



The Looming Demise Of The International Atomic Energy Organization

This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.

Dimitri Lascaris (DL): Yesterday, Iran's president signed a law which, according to Iranian state media, suspended cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency, or IAEA. And if you could pull up image number one, this is a tweet that was put out by Iran's foreign ministry yesterday. If you look at the bottom, he's commenting on a post on X from the German foreign ministry in which it said, following the adoption of this law in Iran, which suspended cooperation, it said: "Iran's decision to suspend cooperation with the IAEA sends a devastating message. It eliminates any possibility of international oversight of the Iranian nuclear program, which is crucial for a diplomatic solution. Iran must reverse this decision". And so the foreign minister Abbas Araghchi, he writes: "Fake news. Iran remains committed to the NPT in its Safeguards Agreement. In accordance with the new legislation by Majlis, sparked by the unlawful attacks against our nuclear facilities by Israel and the US, our cooperation with IAEA will be channeled through Iran's Supreme National Security Council for obvious safety and security reasons". Now just pausing there; the Iranian state media did appear to say that this was a suspension of cooperation with the IAEA. So it's kind of hard to reconcile what he's saying there with what the state media said, but I think what the message is, is that Iran is not yet going to withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. And if its trust in the organization can be restored at some point in the future, perhaps it will allow some level of inspections to take place of its nuclear facilities, but for the time being, it has lost trust and although it remains formally within the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, it is going to be very, very circumspect about allowing IAEA officials to inspect its facilities for the time being.

So what I found particularly entertaining about this response from the Iranian foreign ministry, as it goes on to say: "Reality to Iranians, what truly sends a devastating message and destroys a diplomatic solution is very obvious. First, Germany's explicit support for Israel's unlawful attack on Iran, including safeguarded nuclear sites, has dirty work carried out on behalf of the West" – absolutely true; Israel attacked Iran on behalf of the West, not just on its own behalf. And then he says, "Germany also shamefully supported the unlawful US attack against Iranian nuclear facilities, which violated international law". That is absolutely true. It

did violate international law and was supported by Germany. Also violated the NPT and the UN Charter. "Third, Germany's repudiation of the JCPOA" – that is the Obama era nuclear deal, which Trump tore up in his first administration – "by openly demanding zero enrichment in Iran". And finally, he says, "Iranians were already put off by Germany's Nazi-style backing of genocide in Gaza and its support for Saddam's war in Iran by providing materials for chemical weapons". All of that is true. So who the hell is, you know, Chancellor Blackrock of Germany to criticize the Iranians for suspending the cooperation with this corrupted and co-opted Western puppet agency, the IAEA.

So we can take that off the screen, Rami. Now, tensions between Iran and the IAEA have been building for years. Matters reached a boiling point when the IAEA board adopted a resolution condemning Iran on June 12th. That was the last day of the 60-day deadline that the war criminal Donald Trump had unilaterally imposed on Iran for completing a nuclear deal that was acceptable to the Trump regime. June 12th was also the day before Israel launched its criminal and failed war of aggression on Iran. So, you know, everybody knew that Israel was preparing to attack Iran. On June 12th, everybody knew it was preparing. No one knew exactly, well, no one outside the Israeli US government knew exactly when that was going to happen. The fact that Grossi, Rafael Grossi the head of the IAEA would push this resolution through on the last day of the 60-day deadline that Trump had imposed unilaterally, and at a time when Israel was preparing to attack Iran, the timing of this stunk to high heaven and it should have been obvious to everybody on the IAEA board that – they should have all smelled a rat.

