

**BEZPIECZEŃSTWO W WYMIARZE GLOBALNYM,
REGIONALNYM I WEWNĘTRZNYM**

Radosław FIEDLER

DOI 10.14746/ps.2016.1.4

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

SEARCHING FOR A NUCLEAR SETTLEMENT. EUROPEAN UNION NUCLEAR SETTLEMENT WITH IRAN

The concept of crisis diplomacy needs to be précised and defined. In the classical work of Paul Diesing and Glenn Snyder's, *Conflict Among Nations*, presented characterization of crises as "sequences of interactions between the governments involving a dangerously high probability of war" (Snyder, Diesing, 1977: 6). In another definition sees a crisis "in which the breakdown or transformation of system or a pattern of relations is threatened" (Richardson, 1994: 11). Above referred depiction is basically more state-centric analysis, omitting the fact of more interlinked world in which besides the states there are non-states actors, additionally all within globalization process and increasingly growing interdependencies. Analyzing nowadays international crises, more complex and nuanced respond is essential. The war as a final outcome ensuing from crisis is being considered as the last resort and can bring devastating result for all sides. During cold war the Cuban missile crises could bring a nuclear war between two antagonistic blocs. In the past, even a relatively small crisis could ended in war. Now – a war as tool for solving crises is often ineffective and counterproductive. The classical example is United States' military involvement in Iraq after 2003. Despite the US military dominance, as it turn out, political stabilization was not possible to achieve.

Thus, for overcoming different challenges and threats for international security is desirable for conducting crisis diplomacy as a tool for initiating dialogue and finally pathing the sides to lessen crisis and getting finally a settlement. Crisis diplomacy might be efficient way for searching settlements and arrangements in the post-cold war's environment with a global interconnectedness. Having such perspective, even a more traditional challenges as nuclear proliferation needs to be solved by a multilayered approach within the frame of crisis diplomacy. Crisis diplomacy is non-coercive in its nature and maintaining relations with so called rouge states is a part of sustaining international stability, especially when is under pressure caused by troublemakers.

Iran as a case study is particular example. Prior the Islamic revolution in Iran, both Great Britain, France and Germany had diplomatic and trade relations with Iranian authorities during shah's reign. Iran was for the Western powers a strategic asset in the rivalry with Soviet Union. In the United States', Iran was placed in the Middle East as a valuable ally. Such status had only Turkey, Israel and Saudi Arabia. Nuclear program began years preceding the revolution in 1979, when Shah Reza Mohammad Pahlavi sought a full-fledged nuclear industry with the capacity to produce 23,000 megawatts of electricity (Burr, 2009: 21). Teheran had been developing nuclear program and the

US and the Western Europe assisted in it, contributing through research, infrastructure and technology.

The Islamic revolution in 1979 negatively affected on Iran's relations with the West. Anti-Americanism was a key element of the Islamic revolution. Iran lost credibility and predictability during hostage crisis, which lasted 444 days. As a rouge state, Iran was accused for sponsoring terrorism, which was aimed at Israel and also hinders Western/United States' interest at the Middle East. Another accusation was related with Iran's role in destabilizing Lebanon (civil war) and promoting Hezbollah and also provoking regional Shia-Sunni tensions and exporting Shia Islamic revolution to the neighboring Arab states. Other issue was Iran's anti-Israel role in undermining Middle Eastern peace process after 1993. Among those accusations, problems, threats and challenges which were posed by Iran, in 2002 was added its nuclear program with hidden military component. From the beginning – Iran's nuclear ambitions had been treated as the gravest threat for international security.

