pledges to do it and then they even break those. So I think what you'll see coming out of the IAEA Board of Governors is a very clear statement that, you know, enough is enough. You need to come clean, you need to satisfy the IAEA Board of Governors, once and for all, that you are meeting the commitments that you made in your meeting, what international treaties call for.

QUESTION: So it's what they do and not what they say?

MR. ERELI: Exactly.

QUESTION: Follow-on? Follow-on?

MR. ERELI: Heard that somewhere before.

Yes.

QUESTION: I don't think the current resolution includes -- draft includes any mention of the Security Council. Again, is that something that we're -- we've been willing just now to take off the table at this point?

MR. ERELI: I don't think it's an issue we're taking off the table. I mean, we've been clear that we think, you know, things have reached the point where that's something that needs to be seriously considered, seriously debated, should be, you know, probably should be before the Security Council. The issue is working it in terms of a consensus so that everybody else sees it that way and takes the actions necessary to do it. That's what the resolution was designed to do, that's the direction it's moving in, but I don't want to go into detail about what it says at this point.

QUESTION: But there's no consensus on the Security Council issue yet, is that safe to say, still, at this point?

MR. ERELI: I would say that it's an issue that we continue to push, but I don't want to speak for the whole board.

QUESTION: Adam?

MR. ERELI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: With respect to Mr. ElBaradei's report, he says -- or it seems in the report, in the newswires, there are some new signs of additional nuke work. Are they -- is he at odds with you? And also, any help from the Russians, with respect to the commercial contracts they have with the Iranians?

MR. ERELI: On the subject of the contracts, the Russians have those -- we've -- we're confident that the Russians are acting consistent with previous pledges to suspend fuel shipments to suspect reactors. On the subject of ElBaradei's comments, I didn't see those. I would note that, you know, the Secretary, the Director General presented a report for this Board of Governors meeting. It was a report that we welcomed, that we noted had important conclusions, and that we think provides the firm basis, strong basis for taking further action on Iran. [...]

## IAEA

Implementation of the NPT Safeguards  
Agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran

### **Resolution adopted by the Board on 18 September 2004**

The Board of Governors - **GOV/2004/79**

Item 8(d) of the agenda - (GOV/2004/71)

(a) Recalling the resolutions adopted by the Board on 18 June 2004 (GOV/2004/49), 13 March 2004 (GOV/2004/21), 26 November 2003 (GOV/2003/81), and on 12 September 2003 (GOV/2003/69) and the statement by the Board of 19 June 2003 (GOV/OR.1072),

(b) Noting with appreciation the Director General's report of 1 September 2004 (GOV/2004/60), on the implementation of safeguards in Iran,

(c) Noting the Director General's assessment that the Agency is making steady progress towards understanding Iran's nuclear programmes, but that further work is still required on a number of questions and issues, notably contamination and the scope of the P2 centrifuge programme, and that there are other issues that will also require further follow-up, for example the timeframe of Iran's plutonium separation experiments,

(d) Noting with serious concern that, as detailed in the Director General's report, Iran has not heeded repeated calls from the Board to suspend, as a confidence building measure, all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities,

(e) Also concerned that, at its Uranium Conversion Facility, Iran is planning to introduce 37 tonnes of yellowcake, as this would run counter to the request made of Iran by the Board in resolution GOV/2004/49,

(f) Recognising the right of states to the development and practical application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, including the production of electric power, consistent with their Treaty obligations, with due consideration for the needs of the developing countries, and

(g) Stressing the need for effective safeguards to prevent nuclear material being used for prohibited purposes, in contravention of agreements, and underlining the vital importance of effective safeguards for facilitating cooperation in the field of nuclear energy,

1. Strongly urges that Iran respond positively to the Director General's findings on the provision of access and information by taking such steps as are required by the Agency and/or requested by the Board in relation to the implementation of Iran's Safeguards Agreement, including the provision of prompt access to locations and personnel, and by providing further information and explanations when required by the Agency and proactively, to assist the Agency to understand the full extent and nature of Iran's enrichment programme and to take all steps within its power to clarify the outstanding issues before the Board's 25 November meeting, specifically including the sources and reasons for enriched uranium contamination, and the import, manufacture, and use of centrifuges;

2. Emphasises the continuing importance of Iran acting in accordance with all provisions of the Additional Protocol including by providing all access required in a timely manner; and urges Iran once again to ratify its Protocol without delay;