Now before I go further on that point, let's take a closer look at the June 12th resolution. So this would be image two, Rami. And if we can scroll through it, we'll see at the very top there, they start out the Board of Governors, there are 35 states represented on the IAEA Board of Governors, they start by, you know, stroking the ego of Rafael Grossi, "commending the continued professional independent and impartial efforts of the IAEA Director General, including its inspectors to implement Iran's NPT Safeguards Agreement [...] emphasizing the essential and independent role of the IAEA in verifying your hands compliance with its NPT Safeguard obligations". You can judge for yourselves when you're finished whether the IAEA has been truly independent and impartial. And then we go down, so that's the preamble, and then on the second page in the top half, the first part of the resolution: "The agency deeply regrets that despite repeated calls from the board and many opportunities offered Iran has failed to cooperate fully with the Agency as required by its Safeguard Agreement". And then down at the bottom of that page, this is clause seven, "reaffirms its decision that it is essential and urgent in order to ensure verification of the non-diversion of nuclear material that Iran act to fulfill its legal obligations and with a view to clarifying all outstanding Safeguards issues, take the following actions without delay: One, provide technically credible explanation for the presence of uranium particles of anthropogenic origin in two undeclared locations in Iran". I'm going to explain what this means in a moment. "Two, inform the agency of the current locations of the nuclear material and or of the contaminated equipment. Three, provide all information, documentation, answers the Agency requires for that purpose".

So what is that all about? I was going to talk to you about the voting around this resolution, but first I'll tell you what this is all about. And it's explained very clearly and helpfully by Medea Benjamin and Nicolas Davies in a June 23rd article published by Common Dreams. And I'm quoting from their article: "The source of the IAEA investigation that led to this resolution was a 2018 Israeli intelligence report that its agents had identified three previously undisclosed sites in Iran where Iran had conducted uranium enrichment prior to 2003" – prior to 2003, more than 20 years ago. "In 2019, Grossi opened an investigation" – so even though it's related to events prior to 2003, "Grossi learns about it from the Israelis in 2019. He opens an investigation, the IAEA eventually did gain access to the sites and detected traces of enriched uranium". So the Iranians let them go there, they detect traces of the enriched uranium and the article goes on by Medea Benjamin and Nicolas Davies and says, "despite the fateful consequences of his actions, Grossi has never explained publicly how the IAEA can be sure that Israel's Mossad intelligence agency or its Iranian collaborators such as the MEK, did not put the enriched uranium in those sites themselves, as Iranian officials have suggested". Okay, so this just raises so many questions. First of all, why does Grossi trust so-called intelligence provided by the Mossad? This is a state that refuses to expose its own nuclear facilities and nuclear weapons to international inspection. It's the only state in West Asia not to be a member of the NPT, it is a serial human rights abuser, a serial violator of international law, and has demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that it will spread any falsehood in order to justify the destruction of Iran. So why is he dealing with the Mossad and why is he trusting these people, Grossi, and secondly, why is he rehashing now, on this day, the 60th day, the last day of the period unilaterally imposed by Trump for a nuclear deal, that's acceptable to him, the allegations that relate to sites that were used prior to 2003. They learned about them, the IAEA, from the Mossad in 2018 but the sites themselves were allegedly being used over 20 years ago. And since then, the Western intelligence agencies, including the US intelligence agencies consistently said that Iran is not trying to develop a nuclear arsenal, despite its possession of enriched uranium.

So I think the answer is obvious. The IAEA chose to, at Grossi's insistence, promulgate this resolution on this date in order to set the stage for an Israeli attack on Iran and provide some kind of moral or legal justification for this criminal act. You can hardly imagine a less impartial, a less independent regulatory agency than that. So let's talk briefly about the voting around this resolution of the 35 countries represented on the IAEA's board. Only 19 voted for it. Three voted against and eleven abstained. Two did not vote at all. The United States contacted eight board member governments on June 10th to persuade them to either vote for the resolution or not to vote. So there was a lot of arm twisting going on. The 19 states that voted in favor of the resolution are overwhelmingly states that serve as vassals of Washington. They include Japan, Canada, South Korea, Australia, Argentina, Ecuador, Morocco, Spain, France, the UK, Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Ukraine, Belgium, and Luxembourg, all vassals of Washington. Russia, China, and Burkina Faso voted against the resolution. The eleven states that abstained come from the Global South, Thailand, India, Pakistan, South Africa, Egypt, Algeria, Ghana, Brazil, Armenia, and Bangladesh. Apparently those eleven states failed to appreciate despite its highly suspicious timing that this resolution was designed to set the stage for an illegal Israeli attack on Iran's nuclear facilities. And

frankly I find that difficult to understand. How could they have not smelled the rat? It was so obvious what was going on here from the very beginning.