Iranian theocratic regime after 1979 was perceived by the West as a fanatical and unpredictable in conducting its policy. However, in the nineties there was some relaxation in relations between Western Europe and Iran during the pragmatic president Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani. Iranian nuclear program especially after 2002 was a great concern for the Western European powers. Unites States in 1980 ceased diplomatic relations with Iran and condemned Iranian authorities for terrorism, destabilizing Middle East and also nuclear activity. Officially, Washington had no ties with Teheran, so could lead any direct diplomacy aimed in solving the problem of increasing challenge regarding with Iranian nuclear program. Such a crisis diplomacy was initiated by Germany, France and Great Britain. Maintaining diplomatic relations with Tehran, their crisis diplomacy could lessen crisis and mistrust in relations with Iran's authorities.

The crisis diplomacy pursued by the European Union towards Iran was initiated in 1992 and was within a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) aimed at maintaining contact with Iran. It was called 'Critical Dialogue' and was endorsed by the European Council at the European Union summit in Edinburgh on 11–12 December 1992 (Gstöhl, Lannon, 2016: 147). The Critical Dialogue was adopted to pursue a range of goals, which were clearly expressed by the European Council of Ministers: "[...] This should be a critical dialogue, which reflects concern about Iranian behavior and calls for improvement in a number of areas, particularly human rights, the death sentence pronounced by a Fatwa against the author Salman Rushdie, which is contrary to international law, and terrorism. Improvements in these areas will be important in determining the extent to which closer relations and confidence can be developed" (ibidem). European Union maintenance Critical Dialogue was in contrary to United States' dual containment strategy aimed in Iraq and Iran. From 1995, Washington implemented severe sanctions. US had a plan not only isolate Iran but also a regime change in that state. The EU's refusal to support the sanctions also within Iran Libya Sanctions Act (ILSA) led to tensions between US and its European allies. EU's crisis diplomacy strategy was perceived as a method to make Iran observe international norms and also by tying it through commercial relations.

Despite the approach and some positive signs of improvement Critical Dialogue was suspended. On 10 April 1997 a German court found the highest Iranian authorities,

including the Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, responsible for assassination members of the Kurdish opposition, which was done in Mykons restaurant in Berlin (Wilford, 2011). Assuming the presidential office by Muhammad Khatami and a new moderate rhetoric renewed EU's crisis diplomacy with Iran. New phase was called a "Comprehensive Dialogue", which was launched in 1998. Comprehensive Dialogue was concentrated on issues of mutual interests in which the cooperation regarding the areas of energy, drugs, trade and investments, human rights, terrorism, the fatwa against Salman Rushdie were possible to get some improvement (Dupont, 2009). Despite many difficulties in 2000, the EU advanced with Iran negotiations on a Trade and Cooperation Agreement (TCA) linked to the Political Dialogue Agreement. Within the scope were four areas: human rights, non-proliferation, terrorism, and the Middle East peace process. The strategy was simple: getting Iran closer to the EU politically and economically would allow Europe to extract significant concessions from Tehran (Kaussler, 2008: 269–270). Reciprocity of president Khatami and some improvement in general relations with Iran helped to restore relations with the United Kingdom. As noted Bernd Kaussler: "the irony of the Comprehensive Dialogue was that while the human rights dialogue bore progress in legislation and policy as well as supporting stakeholders of human rights and democracy thorough various multi-track roundtables organized by the EU, by 2004 Germany, Britain and France had largely shifted their priorities to non-proliferation" (Kaussler, 2014: 18). In 2003 was formed EU 3 with above-mentioned European states in pursuing their crisis diplomacy with Iran.

In 2002 erupted crisis regarding Iranian nuclear program. Despite the fact of Iran accession to the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and taken obligations from the Safeguards Agreements, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) founded several worrying facts. Iran did not report and respond on the IAEA's questions. Following issues could be perceived as Iran conducted concealed and illegal military nuclear program:

- Iran was building two plants to enrich uranium in Natanz;
- It was building a heavy-water facility and nuclear reactor in Arak to produce plutonium;
- Teheran purchased the designs for the conversion plant and both natural uranium UF4 and UF6 from China;
- Iran did not report that it was testing the centrifuges at the Kalaye plant (Melman, Javedanfar, 2007: 126–127).

