

Iran Nuclear Deal 2013 and the World Peace

Pratick Mallick

Guest Lecturer, Dept. of Political Science, Polba Mahavidyalaya, Polba - 712154, Hooghly, West Bengal, India

E-mail: pratick_mallick@rediffmail.com

(Received on 02 July 2013 and accepted on 05 October 2013)

Abstract – A nuclear deal has been concluded between Iran and six powers including all the Permanent Members of the United Nations Security Council plus Germany. This deal is to be effective only for six months for tentative purposes for further finalization. However, this deal is found to have enough potential to promote good relations among almost all the peace-loving countries to start a new journey of cooperation and that has been ultimately possible only due to the recent changes in the political arrangement in Iran. So, with the good intention of Iran, at least whatever found in the new regime in its expressive pledge, it is expected also to create a latent pressure upon those countries still left to be mobilized into the common trustworthy pattern of the world in a mutually confident and reliable respective manner.

Keywords: Peace-loving countries, Variable-Sum Game, Weapons of Mass Destruction

I. INTRODUCTION

The latest nuclear pact between Iran and the five Permanent members of the United Nations Security Council Plus One (Germany), that is, P5+1 concluded on 24th November, 2013 in Geneva opened a new remarkable chapter in the history of controlling the roughness in the behaviour of some desperate States like Iran. There have been so far various controversies concerning the attitude of Iran in terms of the international law and ethics of humanitarianism. Before going into the detail of the main theme of the essay, it is essential to recapitulate the cause of the throbs around the incident of Iran in the eyes of the international forum in its entirety. The conflictuous relations between the United States of America (henceforth, the USA) and Iran emerged concerning the nuclear programmes mainly in the time of Mohammed Ahmedinajad as the President of Iran. There

were so many serious exchanges of vocal wars between the States over the actual character of the nuclear programme concerned here. In case of the USA relentlessly trying its best to put pressure upon Iran to become verifiable and, thereby, accountable so much so that the US philosophy of the *War-On-Terror* could be further justified. In other words, it has been a normal apprehension of the USA traditionally that any other State be it North Korea, Iraq or Iran could make a crisis in the maintenance of the international peace. In fact, such apprehensions perhaps became more acute in the wake of the 9/11 attacks on the USA. The governmental attitudes across the globe got, as a result, very easily convinced as was very much necessary in favour of the initiatives against the zero-tolerance to terrorism. What the entire world led by the USA and obviously the other four Permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and Germany - a significant addition - suffered premonition from can be easily figured out in the negotiation intricacies of the Iran Deal.

II. THE MAIN ISSUES OF THE NUCLEAR DEAL

The Nuclear Deal put special or the main emphasis upon the most important series of interests as below:

First, the ceiling of the Uranium enrichment to be done by Iran has been identified clearly. Iran has agreed to the so-called enrichment level at the five percent which is much below the threshold required for a warhead.

Secondly, Iran has agreed to stopping reactor-grade as well as diluting its enriched Uranium stockpile of 20 percent. Iran has also agreed to converting it to oxide otherwise making it difficult to re-enrich.

Thirdly, Iran is further not to step up its stockpile of low-enrichment of Uranium.

Fourthly, Iran has as many as sixteen thousand operable centrifuges. Iran has come to the conclusion of freezing its enrichment capacity by uninstalling any further centrifuge without operating more than eight thousand centrifuges as mentioned above recently.

Fifthly, the production of Plutonium from the spent fuel was a cause of concern to the world. So Iran was supposed to and Iran also agreed to not fuel, commission the heavy-water reactor in Arak or build a plant for reprocessing Plutonium from the spent fuel.

Sixthly, Iran has been ready to face the verification of its facilities by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In the affairs of Strategic Studies, the clause or provision is considered as the most essential for promoting as well as maintaining the accountability of the State in question, whoever it may be, to the questions of international peace and security. In fact, in many past cases, the parties for verification had denied the international forum access to their facilities in maximum instances showing the legal barriers of the international law and custom of external non-interference in order to show the territorial integrity categorically enshrined in the *Charter* of the United Nations Organisation (henceforth, the UNO).

