



INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY
GENERAL CONFERENCE
FORTY-SEVENTH REGULAR SESSION SEPTEMBER 2003

STATEMENT

IRAN, ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF

**STATEMENT TO THE FORTY-SEVENTH REGULAR SESSION OF THE
GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE
INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY**

by

**H.E. Mr. Reza AGHAZADEH
VICE-PRESIDENT OF
THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN**

and

**PRESIDENT OF THE
ATOMIC ENERGY ORGANIZATION OF IRAN**

SEPTEMBER 2003

In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful

Mr. President,
Excellencies,

I wish to congratulate you and through you all the members of the Bureau for your election to guide the important deliberations of the 47th Session of the General conference in the next few days. My delegation is confident that under your leadership we will work through important issues before us and try to inject more wisdom and rationality in our dispensation of the issues.

I also wish to thank our distinguished Director General for his statement and reports.

Last week a resolution was adopted in the Board of Governors on the nuclear program in my country. My delegation objects not only to the resolution but also to the manner in which it was developed and negotiated. The resolution goes beyond the words and spirit of the NPT and the IAEA Statutes, even beyond the provisions of the Additional Protocol, which we are still in the process of negotiating it. My delegation could not have associated itself with such a resolution, which was pushed to a decision through resorting to false attributions to the Secretariat, arms twisting at many capitals, and stone walling the views and amendments of not only 15 members of the NAM, but also those of others including some of the co-sponsors themselves. This is unilateralism at its worst, that is to say, extreme unilateralism posed under a multilateralist cloak. We believe there is more to this resolution that meets the eye at the first glance. There is an agenda behind it that is conceived in escalating tension and chaos to divert attention from serious issues that deal with partisan politics in the United States.

In our view, such a heavy-handed approach to get a resolution casts considerable doubt on the validity, utility and above all, the practicality of so a resolution. It seems that the resolution has been engineered in such a manner to guarantee its non-or half implementation. We sincerely doubt

whether this resolution intends, as it should, to promote the effectiveness of the safeguards and non-proliferation regime.

We have serious problems with this resolution. From its inconsistency with the NPT to its deadline for cooperation and its venomous language are all problematic. These are our preliminary views on this resolution. We are studying the resolution carefully and will officially respond to it in a few days.

In the meantime, I wish to underline the following points:

- 1- Iran is fully committed to its NPT responsibility, not only because of its contractual obligation, but also because of its religious and ethical considerations,
- 2- Iran's actions and policies are geared to strengthening the safeguards regime, because of strategic considerations,
- 3- Iran's planned nuclear development programme to generate 7000 Mw electricity with secured fuel has factored in consideration of strengthening the Safeguards, through joining the Additional Protocol or otherwise, so as to encourage the international community to give a serious impetus to others in the Middle East to respond positively to Iran's initiative for establishing the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon free zone.
- 4- It is indeed unfortunate to note that despite all our attempts to resolve the outstanding issues, the ever-increasing cooperation with the Agency as clearly reflected in the report, we have witnessed an opposite trend by those who seek to disrupt the process.
- 5- Had the ongoing process continued, we would surely have had achieved the desired results of full transparency and confidence. The Resolution will certainly not help the process forward and is thus seen as counter productive.
- 6- We are here with the message of willingness to find ways and means that would salvage the process and maintain the issue within the framework of the relevant international body, under the direction of the Director General, taking into account the interpretations put forth by the majority of the Board members on the content of the resolution.

The international community still considers the existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use as the most serious threat to the very

existence of humankind and civilization, however some developments and setbacks have occurred since the 2000 Review Conference and the last PrepCom. The emergence of a new security doctrine that set rational for possible use of nuclear weapons is among those developments. This doctrine relies on nuclear weapons, for foreseeable future as a key element in the national security strategy of a nuclear power. The new approaches towards nuclear weapons stress capabilities to respond to conventional and non- nuclear threats, which should serve as a credible deterrent at the lowest level of nuclear weapons consistent with the security interest of that nuclear power. Ignoring the widespread protest against its nuclear doctrines in its National Security Strategy released in September 2002, it asserts that *“has long maintained the option of pre-emptive actions to counter a sufficient threat”* to its national security and that it will, if necessary, act pre - emotively *“to forestall or prevent hostile acts by its adversaries”*.

Now, please consider a scenario where this argument is made by a country other than the United States. Take for instance our own case. We believe, that with the resolution adopted last Friday, there is a sufficient threat of hostile acts by the United States or its client Zionist regime against our interest and National Security. Using the logic in US National Security Strategy, is it acceptable or is it saving international peace and security if we were to say that we are going to act pre-emptively to forestall or prevent hostile acts by our adversary the United States. I think, few would think that this reasoning is sound and promotes International Peace and Security.

It is time to stick to the principles of disarmament and to protect past collective achievements. We, as a matter of principle, are strongly of the view that the only way to counter challenges that emanate from the existence of nuclear arsenals of the nuclear powers and the proliferation of nuclear weapons is to strengthen the relevant international instrument through multilateral, comprehensive and non discriminatory efforts. We firmly believe that the NPT is the cornerstone of the international efforts to achieve complete nuclear disarmament and to halt vertical and horizontal proliferation of this horrible weapon.

Due to the reluctance of some nuclear weapon states, the disarmament objectives of the NPT have not materialized in spite of their clear obligations and the continuous calls of the international community. Nuclear disarmament is still the highest priority in the security agenda of

the international community. A review of the past shows a lack of progress by the nuclear powers to accomplish the elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament.

By the adoption of 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the NPT and the related paragraph of the 1995 Decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear and non proliferation and Disarmament", including an unequivocal undertaking of nuclear powers to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, the 2000 Review Conference gave fresh hope that the collective efforts of the international community were moving forward in the right direction. However, the actions and policies undertaken by the nuclear powers were far from the expectation of the international community reflected by the 2000 Review Conference. The picture of nuclear disarmament over the past two years has been one of setback and negative developments.

Realizing the universality of the NPT is an urgent need to enhance security and stability in the world, in light of the current developments, the Middle East, as one of the most sensitive areas, deserves more attention and substantial work during the current meeting. We vividly recall that the Resolution; on the Middle East adopted in the 1995 Review and Extension Conference was an integral part of the decision for the indefinite extension of the NPT. Now the sole obstacle for the establishment of a nuclear weapon free zone in the region is Israel, which has not yet joined the NPT and has not placed its nuclear facilities under the comprehensive safeguards of the IAEA. All members of the NPT and specifically those who have influence on this regime should exert far more pressure on it to join the NPT and renounce its security policy based on WMD and in particular nuclear weapons

Article IV has a critical role to play in full and indiscriminate implementation of the NPT. Its goal is to strike a balance between the security concerns and the socio-economic requirements for development especially for the developing countries. By establishing a framework to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, through enhancing international cooperation among state parties, it provides the main incentive set forth in the treaty. Considering the experience with Iraq concerning its circumvention of the rules of the NPT and IAEA safeguards, we do recognize that keeping such balance is a challenge. However, stressing only the security aspect of disarmament treaties including the NPT, and hampering the materialization of recognized inalienable rights of state parties to engage in peaceful uses of nuclear

energy would be a disservice to the principles and objectives of the Treaty.

The NPT constitutes an integrated structure, whose effectiveness and realization of its noble goals lie in full compliance with all its provisions by all Parties. The credibility on the NPT as the most encompassing disarmament treaty would be impaired through selective and discriminatory approaches towards its implementation.

Thank you Mr. President