3. Deeply regrets that the implementation of Iranian voluntary decisions to suspend enrichment-related and reprocessing activities, notified to the Agency on 29 December 2003 and 24 February 2004, fell significantly short of the Agency's understanding of the scope of those commitments and also that Iran has since reversed some of those decisions; stresses that such suspension would provide the Board with additional confidence in Iran's future activities; and considers it necessary, to promote confidence, that Iran immediately suspend all enrichment-related activities, including the manufacture or import of centrifuge components, the assembly and testing of centrifuges, and the production of feed material, including through tests or production at the UCF, under Agency verification so that this could be confirmed in the reports requested in paragraphs 7 and 8 below;

4. Calls again on Iran, as a further confidence-building measure, voluntarily to reconsider its decision to start construction of a research reactor moderated by heavy water;

5. Underlines the need for the full and prompt cooperation with the Agency of third countries in relation to the clarification of outstanding issues, and expresses appreciation for the cooperation received by the Agency to date;

6. Appreciates the professional and impartial efforts of the Director General and the Secretariat to implement Iran's NPT Safeguards Agreement, and, pending its entry into force, Iran's Additional Protocol, as well as to verify Iran's suspension of enrichment-related and reprocessing activities, and to investigate supply routes and sources;

7. Requests the Director General to submit in advance of the November Board:

- a report on the implementation of this resolution;
- a recapitulation of the Agency's findings on the Iranian nuclear programme since September 2002, as well as a full account of past and present Iranian cooperation with the Agency, including the timing of declarations, and a record of the development of all aspects of the programme, as well as a detailed analysis of the implications of those findings in relation to Iran's implementation of its Safeguards Agreement;

8. Also requests the Director General to submit in advance of the November Board a report on Iran's response to the requests made of it by the Board in previous resolutions, especially requests relating to full suspension of all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities;

9. Decides that at its November session it will decide whether or not further steps are appropriate in relation to:

- Iran's obligations under its NPT Safeguards Agreement;
- the requests made of Iran, as confidence building measures, by the Board in this and previous resolutions; and to remain seized of the matter.

## US Department of Energy

### **Remarks**

by Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham – 20 September 2004

[...] As a party to the NPT, Iran accepted legally binding obligations. Yet for nearly 20 years it has acted contrary to those obligations, secretly building sensitive nuclear fuel cycle facilities, and doing so for weapons purposes.

The IAEA Board of Governors has said that Iran must cease its pursuit of nuclear weapons, suspend enrichment activity, and answer all questions raised by the Board. And it is essential that Iran now cooperate fully and immediately with the IAEA's requests.

Since September 2001, the IAEA and the world community have understood more clearly than ever the threats posed by international terrorism. We have taken a positive series of steps to address those challenges.

For one, we have realized that we need to do more to control nuclear technologies, and are taking steps to improve our efforts on that front. In February, President Bush called "on all nations to strengthen the laws and international controls that govern proliferation," and "proposed a new Security Council resolution requiring all states to criminalize proliferation, enact strict export controls, and secure all sensitive materials within their borders." He noted that there is a "consensus among nations that proliferation cannot be tolerated."

But as the President also said, "this consensus means little unless it is translated into action." To that end, the President proposed seven measures to strengthen the world's efforts against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Those measures address the urgent requirements to heighten law enforcement against proliferators, to expand assistance to reduce and secure deadly materials, to tighten controls on nuclear transfers, and to enhance the IAEA's ability to fulfill its verification mission. [...]

## **BERICHTEN**

### AFP

#### **Iran denies any nuclear activity at suspect site Parchin**

16 September 2004

VIENNA (AFP) - Iran denied that it had carried out any nuclear-related activity at the Parchin military site which is the subject of US and UN concern.

"We categorically deny any nuclear-related testing at Parchin," a huge military complex 30 kilometres (19 miles) southeast of Tehran, Hossein Mousavian, head of Iran's delegation to a meeting of the UN nuclear watchdog in Vienna, told AFP.

Mousavian also denied reports that the watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency, had asked to inspect the Parchin site.

"They did not request to go," he said, although he added that "if this is requested by the IAEA, we are fully ready to cooperate."

A diplomat close to the IAEA said late last week that the agency had asked to send inspectors to Parchin.

Iran says its nuclear program is strictly civilian and peaceful and that it is not developing atomic weapons.

However US officials insist the work at Parchin is being used by Tehran as cover for a clandestine nuclear weapons program.