III. NEWNESS IN THE NEW POLITICAL ARRANGEMENTS OF NUCLEAR DIPLOMACY

This latest remarkable development that happened not only in Iran but the world itself has been considered to have been possible due to the newest change in the political arrangements; On November 12, 2013 marked the one hundred days in the office of the new government led by the President Hassan Rouhani in Iran. In fact, such change has caused transformation in the entire equilibrium of the international politics and diplomacy. The main institutionalization of this new government has been establishment of good relations with the platform of the *peace-loving countries*. In fact, to that particular effect and materialization of intents, the new President has taken the policy just opposite to that of his predecessor Ahmadinejad. ‘The democratic world has welcomed the conciliatory approach of President Rouhani’s government with regard to nuclear diplomacy and the release of some political prisoners. This has provided the hope that the

country is genuinely committed to end the ruthless oppression of its own people and its bad influence abroad’ (Beck, *The Hindu*, Kolkata, November 23, 2013). Beck discussed that Iran would need to take some steps in order to prove that Iran is serious enough to pursue a good and complimentary relation with the international interests. Beck indicated that any kind of verification would divulge the actual ordeal of the society inside. Therefore, it must be kept in mind that such of Beck’s version is highly related to the broader aspect of democratization—integratively best when tallied with the least, even if it is a prolong process necessitating for continuous influence towards further upgradation. Therefore, Beck seems to be somewhat in the line with what can be said to be iterating the interactive congruence between the internal sovereignty and external sovereignty. So, it is clear that the country is high on the rise towards the quest for the *Variable-Sum Game*.

Further, the experts in International Relations are always found taking cognizance of any even in the light of theoretical justifications. Any country behaving like Iran during the time of Ahmadinejad can be well branded as hyper-realistic. National interests work as the most essential variable in the attitudes of all countries and to that effect it is required to go by the rules and regulations of the international bodies only to justify the non-arbitrary behaviour for the collective good. When a country goes too much arrogant to forcefully justify its national interests even without compromising with the acceptable demands of the collective to maintain credibility in the interests of the security of the entire world, it sounds hyper-realistic. The difference between realism and hyper-realism can be identified in the sense that unlike realism, hyper-realism goes quite in non-cooperation with the any of the peace-loving countries so much so that to quell that kind of realistic approach, the war—if resorted to by the peace-loving ones in ultimate chance of universal survival—could be termed as nothing but the ‘Just War’ itself. Thus, realism goes in contradiction with hyper-realism in itself. Even it can be said that hyper-realism cannot be termed as the normal acceptable approach by any school of thought of International Relations.

IV. STRATEGIC WARMTH ACROSS THE WORLD

The event of Iran coming along the willingness of the world powers can be said to be a triumph over the rogue States or the rogue features irrespective of which country is to be blamed. Whichever the country is, is always expected not to go into the extreme attitudes so that it may become the cause of new thinking for a new kind of deterrence. In fact, although there are certain provisions well mentioned in the Charter as well as in various international laws and regimes not to interfere with the internal affairs of any country, yet it has to be accepted by almost all the peace-loving countries that for the humanitarian causes and fear of the essential security lapses in potentiality, such international pressure to go accountable should not be blamed because if the way the international forum had so far been apprehensive of misuse of nuclear weapons—the *Weapons of Mass Destruction* (WMD)—would come to reality, would not have been a matter merely treated as a domestic policy deserving no external interferences. Therefore, it is to provide a good lesson for all the rogue states—actual and potential—to rectify their behaviour in favour of the decisions of the world powers. It is obviously not in the interests of the world powers but the entire world *per se*. It is as if the international implementation of the concept of ‘General Will’ making the disagreed agreed to go by the ‘will’ of the collective since the ‘will’ of the individual goes vile to the others’ interests.

The US President Barack H. Obama reacted positively in favour of the Deal expecting the world would become safer and ‘the most “significant and tangible” progress of a diplomatic campaign’ and continued saying “...that diplomacy opened up a new path toward a world that is more secure...a future in which we can verify that Iran’s nuclear programme is peaceful and that it cannot build a nuclear weapon” (Gordon, *The Indian Express*, Kolkata. November 25, 2013). As a result, it is now clear that with this newest development the interaction between the USA and Iran is very much likely to be more convenient to the bilateral and peaceful multilateral cooperation across the world. What the US Secretary of State John Kerry has opined is highly justified in the sense that his ideas were not overwhelming than absolutely based upon the test of time that is to prove to what extent Iran is serious about the issue of the Deal. In fact, it well indicates that the time has already started for

Iran to face the examination of accountability, interests in humanitarianism and intention to become a part of the world peace ahead through its nuclear programme.