Now, predictably the IAEA's June 12th resolution unleashed a deluge of alarmist reports by Western corporate media. If you could pull up, I'm just going to show you one of many examples. This is a Reuters report: *IAEA board declares Iran in breach of non-proliferation obligations*. Okay? The headline doesn't convey that what the IAEA was doing was dredging up allegations that came from the Mossad and that related to nuclear sites that had allegedly been used for uranium enrichment prior to 2003. Okay, and these headlines, headlines like this, misleading, uninformative headlines, were plastered all over the Western corporate media on June 12th, and the next day, Israel launches its criminal war of aggression, and in violation of international law, bombs Iran's nuclear facilities. So you can imagine that at that stage, the Iranian government has had quite enough of the IAEA. And to compound matters, after Israel attacked Iran's nuclear facilities on June 13th, the IAEA on that very day issued a meek statement which worsened relations between Iran and the agency even more. It did not explicitly condemn Israel's attacks and it used language that was less harsh than the language of the IAEA board resolution on June 12th. So here is the Rafael Grossi statement of June 13th. This is image number four, Rami. And you'll see what he says there: "This development" – namely the bombing of Iran's nuclear facilities, an egregious and dangerous violation of international law because of the contamination this can cause. These are protected sites in international law. There is no conceivable argument that this was legal. And what does he have to say about it? He says he finds this deeply concerning. That's the most condemnation that Rafael Grossi could muster on that day.

So since the IAEA board adopted that resolution, more damning revelations have emerged about the head of the IAEA Rafael Grossi and the agency's collusion with the Trump and Netanyahu regimes. One of the journalists who has brought more damning information to light is Kit Klarenberg. He's an investigative journalist exploring the role of intelligence services in shaping politics and perceptions. He writes frequently for The Grayzone and other important alternative media outlets. Earlier today, I interviewed Kit about the new information he has brought to light. We're going to publish Kit's interview in the morning. In the meantime, I commend to you the two articles he's authored in the past few days. The first was published by The Grayzone on July 1st. You can see it there: *Spying on Iran: How MI6 infiltrated the IAEA*. And there Kit talks about a previously undisclosed document which was leaked, which shows that a character by the name of Nicholas Langman, an MI6 agent with an extraordinarily unsavory background was working hard to influence the IAEA's policies and practices with respect to Iran at a critical moment in the relationship between the two. But I'm not going to get into the details of that now. You can read the article and watch our interview of Kit tomorrow. It was most informative. The second article Kit authored this week was published by The Cradle on July 2nd, yesterday. And this one is about MOSAIC, a program developed by a really shady company called Palantir, which is a complicit six ways from [inaudible] and various human rights abuses by both Israel and the United States government. Again, I commend that article to you, and we'll get into how the IAEA has been using this predictive technology, or supposedly predictive technology to do its dirty work.

So, the last thing I want to say about all of this, because it's not discussed often enough, just sort of what is the NPT all about? It's important to understand that because it is now at serious risk, to be perfectly blunt about it. We are at a place, because of the agency having become so discredited, because it's obvious co-option by Western governments, it's possibly, quite possibly, providing to Israel the identities of nuclear scientists in Iran who were murdered, some of them along with their families. The entire non-proliferation regime that was set up in 1968 pursuant to this treaty is at risk of collapse, very serious risk of collapse. And if there ever was a case of blowback, this is it, because if this regulatory regime, this regime of oversight of the nuclear operations of countries around the world, if it collapses, and there is no independent examination or inspection going on of nuclear facilities around the world that is going to dramatically increase the risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons; which is presumably something that the US government and Israel do not want. So their depravity and their corruption of this agency could end up in a massive own goal where their own security interests are profoundly compromised by their subterfuge. So the NPT, as I mentioned, was adopted in 1968 only a few years after the Cuban Missile Crisis and less than 25 years after the US committed one of the worst atrocities in human history by nuking Hiroshima and Nagasaki and knowingly incinerating tens of thousands of Japanese children. That's what it did when it attacked those two cities. It knew exactly that it was going to kill, murder, tens of thousands of innocent children. And it did it anyway, at a time when it was not militarily necessary for the United States to destroy these cities in order to secure the surrender of Japan. The NPT is remarkably brief. It consists of only eleven articles. I would like to show you what I would consider to be the heart and soul of the NPT. So these are articles five and six of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