The IAEA's Board of Governors adopted a resolution in November 2003 expressing "deep concern that Iran has failed in a number of instance over an extended period of time to meet its obligations under the Safeguards Agreement" (Sabet-Saeidi, 2008: 67). United States pressured to the IAEA to refer the case to the United Nations' Security Council. Tensions which aroused around Iranian nuclear program urged France, Germany and the United Kingdom through crisis diplomacy to resolve it. It seemed to be successful diplomacy, following intensive negotiations Iran accepted:

- to engage full cooperation with the IAEA, meeting all obligations regarding the adherence to the Safeguard Agreement and full transparency with its nuclear program;
- to sign the IAEA Additional Protocol, which allows more intrusive and deep inspecting system, also objects and plants which IAEA would like to supervise;

– to suspend all uranium-enrichment and reprocessing activities, as defined by the IAEA (*Paris Agreement*, 2004).

Paris Agreement was not implemented there were at least two main reasons of its failure:

1. France, Germany and the United States acted without United States' involvement and essential support which could help to implement this agreement with security assurances for Iran. Contrary to it, Washington presented very critical attitude to Iranian nuclear program and even consider military solution of this crisis.
2. In Iran itself there were divisions – hardliners opt for all uranium-enrichment and reprocessing activities with no limitations, moderates as Khatami opt for a temporary suspension of uranium enrichment in order to lessen crisis and omit sanctions. Generally, Iranian authorities were against permanent suspension of uranium-enrichment activities, arguing – it was necessary for developing a civilian nuclear program and was undeniable Iran's right to do it with no constraints according to the rules of NPT (Fiedler, 2013: 108).

Moreover, in 2005 won the presidential elections Mahmoud Ahmadinejad who represented so called hardliners regarding concessions on Iranian nuclear program. Iran did not implement Paris Agreement and resumed uranium-enrichment in Isfahan and Natanz. As noted Seyed Hossein Mousavian: “with Ahmadinejad in power, the nuclear policy became aligned with the supreme leader's real intentions” (Mousavian, 2012: 185).

Iran was testing the international community, especially EU3 and the United States. As it turn out, the EU3 was extended into greater platform the P5+1, which brought Washington, Beijing, and Moscow in pursuing crisis diplomacy with Iran. It seemed that Russia and China would remove a threat of supporting painful sanctions aimed in Iran. Russia proposed in October 2005 a joint Russian-Iranian enrichment program in Russia. In January 2006 Iranians were told that removal the seals at Natanz was not consistent with Paris Agreement, as insisted Russia, should be resumed as a necessary demand for further steps for crisis resolution. Russian proposal failed, because Iran did not accept a joint program and insisted on unfettered development of the entire fuel cycle (Freedom, 2006).

Despite the attempts for resuming the Paris Agreement and Additional Protocol, Iran did not comply to it. In the first half of 2006, Iran's nuclear program made significant advancements. The most important moment was obtaining enrichment levels at 5 per cent U235, which could be further reprocess and enriched. Iran was still reluctant in responding to IAEA's questions and reacting positively on different initiatives.

Referring the Iranian case to the UN's Security Council and adoption the resolution 1696 in July 31, 2006 was a diplomatic defeat for Iran – international community agreed that its nuclear program was a threat to international peace and security. Uranium enrichment suspension, which had been recognized before as a voluntary and not legally binding measure, became obligatory for the first time. The resolution referred to the P5+1 offer as channel to negotiate but also made it clear that non-compliance by 31 August 2006 would oblige the UN Security Council to adopt appropriate measures under Article 41 of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations (UN SC 1696, 2006).

Internationalized crisis around Iran's nuclear ambitions and forthcoming probable sanctions, urged Iran for another crisis diplomacy initiative. Mohamed El Baradei, IAEA's Director General, proposed a plan within the formula 'freeze-for freeze' (El Baradei, 2011: 204). Iran would suspend enrichment during the talks with the Western partner. Javier Solana, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy held crisis diplomacy with the Iran's nuclear negotiator, Ali Larijani. Unfortunately, the meetings were not negotiations in its character – rather more official statements and in some extend – 'clarifications' (Kaussler, 2014: 50).