AFP

### **Iran tests long-range missile as UN watchdog reviews nuclear program**

18 September 2004

TEHRAN (AFP) - Iran will test fire a long-range missile amid fears in the West that Tehran is developing nuclear weapons and an ongoing review by the UN watchdog of the country's atomic energy program.

State television said Iran's Revolutionary Guards will test fire the missile during military manoeuvres being watched by supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, after firing short- and medium-range missiles on Friday.

"The most important part of today's programme consists of the firing of a long-range missile on fictitious enemy positions," the television said Saturday.

Iran's state-controlled media have been giving extensive coverage to the manoeuvres in the western part of the country.

The officially stated purpose of these exercises is to "test and evaluate new equipment," try out "modern tactics" and maintain the "spirit of jihad (holy war) and of defense."

Saturday's report said the missile was a "strategic" one, a term that normally refers to weapons systems designed to strike an enemy at the source of its power, such as its cities, factories, military bases, communications and transport.

The report gave no details on the range or capabilities of the missile.

In August, Tehran tested an enhanced version of its medium-range Shahab-3 missile, which is derived from the North Korean No-dong missile reportedly capable of carrying a 1,000 kilogram (2,250 pound) warhead.

The Shahab-3 was deployed with the Revolutionary Guards air arm in July last year. Although the missile has been paraded with the banner "Israel should be wiped off the map", Iran says it is purely defensive.

The Israeli daily Haaretz recently wrote that the upgraded version had a range of 2,000 kilometers (1,280 miles), whereas the previous version was believed to have a range of 1,300 to 1,700 kilometers.

Whatever the case, the missile is well within the range of Israel, which lies only some 800 kilometres (500 miles) west of Iran.

The United States and Israel claim Iran is using its atomic energy program to secretly develop nuclear weapons, and fear the missiles could be used to carry nuclear warheads.

Tehran vehemently denies charges that it is seeking nuclear weapons, saying its program is purely for civilian purposes.

On Monday, the head of Israeli military intelligence, General Aharon Zeevi, claimed that Iran could be in a position within six months to develop nuclear weapons without outside help.

Two days later, Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon said Iran and its nuclear ambitions represent "a very great danger" to the Jewish state but played down the prospect of a pre-emptive strike on its atomic facilities.

Israel has acted in the past to eliminate perceived nuclear threats, bombing Iraq's Osirak nuclear facility in 1981.

Iran has promised to retaliate against any such move.

"Iran constitutes a very great danger, due to its efforts to acquire nuclear weapons and means of launching them," Sharon said.

Asked if that meant Israel needed to carry out a pre-emptive strike against Iran, Sharon said times had changed and instead called for the threat posed by Iran to be addressed by the United Nations.

The UN's International Atomic Energy Agency is currently considering a US-European draft resolution that would set a November deadline for a full review of Iran's nuclear program.

Israel itself refuses to confirm it has a nuclear arsenal but is estimated to possess some 200 warheads.

Unlike Iran, it is not subject to inspections by the UN's International Atomic Energy Agency because it has not signed the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

## Washington Post

### **Allies at IAEA Meeting Reject U.S. Stand on Iran**

Draft Asks for Suspension of Nuclear Work

by Dafna Linzer – 18 September 2004

VIENNA, Sept. 17 -- The Bush administration failed on Friday to persuade its closest allies and other members of the International Atomic Energy Agency to increase diplomatic pressure on Iran, settling instead on another request that Tehran voluntarily drop its nuclear program.

A draft resolution, likely to be approved by the IAEA's 35-member board on Saturday, calls on Iran to suspend suspect nuclear work before the board meets again in late November. It also asks the Iranian government to provide U.N. inspectors with additional information about nuclear equipment and technology bought on the international black market.

Iranian officials said they had addressed some of the issues raised by the IAEA and were prepared to meet other requests.

For the past year, the U.S. government has been trying bring the Iranian nuclear issue to the agenda of the U.N. Security Council, arguing that Iran's government is hiding a nuclear weapons program. Bush administration officials had hoped the meeting this week would show progress on the issue before the November presidential election. But European and American diplomats said the negotiations produced more friction than consensus and said they were not sure the United States would have enough support from member countries to move the issue to the Security Council.

The U.S. negotiating team presented a draft resolution at the opening of talks on Monday that would have declared Iran in violation of the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The U.S. proposal also would have imposed a deadline of Oct. 31 for Iran to halt all nuclear activities. Failure to meet the deadline would have forced the issue to the Security Council by November.

