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Mr. President, 

My delegation would like to express its sincere appreciation and gratitude to you for your efforts, perseverance and able leadership to guide our deliberations in the course of this conference. I would like to associate myself to the statement made by the distinguished Ambassador of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. I wish also to express the gratitude of my delegation and our thanks to the competent and skilful chairs of the main committees and subsidiary bodies as well as the Secretary General of the NPT Review Conference.

Mr. President, 

The existence of nuclear weapons is the most immediate danger to the humanity. The catastrophic consequences of the possible use of nuclear weapons confer on all of us the clear obligation to adopt all the necessary measures to prevent such event happen again. The nuclear weapons when used may not discriminate between military and civilian population leading to mass killing of innocent people including women and children. Such destructive and indiscriminate nature of nuclear weapons put nuclear weapons among those weapon categories which are prohibited under international humanitarian law.

We must put an end to this imagination that nuclear weapons should imply political clout and capability to shape and influence world events. Holding on and modernizing nuclear arsenals should be condemned rather than condoned or tolerated. Any increase in nuclear capability, in particular qualitative improvement under the pretext of “reliability” should equal a reduction in political credibility.

The international community expected that this Conference would adopt urgent practical and actual steps to further prohibit the acquisition, development, modernization and use or threat of use of nuclear weapons within a definite timeline. This expectation is legitimate more than ever specially following the extension of the Treaty in 1995. In 2000 NPT Review Conference following extensive negotiations by the States Parties to the Treaty, thirteen practical steps were particularly identified as limiting and prohibiting
further nuclear weapons. Unfortunately since 2000 Review Conference, not only the practical steps have not been implemented but measures contrary to such decisions were adopted by certain Nuclear Weapon States. The abrogation of ABM Treaty, recognized by the NPT Conference as the cornerstone of global strategic stability, in violation of 2000 agreement and increasing operational status as well as the role of nuclear weapons in the military and defense doctrines of the nuclear weapons States led to a new phase of development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons. These new policies were consequently the main reasons for the failure of the 2005 review conference.

Mr. President,

The 2010 NPT Review Conference is convened at a time that the unilateral measures adopted and symbolic statements made by some nuclear weapons States increased the expectation of the international community that this conference could well go beyond the previous review conferences in identifying the practical measures for total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Contrary to such expectations, the positions taken by certain nuclear weapon States manifested that they are not even ready to reaffirm their previously established undertakings and commitments. It is unfortunate that the draft text presented to the conference at this final stage lacks a clear reference to the very fundamental principles established by the NPT Review Conferences. I would like to cite some following examples for your kind consideration.

1. The reaffirmation of the commitment of the nuclear weapon States to reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons has been watered down to a useless recognition of the interest of the non-nuclear weapon States to the treaty for such commitment.

2. The reaffirmation of the “commitment of the nuclear weapon States to cease the development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and ending the development of advanced new types of nuclear weapons” has been changed only into “the legitimate interest of the non-nuclear weapon States” for such commitment. Some portions of the draft wrongly draw a rosy picture about nuclear disarmament by “welcoming” limited and insufficient unilateral or bilateral measures, while the United States in breach of its obligations under the Treaty publicly and officially announced that it would “invest 100 billions of dollars in nuclear delivery systems to sustain existing capabilities and modernize strategic systems”.

3. The text has not been able to recognize that the nuclear weapon States should abolish the role of nuclear weapons in their military doctrines. On the contrary, by asking only to diminish “the significance of nuclear weapons in all military and security concepts, doctrines and policies”, the non-nuclear weapon States are called to implicitly recognize the role of nuclear weapons in military doctrines on
4. While international community has repeatedly called for prohibition of use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, the draft final document has merely asked nuclear weapons States to “engage with a view to discuss policies that could prevent the use of nuclear weapons”, rather than to commit them to a legally binding instrument. It is really unfortunate that France and US in an effort to keep the operational status of their nuclear arsenals unaffected, blocked any possible agreement to further limit or prohibit the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

5. With regard to nuclear weapons transferred and stationed in the territories of non-nuclear weapon States in clear violation of articles I and II of the Treaty, the draft failed to call for the withdrawal and elimination of such weapons and only referred to addressing “the question” of these weapons.

6. The text submitted to the conference lacks the most important request of non-nuclear weapons States, specifically the NAM parties to NPT, who constantly called for a legal framework with specified timeline for the total elimination of nuclear weapons, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention by 2025. In this regard and after more than 40 years living under the shadow of nuclear weapons, the current draft is merely stated that “a majority of States parties believe” an agreed legal framework should include specified timelines. This is not certainly an achievement and the result of the sincere efforts and good intentions of a great majority of States Parties from all corners of the world gathered at this conference.

7. The universality section of the text has been silent in calling upon Israeli regime to stop developing nuclear weapons and accede to the NPT which is a clear setback.

8. The text of the Conference has been forced to be silent on the legitimacy of the agreement reached, in clear contravention to the agreements in 1995, between a nuclear weapon State and a non party to the NPT concerning the transfer of source, special fissionable material and equipment. Paragraph 12 of “Decision on Principles and Objectives” has set two necessary preconditions, namely “acceptance of the Agency's full-scope safeguards and internationally legally binding commitments not to acquire nuclear weapons” for any agreement on such transfers.

9. On the important issue of the Nuclear Weapons Free Zone in the Middle East,
after 15 years of non-implementation of the 1995 Resolution which was the essential part of the package agreement for indefinite extension of the NPT, international community, particularly the countries in the region who have lived under the constant threat of nuclear arsenals of Zionist regime, expected the commitments of certain nuclear weapons States to be fulfilled. Contrary to our expectations, the text not only failed to directly call upon Israel, the only obstacle to the establishment of NWFZ in the region, to accede to the NPT without condition. Moreover some of the languages used in this section go well beyond the current political realities of the Middle East which my delegation wishes to express its reservations with their respect.

Mr. President,

There are numerous other examples to testify that the outcome of this conference is coming short of the expectations of the international community. However we share the views of many States Parties to the treaty that we are not at the end of the road to progress towards total elimination of nuclear weapons and creating a world free from nuclear weapons. The limited measures identified in the document of this Conference, is however a step forward, and can still be served as a viable benchmark to progress towards our common goal of nuclear disarmament. And the commitment of the States parties to the treaty to vigorously follow that path is a real source of pride and inspiration in our future endeavors.

Mr. President, my delegation joined consensus to show our respect for the views of the others and our political and good will. The Islamic Republic of Iran is determined to pursue actively with other non-nuclear Weapons States, NAM in particular, for the full implementation of the decisions of the conference and taking further practical steps in realization of the expectations not fully fulfilled in this conference.

Thank You Mr. President.