Without evident progress and growing suspicions on Iran's nuclear intentions paved a way to passing Resolution 1737 on December 23, 2006. It was first multilateral sanction adapted by the Security Council regarding Iranian nuclear program. It demanded from Teheran suspend 'proliferation sensitive nuclear activities' and banned the supply of nuclear-related technology and materials to Iran. Additionally, it froze the assets of key entities and individuals engaged in nuclear program. Sanctions did not cover Russia assistance in constructing Bushehr plant and arms sale which were outside sanctions regime (UN SC 1737, 2006).

In the period 2007–2012 EU3 was more concentrate in align with the US position in more punitive approach to Iran. It was a plan to extend sanctions regime aimed in Iranian nuclear program. Having support of Russia and China was a great US diplomatic success. However, both powers did not intend to harm Iranian economy and finances, despite the adopted sanctions good political and trade relations with Iran. Especially, the fallout of the 2007 National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) in US in which was stated that Iran apparently suspended its nuclear weapons program in 2003 complicated EU3 and US efforts to maintain a multilateral sanctions front in the UN's Security Council (NIE, 2007).

In 2008 despite the attempt and some positive signals, IAEA' General Director had only minimal support from the US. Washington emphasized negative narration of Iran's proliferation intentions. Such position blocked IAEA and EU3 attempts to engaged activity in meaningful problem solving crisis diplomacy. The passing of UN Security Council Resolution 1803 was a consequence of US policy focused on tightening financial measures against Iran (UN SC 1803, 2008).

Though US approach to Iran, initially was continued by the president Barrack Obama. However, president Obama gave some positive signals to Iran and informing on US readiness for direct negotiations with Teheran. Despite these positive acts, were significant setbacks as discovery of Frodow's secret enrichment plant not declared to the IAEA and not supported by US and EU3 the joint Teheran Declaration of Turkey, Brazil and Iran from May 17 from 2010, in which was proposed exchange 1200 kg LEU (low-enriched uranium) for fuel needed for the Teheran Research Reactor. One major problem of this offer – did not ceased enrichment uranium to 20 per cent (Bunn, 2009).

On June 9, 2010 The UN Security Council adopted the sixth round of sanctions on Iran in the Resolution 1929. This sanctions targeted influential individuals and organizations in Iran's nuclear program and especially the Islamic Revolutionary Gourd Corps. Resolution 1929 significantly increased the costs of Iranian nuclear activities (UN SC 1929, 2010).

EU crisis diplomacy did not break a stalemate. In 2012 EU decided to pass its sanctions to compel Iran to halt 20 percent enrichment activities and to shut down the Fordow facility (*History*, 2012). European negotiators opted for greater pressure on Iran – crisis diplomacy transformed in coercive one. Among EU restrictions adopted by European Council the main were following:

- oil embargo, prohibited insuring the transport of Iranian oil;
- froze the Central Bank of Iran’s assets in the EU;
- EU Export and import ban on arms;
- prohibition on the financing, insurance and transport of Iranian oil and petrochemical products;
- a ban on the export of key equipment and technology to the Iranian petrochemical sector.
- on March 15, 2012, the Council requested the Belgium-based SWIFT – the world’s largest financial messaging network – to disconnect around 25 Iranian banks black-listed by the EU, further impeding the ability of other countries to do business with Iran (Patterson, 2013: 135–140).

EU’s sanctions, bans and disconnecting Iranian banks from massaging networks, negatively impacted on Iran’s economy and finances. Adopted by the European Council sanctions were the tightest in EU’s history. The EU’s trade with Iran fell from €27.7 billion in 2011 to €12.8 billion in 2012 a 53% decrease with imports decreasing from €17.2 billion in 2011 to only €5.5 billion in 2012 (Giumelli, Ivan, 2013, p. 19). According to the International Energy Agency (IEA) in 2012, Iran sold around 1.5 million barrels of oil and condensate per day abroad, the lowest volume since 1986 and 25% less than in 2011 (IEA, 2013).