The U.S. proposals were opposed by a group of influential members -- Britain, France, Germany, Canada, Australia, Russia and China. Those governments opted instead to give U.N. inspectors more time to investigate, and then make a final diplomatic effort to persuade Tehran to give up its nuclear ambitions.

Nevertheless, administration officials, speaking on condition of anonymity, said the three-page resolution was a victory, because it called on Iran to "immediately suspend all enrichment-related activities."

But the resolution does not declare Iran in violation of the Nonproliferation Treaty, nor does it repeat tough diplomatic language that appeared in a June resolution, in which the IAEA board characterized Iranian cooperation as deplorable. Mohamed ElBaradei, the IAEA director, complained at that time that Iran had failed to fully cooperate with the agency's investigation.

ElBaradei's most recent report gave the Iranians high marks for improved cooperation. But it warned Iran not to backtrack on ending any suspicious programs. IAEA inspectors have been investigating Iran's nuclear program for two years and have uncovered secret experiments and equipment. The Iranian government says they are part of a program to produce energy, not weapons.

An Iranian negotiator, Hoseyn Moussavian, noted that the resolution cited the legal right of all countries to develop a nuclear energy program. He said Iran would maintain suspension of its uranium enrichment efforts as a confidence-building measure.

John R. Bolton, the U.S. undersecretary of state for arms control, spent two days in sessions with his European counterparts before the opening of the IAEA board meeting last Monday. U.S. officials hoped for a consensus, but they said tensions instead had increased.

At one point, British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw phoned Secretary of State Colin L. Powell and said British diplomats were having difficulty with newly named U.S. negotiators, officials said. The U.S. team is led by Ambassador Jackie W. Sanders, a close associate of Bolton's based in Geneva and in charge of arms control issues.

Diplomats said British, French and German negotiators overruled key language sought by the United States and disagreed with the United States on most details of the final resolution.

### BBC News

#### **Iran given new nuclear 'deadline'**

18 September 2004

The International Atomic Energy Agency has passed a resolution calling on Iran to suspend uranium enrichment - a key process used to make nuclear weapons.

It also asked Iran to grant access to IAEA inspectors and provide them with any further information needed.

The resolution imposes an indirect deadline of 25 November, when the IAEA board of governors is next set to meet.

Iran's delegate said a decision "about a range of suspension" would be taken in Tehran in the next few days.

The resolution follows several days of intense negotiations in Vienna.

The talks centred on allegations, voiced in the US and elsewhere, that Iran's nuclear enrichment programme could be used to make material for nuclear weapons.

Chief US delegate Jackie Sanders said the resolution "sends an unmistakeable signal to Iran that continuing its nuclear weapons programme will bring it inevitably before the Security Council".

"The time for decisive action is approaching," she said.

"With every passing week, Iran moves that much closer to reaching the point where neither we, nor any other international body, will be able to prevent it from achieving nuclear weapons capacity."

#### **Reservations**

The US, Britain, France and Germany submitted the resolution, which expresses serious concern that Tehran has not heeded previous calls to suspend its uranium enrichment activities.

The resolution also asks the head of the IAEA, Mohamed ElBaradei, to submit reports reviewing Iran's co-operation with the agency.

But other board members have expressed reservations over the resolution and Iran insists on its right to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes.

The UN nuclear watchdog keeps open the option of further steps if Iran fails to comply with IAEA demands that could include taking Tehran before the UN Security Council.

Iran says its nuclear programme is peaceful and not a matter for the UN.

Its chief delegate at the Vienna talks, Hossein Mousavian, said Tehran welcomed the decision of the IAEA board of governors "to come to [a] final conclusion in November meeting".

"We will decide in the coming days about a range of suspension which the board today have asked Iran for a full suspension," Mr Mousavian said.

### Reuters

#### **Iran Rejects UN Call for Uranium Enrichment Freeze**

by Parisa Hafezi – 19 September 2004

TEHRAN (Reuters) - Iran rejected Sunday a U.N. resolution calling on it to freeze uranium enrichment activities and threatened to stop snap checks of its atomic facilities if its case were sent to the U.N. Security Council.

It said that if the Security Council went as far as punishing Tehran with sanctions, Iran might follow North Korea and pull out of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty altogether.