So first of all, let's take a look at Article four. Article four says, "Nothing in this treaty shall be" – this is clause one of article four – "shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all parties to the treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with articles one and two of this treaty". So the first thing to understand is that Iran, by signing onto this treaty as it did, and as I mentioned, Israel has not done that, was not surrendering the right to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. It has the inalienable right, as do all states, and no one has the authority to deprive it of that right. The Trump administration was demanding that Iran give up its nuclear energy program altogether, not just that it give up enrichment, but that it gave up its nuclear energy program. Where did the Trump administration get off telling a sovereign nation that it had to give up something to which it is entitled under international law?! And Trump says, oh, they have a lot of oil. That's completely irrelevant. It doesn't matter that they have a lot of oil, all countries, regardless of how many other energy sources they have at their disposal, have the right to nuclear energy. It's not just an energy source. It also is important for medical research and a host of other peaceful applications. And by the way, the United States is one of the biggest oil producers in the world. Does that mean the United States is not entitled to have nuclear energy? I don't think that's the reason for the US government. And there are other states that have nuclear energy and that have large resources. I mean, the Russian Federation has gigantic fossil fuel reserves and obviously employs, both for peaceful and military purposes, nuclear energy.

So the second thing is, under this treaty, there's nothing in this treaty that bars the enrichment of Uranium. In fact, in order to have nuclear energy reactors for peaceful purposes, you have to have enriched uranium. The level of the composition of uranium occurring in nature is not sufficient to fuel a nuclear energy reactor. You have to enrich uranium up to about a level of five percent. So if you have an inalienable right to nuclear energy, which you do under international law and NPT, then you also necessarily have the right to enrich uranium. Otherwise, you couldn't have a nuclear energy program. So again, there's absolutely no legal basis to the demand from Israel, the United States, and other Western states that Iran surrender its capacity to enrich uranium.

Now, Article five says, "Each party to the treaty undertakes to take appropriate measures to ensure that under appropriate international observation and through appropriate international procedures, potential benefits from any peaceful applications of nuclear explosions will be made available to non-nuclear weapon states to the treaty on a non-discriminatory basis". Critical words. So you can't say, you know, that some countries get to use nuclear energy while others don't. Because you don't like their politics or you don't like their political stance towards something like a genocide in Palestine.

And then this is a very important article, Article six, which is not discussed nearly enough in the corporate media. Article six says, "Each of the parties to the treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control". Now, several years ago, dozens of states entered into the Nuclear Weapons Ban Treaty. Not only did the United States and Israel refuse to sign on to that treaty, but they also strong-arm other countries that don't have nuclear weapons and don't want to develop nuclear weapons, for example, Canada, where Rami and I are currently situated, they got strong-armed by the United States not to sign onto that treaty because the United States didn't want to be pressured to do that itself. Now, this article, as I mentioned, Article six, is part of a treaty that was adopted in 1968. That was 67 years ago. 67 years ago, are we anywhere closer to nuclear disarmament today than we were then? In fact, the United States is going in the opposite direction. It started under the Bush administration when George W. withdrew the United States from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. Then, of course, the Trump administration blew up the JCPOA between the US government and Iran, even though Iran was complying with the deal, according to the IAEA. And then the Trump administration withdrew the United States from the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty, which was a bedrock of nuclear security in Europe, and did so over the objections, the strenuous objections of the Russian Federation. So the United State, in all of this time, in the decades that have passed since this treaty was entered into has for over 20 years been undermining nuclear disarmament, and in fact it's investing, I think under the Obama administration, the government committed to investing something like a trillion dollars in the modernization of the US nuclear arsenal. So the bottom line is this: The United States is flagrantly violating Article six of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It has been flagrantly violating it for over 20 years, if not much longer, and is in no position to condemn any other state for non-compliance, especially a state that does not have nuclear weapons, and

that its own intelligence agencies, that US intelligence agencies say is not trying to develop nuclear weapons.