Rising costs for Iranian nuclear program and Iran’s international isolation – restored crisis diplomacy as a reliable tool for achieving a comprehensive agreement. In June 2013 Hasan Rouhani (nuclear negotiator) won presidential elections. His plan was clear from the beginning – lifting harmful sanctions in exchange for a comprehensive nuclear deal with the P5+1. There were a lot of problematic issues, which needed to be thoroughly discussed. Analyzing impediments in restored crisis diplomacy with Iran, should be focused following issues:

- Credibility. Iran lost its credibility as reliable partner. The most controversial hidden plant in Fordow, revoking cooperation with the IAEA and by continuing problematic MEU (Medium Enriched Uranium) and building nuclear plant for heavy water in Arak;
- Doubts on Iranian intentions. Teheran diplomacy could be perceived as gaining additional time for advancing its nuclear military program, significantly reducing time needed for acquiring an uranium bomb;
- Iran blamed the US and EU3 for insisting of total ceasing the enrichment program, even LEU. According to Teheran this demand not was not consistent with the NPT, which allows such activity for civil nuclear program;
- Iran blamed US the US for not decline its plans for regime change in Iran and also by unconditional supporting Israel and its plans for bombing Iranian nuclear plants;
- Iran’s other activity: violations on human rights, its involvement in Iraq and other places in the Middle East, especially by supporting Hezbollah and Hamas which activity undermine Israel’s security.

President Rouhani and Iranian foreign minister Mohammad Javad Zarif restarted negotiations with US and within the broader formula of P5+1. Intensive crisis diplomacy on November 23, 2013 led to Geneva interim for six months agreement, in which was declared:

- Iranian nuclear program should be more transparent and only for peace purposes;
- Iran agreed to halt enrichment above 5% in exchange for not imposing by P5+1 additional sanctions on Iran;
- P5+1 agreed for gradual lifting sanctions as refroze on the beginning 7 billion USD (all Iranian frozen assets 100 billion USD).

Despite these optimistic initial agreement still the crisis around Iranian nuclear ambitions was not resolved. Problem was related with no clearance in negotiations after passing six-months interim time (Gwiazda, 2015: 215). Moreover, in September 2014 the IAEA even raised doubts on Iranian hidden military nuclear component and insisted for inspecting Parchin where is located military complex (*Rocznik Strategiczny*, 2015: 373). Overcoming those impediments was possible because the Iranian negotiations team led by Rouhani and Zarif proceed forward and finally crisis diplomacy gained its momentum in a comprehensive deal in July 2015.

Formerly there were many initiatives and plans which were in the agenda of crisis diplomacy. Summing up the main failures and setbacks of crisis diplomacy before 2013 there were following chosen problems as such as:

- Iranian lack of transparency and reluctance in dealing on nuclear program with the IAEA and international community;
- Demand for halting all enrichment activities also those, which were attached to civilian nuclear program;
- EU3 in years 2003–2006 acted without US involvement and support;
- President Ahmadinejad and Ali Larijani with support of the supreme leader Ali Khamenei's assumed an uncompromising strategy on issues related with Iranian nuclear program;
- Moreover, Iran is a theocratic system with a predominant position of revolutionary;
- Guardians whose surveillance on important parts of nuclear program. Different power centers inside Iran only complicate in presenting an offer which could bring to the agreement. However, rising costs of sanctions and deepening isolation of Iran made a pressure on Iranian political decisions centers for formulating more compromise offer.

Extending and passing another deadlines could be perceived as buying time by Iran and there will be any nuclear deal. Finally, both sides Iran and the powers within the framework of P5+1 signed in Wien in July 14, 2015 a deal, called the *Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action* (JCPOA). The deal consist of not only rules aimed in limiting range of nuclear program but also included detailed technical issues précising its significant issues.