Washington says Iran plans to use enriched uranium to make nuclear weapons, but Tehran says its nuclear program is dedicated solely to generating electricity.

The U.N. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the U.N. nuclear watchdog, unanimously adopted a resolution Saturday calling on Iran to suspend all uranium enrichment-related activities.

"Iran will not accept any obligation regarding the suspension of uranium enrichment," chief nuclear negotiator Hassan Rohani told a news conference Sunday. "No international body can force Iran to do so."

His words chimed with the view of the Iranian parliament, which urged the government to ignore the resolution.

Although the IAEA board termed the suspension a "necessary" confidence-building measure, it observed that suspensions would be "voluntary decisions" by Iran and not obligations, enabling Tehran to tell Iranians it was not acting under U.N. pressure.

Abdul Samad Minty, head of South Africa's Council for the Non-Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, told Reuters Iran was under no legal obligation to halt its enrichment plans and any decision to do so would come from Tehran's desire to create good will among skeptics and critics.

"If Iran decides at some point they do not want to suspend their program any more, they have that right," he said. South Africa, a former nuclear power, also has an enrichment program. Enriched to a low level, uranium can be used to fuel nuclear power stations like the one Iran is building at Bushehr on its south coast. Highly enriched, it can be used in bombs.

### **"This is a war"**

Iran agreed to suspend uranium enrichment-related activities last year after talks in Tehran with foreign ministers from France, Britain and Germany, the so-called EU big three.

But in July Iran said it had restarted building centrifuges and had recommenced work at a plant that produces uranium hexafluoride, the feed material for centrifuges. Centrifuges enrich uranium by spinning it at supersonic speeds.

Rohani predicted a rough ride in the run-up to the next IAEA board of governors meeting on November 25.

"This is a war, we may win or we may lose," said the mid-ranking cleric, who is secretary-general of Iran's Supreme National Security Council.

"Iran has never accepted suspension through a resolution, but through political talks," Rohani said.

He said Iran would stop allowing U.N. inspectors to make short-notice visits to its atomic facilities if its dossier were sent to the U.N. Security Council for possible sanctions.

"If they want to send Iran to the Security Council, it is not wise, and we will stop implementing the Additional Protocol," he said.

The Additional Protocol to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) allows U.N. inspectors to make snap checks of nuclear facilities. Iran is implementing its terms, though parliament has not ratified it.

Rohani also said Iran could pull out of the NPT if the Security Council took extreme measures against it. "If they impose economic sanctions, parliament may ask the government to pull out of the NPT," he said.

### Tehran Times

#### **Iran rejects call to suspend uranium enrichment activities**

20 September 2004

TEHRAN (MNA) -- Iran rejected on Sunday an International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) resolution calling on it to suspend all uranium enrichment-related activities and even threatened to stop unfettered inspections of its nuclear facilities if its nuclear dossier is sent to the United Nations Security Council.

"Sending the dossier to the Security Council is neither a wise decision nor in the interests of the West because I think if Iran's dossier is sent to the Security Council the implementation of the additional protocol will be stopped immediately and cooperation with the agency will be limited to safeguards," the secretary of the Supreme National Security Council (SNSC), Hassan Rowhani, told reporters. "Those who say (the dossier) will go to the UN Security Council or sanctions will be imposed on us are just bluffing because they will gain nothing."

The additional protocol to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) allows inspectors to make snap checks of nuclear facilities. Iran is implementing its terms, though the Majlis has not ratified it.

Rowhani said that if the Security Council went as far as punishing Tehran with sanctions, Iran might pull out of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty altogether.

"If they impose economic sanctions, the Majlis may ask the government to pull out of the NPT," he said.

The IAEA adopted a resolution on Saturday calling on Iran to suspend all uranium enrichment-related activities.

"Iran will not accept any obligation regarding the suspension of uranium enrichment," asserted the SNSC secretary, who is also Iran's chief nuclear negotiator.

"We are committed to the suspension of actual enrichment, but we have made no decision to expand the suspension," Rowhani said.

"No international body can force Iran to do so.

"This demand is illegal and does not put any obligation on Iran. The agency's Board of Governors has no right to make such a suspension obligatory for any country. "Whenever Iran wants, it can stop uranium enrichment and at any time Iran can again start the actual enrichment."

Rowhani said that any suspension would be a "voluntary decision" for Iran and not an obligation.

"Iran has never accepted suspension through a resolution, but through negotiations," Rowhani said.