Incidentally, it must be kept in mind that the Iran Deal has put States like North Korea into test. In case of North Korea, the international forum has been trying its best to get it in their path of cooperation and negotiation. On the other hand, so far as terrorism is considered, any country sponsoring any terrorist outfits is passively required by this Deal to refrain from such inhumanitarian acts. It is already indicated that there is an acute affinity between the hyper-realism and inching towards dependence upon terrorism. However, on the question of the acceptability of the Deal to some significant countries like Israel and Saudi Arabia, it can be said that they are not in favour of this particular treaty. In fact, Israel wanted the US to completely end Iran’s nuclear enrichment programme. In this case, it should be remembered that this Deal is only for six months as if with an intention that it requires further verification of materialization of the provisions for the finalization. Therefore, it is true that during the ‘six months’, Iran is to be under the surveillance of the international bodies like the IAEA in particular. It is all the more important because the initiative has been taken and the Deal was ultimately negotiated under the leadership of the Permanent Five members of the UNSC plus Germany—which can be considered as the most democratic transparency to be with the current and one potential power.

V. INDIA’S AND THE EU’S WELCOMING RESPONSE TO THE DEAL

India has responded with her traditional approach of peace and prosperity. India has welcomed the Iran Deal concluded with the P5+1. India also supported Iran’s negotiation with the IAEA for the verification activity at the Iranian nuclear sites. In fact, India has always been in support of solving any stalemate through relentless dialogue and diplomacy. India has welcomed this Deal with a great hope mainly for the Iran-Pakistan-India (IPI) Gas Pipeline. In fact, the relationship with Iran could not flourish due to the USA (See, quotation by Mahapatra). And it has become the greatest expectation that this Deal would invariably promote India to the talks of the IPI project despite India walked away from talks on grounds of security concerns. At present, the main stimuli under scanner of the international relations experts is to

what way the US-Pakistan relations go on vis-à-vis the issue of talks with the Afghan Taliban. Now, if this equilibrium goes in an expected manner, it would also come to India with great fruition with India-Iran relation to be boosted up by the entry of Afghanistan. Resultantly, the entire South Asia would enjoy a journey towards some solidarity in this discourse. In this manner of development, it is also supposed to help improve not only the sea-trade of India through the Chah-bahar port into Afghanistan and Central Asia but also the strategic significance to India as it would make her stand near the Chinese-built Gwadar port in Pakistan. This sea-trade would also accommodate preferential treatment and tariff reduction for India, as recently agreed to at the first trilateral agreement among India, Iran and Afghanistan. Further, so far as crude oil and gas diplomacy is concerned, India is to achieve a lot by the next few years. India's aim at talks on the Farzad-B gas would accelerate India's growth in next few years. So, in all respects, this potential and expected development is supposed to establish the intra-Asia security meticulously.

On the other hand, the European Union (henceforth, the EU) has declared its intention to go lenient upon the sanction on Iran. In fact, so far, the US and the EU had separate sanctions upon Iran. As a result of this new development, Iran would be able to EU enjoy 'trade in petrochemicals, gold and other precious metals; financial transfers to purchase food and medicine; and the ability of third countries to use EU-based firms to insure shipments of Iranian oil again' (*The Hindu*, Kolkata, Nov. 26, 2013). So far, there has been always a good relation between the EU and India; so, such development is expected to satisfy the necessity of all sides.

VI. CONCLUSION

The Iran Deal concluded on 24th November, 2013 is to justify how a constructive development within a country can immediately help prosper almost all the bilateral as well as multilateral relations since such treaty can be said to promote a centrifugal potential. In other words, the lack of stimulus, if any required for maintaining the certainty in ensuring the communicational gaps among the countries across the world. Therefore, it is very much likely that this Deal can be able to provide a new string of encouragement among the peace-loving countries to go by the international humanitarianism in a dormant manner and a peaceful warning to other rogue countries in a latent way.

REFERENCES

- [1] Stewart Beck, Standing with an oppressed people, *The Hindu*, Kolkata, November 23, 2013, OPINION, p 9.
- [2] Michael R Gordon, "Historic n-deal with leeway for Iran, Obama says world safer", *The Indian Express*, Kolkata, November 25, 2013, p. 1.
- [3] See Quotation by Chintamani Mahapatra of the School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India in Sandeep Dikshit, 'India-Iran talks create new atmosphere for Peace Pipeline via Pakistan', *The Hindu*, Kolkata, November 25, 2013, p 2.
- [4] 'EU may ease Iran sanctions in December', *The Hindu*, Kolkata, International, p. 9.
- [5] Noam Chomsky, *Failed States: The abuse of power and the assault on democracy*, Allen & Unwin, Australia, Printed in India, First South Asian Edition, 2007.