In JCPOA Iran agreed on following issues:

- to reduce by approximately two-thirds its installed centrifuges. Iran will reduce from 19,000 installed (in July 2015) to 6,104 installed under the deal;
- not enrich uranium over 3,67 percent for at least 15 years;
- to reduce its stockpile of about 10,000 kg of low-enriched uranium LEU to 300 kg of 3,67 percent LEU for 15 years;

- not build any new facilities for the purpose of enriching uranium for 15 years;
- time extension for acquiring enough fissile material for one weapon from 2–3 month to at least one year;
- to convert its facility at Fordow – no longer used to enrich uranium (*Parameters*, 2015).

In JCPOA was also emphasized the IAEA inspecting system in order to get undisturbed access to sites and plants related with the nuclear program and transparency in Iran cooperation with international community. The JCPOA did not lift sanctions imposed by the UN, USA and EU, it is depended on Iranian progress in implementing issues demanded in agreement and after positive verification of IAEA from inspecting of nuclear sites in Iran.

With signing the JCPOA the process of reopening of Iran has started. Iranian 30 banks initiated returning to a global interbank transfer system SWIFT. After interim 6-months period in January 2016 sanctions were lifted and Iranian oil and gas got unlimited access to global market. In case of breaking JCPOA by Iran – is foreseen the system of re-imposing all sanctions though decision of special JCPOA's Joint Commission and UN SC (Kaztman, Kerr, 2016).

Signing and implementation JCPOA did not mean that Iran automatically would resume diplomatic relations with the US and would become valuable partner in providing stability in the Middle East. JCPOA has not changed the course of Iranian politics to the region. Teheran is still supporting Shia militias and Shiites from Lebanon to Yemen, is involved in Iraq and is ally of Bashar Assad's regime in Syria and is hostile to Israel (Goodarzi, 2013).

Despite the success of nuclear deal is significant achievement, the course of EU3 crisis diplomacy is still essential for engagement with Iran. For example EU sanctions related Human Rights in Iran are outside the scope of the JCPOA. Another difficult topic is Iran's role in the Middle East. There are similar EU and Iran interests on regional security such as: combating ISIS, stabilizing Afghanistan, resolving conflict in Syria and Sunni-Shia in Iraq. Potential collaboration is possible but difficult due to Iranian interests in region and specific theocratic system with dominant political position of guardians of revolution.

* * *

EU initially focused on crisis diplomacy through the 'Critical Dialogue' and 'Comprehensive Dialogue' on such issues as human rights or reopening Iranian economy and trade with European partners. When nuclear crisis started in 2002, EU was involved in crisis diplomacy. EU proposals on nuclear issue were not accepted by Iran, because one of demand was a freeze of uranium enrichment and Europeans did not have US support in searching for a nuclear settlement. From 2006 – EU (especially Germany, France and Great Britain), was a part of broader collation within the formula P5+1. Sanctions which were imposed on Iran in years 2007–2012 hit Iranian finances, reduced oil and gas export and isolated Iran. EU in the frame of P5+1 reached on July 2015 nuclear agreement. Settling the nuclear issue, EU again focused on Human Rights in Iran and is engaging Tehran for broader collaboration on security issues in the Middle East.

Iran is becoming again to be an important trade and energy partner for the EU. While in 2004 the EU exports to Iran were reaching the level of almost €12 billion, due to the sanctions they dropped by 46% to less than €6,5 billion in 2014 (EU-Iran relations, 2013). Several months followed JCPOA nuclear deal, president H. Rouhani visited Italy and France. Iran and Italy signed deals worth some \$18,4 billion and French and Iranian officials signed 20 agreements for economic, political and cultural collaboration (Posch, 2016: 8).