In a deal struck between Tehran and the European Union big three states of Germany, Britain, and France in October 2003, Iran voluntarily agreed to suspend the last stage of uranium enrichment and sign the additional protocol to the NPT as a confidence-building measure about its nuclear program. The deal came to be known as the Tehran Declaration.

In the deal, the EU agreed to recognize Iran's right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and to transfer nuclear technology to Iran.

"Today all the ambiguities surrounding Iran's nuclear program have become clear to the (UN nuclear) agency and the call for suspension (of uranium enrichment) in the resolution is not obligatory and it is quite voluntary, and the Islamic Republic of Iran has never committed itself to suspension," the security official noted. "The suspension which Iran voluntarily agreed to implement last year in the Tehran conference was only meant for confidence building. But today the situation is different from last year because at the present time there is no ambiguity about our peaceful nuclear program."

Rowhani said even the recently adopted IAEA resolution shows that the issues which had been deemed ambiguous have been resolved and the remaining issues are in the process of being resolved.

He praised the unprecedented efforts of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) members of the IAEA Board to support Iran's views on the resolution authored by the so-called EU trio.

Rowhani said that NAM made a valuable and great effort in the board meetings which stunned the U.S. and the EU.

He stated that NAM's action forced the EU trio to issue a statement announcing that they do not intend to deprive Iran of its right to utilize nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

The SNSC official said the resolution has been diverted from its main course because any IAEA Board resolution should be based on the director general's report.

"The resolution will not cause any problems for our activities and we will continue our cooperation with the agency as before," he added.

Rowhani rejected claims that the last clause of the resolution has set a deadline for Iran. "The last clause of the resolution has not set a deadline, but it shows that the November meeting is very important and the issue should be finalized by November."

Rowhani said the fuel cycle work at the Uranium Conversion Facility in the central city of Isfahan is going ahead -- as is the construction of a heavy water reactor at Arak and enrichment preparations at Natanz.

"The conversion has started, it is a one-month test that started two or three weeks ago," he said.

"At Arak, the heavy water reactor is in its final stage to be completed. At Natanz we are taking the final step toward enrichment," AFP quoted Rowhani as saying.

He also noted that Iran has mastered the complete nuclear fuel cycle.

"On the nuclear fuel cycle we don't need to import any equipment from abroad. We have all facilities at our disposal. However, we didn't want our enrichment activities to cause any crisis in our relations with others," he noted.

"We have reached the stage where we can produce nuclear fuel... People should know that the suspension is not a halt to our activities. In one year we have obtained everything we wanted," Rowhani said.

Rowhani also accused Britain, France, and Germany of breaking an accord on Iran's cooperation with the IAEA.

"The three European states have violated the terms of the accord regarding enrichment because the suspension of enrichment was voluntary," he said.

The EU big three were the main architects of the tough resolution passed at the IAEA Board meeting on Saturday.

The Iranian parliament also adopted a harsh tone toward the IAEA, saying it would not ratify the additional protocol to the NPT, even though the IAEA resolution called on it to do so and described the IAEA move as "illegal".

Two hundred MPs issued a statement on Sunday rejecting the IAEA Board resolution on Iran's nuclear dossier.

"The continued defiance of principles by the IAEA Board of Governors leaves no room for us to ratify the additional protocol, and will lead us to question why the nation should leave its doors open to IAEA inspectors," the statement read.

"We the deputies urge the government to seriously follow up with the completion of the fuel cycle program for nuclear plants and to pay no heed to resolutions," said the statement, carried live on state radio.

The SNSC did not rule out negotiations with the U.S. on Iran's nuclear program.

"We have negotiated with Americans on different issues such as Afghanistan and Iraq in the presence of United Nations officials and negotiations with the Americans on Iran's nuclear issue are not completely ruled out. If the U.S. changes its threatening tone and asks for negotiations, then that could be considered.

"But when they adopt bullying tactics, they make their situation worse.

"When the three European states announced their readiness for negotiations on Iran's nuclear issue and entered talks with Iran, the U.S. could have also made such an announcement," Rowhani said.

## Defense News

### **EU To Accept Only IAEA Data on Iran**

by Riad Kahwaji (Cairo, Egypt) – 20 September 2004

The Bush administration says Iran is building nuclear weapons, but world leaders, remembering similar U.S. claims about Iraq, want proof. Until the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) presents hard evidence, the European Union will not back U.S. efforts to win U.N. Security Council support for punitive actions against Tehran, European officials and experts said.