So I think that we're on a stage now where the vast majority of people in the world can see the grotesque hypocrisy of this. If anything, the United States and Israel have done us at least in one respect a favor because they brought this whole subject of nuclear weapons proliferation back into discussion. But the primary focus of our discussion of that issue should be their non-compliance with the NPT, their nuclear provocation, their nuclear saber rattling, the US' use of nuclear weapons in the Second World War, the only time that has ever been done in human history, that's where the focus should be put. It should not be put on states that don't have nuclear weapons and that clearly have not been trying to develop them. So, where we now stand, my friends, is this entire regulatory regime has been thoroughly discredited. And as I say, we may be about to witness the collapse of the NPT in the years ahead.

Rami Yahia (RY): Dimitri, the Iranian nuclear program, I think it's a symbol of Iranian sovereignty. You cannot tell countries what they can and can't do. They can abide by international law, which is what Iran was doing. But Iran, at the end of the day, is guilty of one crime, and it's a crime of having its own independent foreign policy and standing up for the Palestinian people. Now that America attacked the Iranian nuclear facilities, I mean, it does seem like they're not that impacted, Iran will be able to build it back, but just the fact of building back, I see a lot of ties or similarities with what's going on in Palestine. They demolish our homes, we build them back. They attack Iran's nuclear facilities, Iran will build them and keep operating it the way they want to operate it. Iran has pledged to use it for civilian purposes, for energy, for medical research, and they'll keep doing so for as long as they wish to do so. But, what I find interesting here is that you mentioned the IAEA working in cahoots with Israel and basically giving them a political reason to attack Iran. What other UN agencies or international agencies are also working in collaboration with Israel to push their goals? I mean, what stops us from believing that UNRWA is also not collaborating with Israel in Gaza or in the refugee camps in Lebanon and Jordan? And then my other question, Dimitri, would be, well, if you're a country like China and Russia and you know that all these Western backed organizations are working for their own interests and they're all controlled by them, then do you think that there's an opportunity to create new organizations that will be much more fair and not being totally controlled by the West?

DL: Well, in response to your first question, we know from some excellent reporting by independent journalists, including in particular Aaron Mate, that the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, the OPCW, you know, put out – how shall I put this – fabricated analysis in order to persuade the public that Bashar al-Assad's forces had launched a chemical attack in Syria. When whistleblowers came forward from that agency and said that they had been pressured to change their report to implicate the Assad government, they were, as I recall, fired. And if you want to know the full history of that sort of affair, as they say, you know, Aaron Mate has written very extensively and ably about it, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE, in my discussion today with Kit

Klarenberg, he was talking about how that organization was basically used by NATO to gather intelligence in Kosovo on the positions of Serbian forces, which was then used by NATO to bomb those forces. So this is not unique to the IAEA, this corruption and co-option by Western governments and Washington for their sorted hegemonic purposes and how we rectify this problem.

I think, frankly, some of these organizations need to be dismantled and rebuilt from the ground up. And a very important protection that we have to put in place is the funding of these organizations has to be insured in ways that it's kind of like the problem you have with the corporate media; the corporate media are so corrupt and they lie so much because they're owned by and funded by billionaires and so the billionaires use them as propaganda organs rather than as instruments to inform the public so the same thing happens with these international organizations. A lot of the funding comes from Western governments and they use the funding in order to corrupt them. And you also have to make sure you're hiring people who have the highest integrity. You can't allow them to go work for the industries they regulate. You know, the revolving door becomes a huge problem. So there are a number of measures I think would have to be put in place to ensure that these organizations in the future are committed to their mission and are not corrupted by any governments. But right now, Rami, I mean, it's almost as if the entire legal architecture set up in the post-World War II period is disintegrating before our very eyes. It's quite dangerous.

END

Thank you for reading this transcript. Please don't forget to donate to support our independent and non-profit journalism:

BANKKONTO:
Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.
Bank: GLS Bank
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600
BIC: GENODEM1GLS

PAYPAL:
E-Mail:
PayPal@acTVism.org

PATREON:
<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>

BETTERPLACE:
Link: [Click here](#)