These positive developments should not cover challenges, as such as: possibility of breaking by Iran some rules of the JCPOA agreement, shifts in Iranian internal politics from moderate into conservative and radical course, violations on Human Rights, hostilities and crisis with Saudi Arabia and Israel, supporting militarily Shia militias in so called Shia Crescent, unconditional supporting Assad's regime in Syria. As it revealed history – Iran is difficult and suspicious partner to the EU – crisis diplomacy should not be abandoned, because after some positive progress it might be setbacks and difficulties. Now first time after the Islamic revolution, Iran has reopened itself on collaboration with European partners. Near future will show if it is a steady direction in which many other difficulties will be gradually solved. It is not easy task – possible are also some setbacks and crisis in EU-Iran relations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bunn M. (2009), *Beyond Zero Enrichment: Suggestions for an Iranian Nuclear Deal*, "Policy Brief", http://belfercenter.hks.harvard.edu/publication/19695/beyond_zero_enrichment.html (25.03.2016).
- Burr W. (2009), *A brief history of U.S.-Iranian nuclear negotiations*, "Bulletin of the American Scientists", January/February.
- Dupont P. E. (2009), *The EU-Iran Dialogue in the Context of the Ongoing Nuclear Crisis*, "Central European Journal of International & Security Studies", No. 185.
- El Baradei M. (2011), *The Age of Deception: Nuclear Diplomacy in Treacherous Time*, New York.
- EU-Iran relations*, European Commission – Fact Sheet, Brussels, 13.04.2016, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-16-1368_en.htm?locale=e (25.03.2016).
- Fiedler R. (2013), *Iran a reżim nieproliferaacji broni jądrowej*, Poznań.
- Freedom R. O. (2006), *Russia, Iran, and the nuclear question: the Putin record*, "Jerusalem Viewpoints", No. 544, Jerusalem Centre for Public Affairs, <http://jcpa.org/jl/vp544.htm> (22.03.2016).
- Goodarzi J. M. (2013), *Syria and Iran: Alliance Cooperation in a Changing Regional Environment*, "Ortadoğu Etütleri", January 2013, Vol. 4, No. 2.
- Gstöhl S., Lannon E. (2016), *The Neighbors of the European Union's Neighbors: Diplomatic and Geopolitical Dimensions Beyond the European Neighborhood Policy*, Routledge.
- Guimelli F., Ivan P. (2013), *The effectiveness of EU sanctions An analysis of Iran, Belarus, Syria and Myanmar (Burma)*, "European Policy Center", EPIC Issue Paper, No. 76, http://www.epc.eu/documents/uploads/pub_3928_epc_issue_paper_76_-_the_effectiveness_of_eu_sanctions.pdf (23.03.2016).
- Gwiazda A. (2015), *Niepewna normalizacja stosunków polityczno-gospodarczych Iranu z Zachodem*, "Przegląd Strategiczny", nr 8.