"Whenever IAEA presents new strong evidence against Tehran, Italy and the EU will take a swift action against Iran," said Italian Sen. Lucio Malau at a U.N.-sponsored meeting in Cairo. So far, he has seen none.

IAEA officials put a spotlight on Iran about two years ago when they discovered that Tehran's nuclear abilities were more advanced than previously thought — for example, Iran had constructed a secret facility for enriching the uranium extracted from local mines.

When U.S. officials worried publicly that Tehran would produce weapons-grade uranium, Iranian officials replied that they intended only to make reactor fuel for export and for a power plant now under construction by Russian engineers.

U.S. officials have been pressing IAEA officials to declare Iran in breach of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. "Can we say everything is peaceful? Obviously, we are not at that stage," agency head Mohamed El-Baradei told reporters Sept. 14 after the agency's board meeting in Vienna.

But agency officials say that despite some "minor technical violations," inspectors have no proof Tehran is building weapons. "The IAEA has been telling the United States for over a year that there is no evidence against Iran, but the Americans do not want to listen," one IAEA official said.

Recent history shows why Europe is not predisposed to listen to Washington. The Bush administration justified the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq in part on the grounds that Saddam Hussein was working hard to get nuclear weapons, and pointed to reports from the CIA and other intelligence agencies. The subsequent inability to find any evidence is undermining the international community's willingness to believe similar U.S. claims about Iran.

“Many European states are, and should be, listening to IAEA and not intelligence services that could be politicized,” Paolo Cotta-Ramusino, secretary-general of the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, an international forum on the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Nevertheless, the European Union has been trying to persuade Tehran to suspend its uranium enrichment plans in return for economic and technological benefits, but without results.

### **Pre-emptive Action?**

One nation outside of North America that is worried is Israel. The head of Israeli military intelligence, Gen. Aharon Zeevi, said in a Sept. 13 televised interview that after six months, Iran would no longer need foreign assistance to build a bomb.

IAEA data indicates that Iran could not make enough enriched uranium for a bomb for three to five years, the IAEA official said. Israel would “have to reassess its position” if the international community failed to deal with Iran, said Gen. Moshe Yaalon, Israeli Defense Forces’ chief of staff, in a Sept. 14 speech. Officials in both the United States and Israel have warned that they might take pre-emptive action to keep Iran from getting nuclear weapons.

A pre-emptive strike against Iranian nuclear facilities could produce exactly the opposite effect, Cotta-Ramusino said. One Iraqi scientist agreed. “Launching military strikes against Iranian nuclear facilities would agitate nationalistic feelings in Tehran and drive many hesitant Iranian scientists into becoming more active and determined to build a nuclear bomb as happened in Iraq,” said Hussein El-Shahrestani, chairman of the National Academy of Science at the University of Baghdad.

In 1979, Shahrestani refused Saddam’s order to help build a nuclear bomb, and was jailed for 15 years. But he said that others, such as Jaafar Dheya Jaafar, the father of the Iraqi nuclear program, decided to help after Israeli jets struck Iraq’s Osirak nuclear facility in June 1981.

Iraq was on the verge of building an atomic bomb when U.S.-led forces destroyed its nuclear facilities during the 1991 Gulf War. “When I asked Jaafar many years later why he agreed to build a bomb for Saddam, he said it was a patriotic and nationalistic reaction to Israel’s attack on Osirak,” Shahrestani said. “That’s why I feel a similar action against Iranian nuclear facilities would only inflame nationalistic feelings among Iranians and further complicate the situation.”

### **A Bluff?**

Tehran might also be bluffing, Malau said. It is widely believed by analysts and members of the intelligence community that Iraqi officials had tried to deter a U.S. invasion by leaking misleading information about on their chemical and biological weapon program.

“There is always the possibility and the danger that Tehran could be letting the U.S. and the West believe that its program is more advanced than it actually is in order to deter Washington from attacking it,” Malau said.

Malau said this would be a miscalculation and urged Iranian officials to come clean and stop plans to enrich uranium.

Malau and other international and regional experts meeting at the Cairo conference said the international community must work to turn the volatile Middle East region into a WMD-free zone.

Israel, the only regional country known to possess an arsenal of about 200 nuclear warheads, stated recently that it would discuss a Middle East free of WMD only after a comprehensive peace treaty is reached with its Arab and Muslim neighbors.