- History of Official Proposals on the Iranian Nuclear Issue* (2012), https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/Iran_Nuclear_Proposals (20.03.2016).
- Iran Country Analysis Brief* (2013), US Energy Information Administration, 28.03.2013, <http://www.eia.gov/countries/cab.cfm?fips=IR> (26.03.2016).
- Iran's Foreign Policy from Khatami to Ahmadinejad* (2008), (eds.) A. Ehteshami, M. Zweiri, Lebanon.
- Katzman K., Kerr P. K. (2016), *Iran Nuclear Agreement*, Congressional Research Service, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/R43333.pdf> (30.03.2016).
- Kaussler B. (2008), *European Union constructive engagement with Iran: an exercise in conditional human rights diplomacy (2000–2004)*, “Iranian Studies”, Issue 41, No. 3.
- Kaussler B. (2014), *Iran's Nuclear Diplomacy. Power politics and conflict resolution*, London–New York.
- Melman Y., Javedanfar M. (2008), *The nuclear Sphinx of Teheran. Mahmud Ahamadinejad and the State of Iran*, London–New York.
- Mousavian S. H. (2012), *The Iranian Nuclear Crisis a Memoir*, Washington.
- National Intelligence Estimate (2007), *Iran – Nuclear Intentions and Capabilities*, <http://www.cfr.org/iran/national-intelligence-estimate-iran---nuclear-intentions-capabilities/p14937> (28.03.2016).
- Parameters for a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding the Islamic Republic of Iran's Nuclear Program* (2015), https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/jcpoa_key_excerpts.pdf (22.03.2016).
- Paris Agreement* (2004), <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documnets/Infcir/2004/infcr637.pdf> (23.03.2016).
- Patterson R. (2013), *EU Sanctions on Iran: The European Political Context*, “Middle East Policy”, No. 20 (1).
- Posch W. (2016), *Iran and the European Union*, <http://iranprimer.usip.org/resource/iran-and-european-union> (26.03.2016).
- Richardson J. L. (1994), *Crisis Diplomacy: The Great Powers since the Mid-Nineteenth Century*, Cambridge.
- Rocznik strategiczny 2014/2015. Przegląd sytuacji politycznej, gospodarczej i wojskowej w środowisku międzynarodowym Polski* (2015), Warszawa.
- Snyder G., Diesing P. (1977), *Conflict Among Nations: Bargaining, Decision-Making and System Structure in International Crises*, Princeton, New York.
- Text of the UN Security Council No. 1696 Adopted by the Security Council at its 5500th meeting, on 31 July 2006, <http://www.un.org/press/en/2006/sc8792.doc.htm> (24.03.2016).
- Text of the UN Security Council Resolution No. 1737 Adopted by the Security Council at its 5612th meeting, on 23 December 2006, https://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/unsc_res1737-2006.pdf (25.03.2016).
- Text of the UN Security Council Resolution No. 1803 Adopted by the Security Council at its 5848th meeting, on 3 March 2008, https://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/unsc_res1803-2008.pdf (25.03.2016).
- Text of the UN Security Council Resolution No. 1929, Adopted by the Security Council at its 6335th meeting, on 9 June 2010, https://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/unsc_res1929-2010.pdf (25.03.2016).
- Wilford M. (2011), *The Assassins' Trail: Unraveling the Mykonos Killings*, “World Affairs”, November/December 2011, <http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/assassins%E2%80%99-trail-unraveling-mykonos-killings> (22.03.2016).

ABSTRACT

In the article is analyzed European Union crisis diplomacy with Iran, which finally brought to the final settlements. Beside the nuclear issues, in EU and Iran relations are visible other issues, as such as: human rights, security, energy and trade. In the 90's and 2000's EU proposed the formula critical and comprehensive dialogue. Now after nuclear settlement, crisis diplomacy with Iran is essential, due to the problems and challenges related with internal Iranian politics and its regional policy.

Key words: crisis diplomacy, sanctions, nuclear program, European Union, Iran

WYPRACOWYWANIE NUKLEARNEGO POROZUMIENIA. KRYZYSOWA DYPLMACJA UNII EUROPEJSKIEJ W STOSUNKACH Z IRANEM

STRESZCZENIE

W artykule poddano analizie unijną kryzysową dyplomację, która przyczyniła się do osiągnięcia porozumienia w kwestii nuklearnej. Obok problemu atomowego, UE i Iran – relacje pomiędzy nimi dotyczą takich kwestii jak: prawa człowieka, bezpieczeństwo, energia oraz handel. Jeszcze w latach 90. XX wieku i 2000., Unia Europejska wyszła z inicjatywą prowadzenia krytycznego, a potem wszechstronnego dialogu z Iranem. Obecnie po porozumieniu nuklearnym z Iranem, utrzymanie kryzysowej dyplomacji jest istotna z powodu problemów i wyzwań wynikających z wewnętrznych uwarunkowań Iranu, jak i jego regionalnej polityki.

Słowa kluczowe: dyplomacja kryzysowa, sankcje, program atomowy, Unia Europejska, Iran

