

# Islamic Republic of

# I R A N

Permanent Mission to the United Nations

**Statement by  
H.E. Mr. Mohammad H. Fadaifard  
Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative of  
The Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations  
Before the First Committee of the General Assembly  
New York, October 14, 2003**

**In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful**

Allow me at the outset to congratulate you Mr. Chairman, on your assumption of the chairmanship of this committee at this important juncture. My congratulations equally go to other members of the Bureau. I am confident that your diplomatic skill is an important asset for this committee to achieve positive outcomes this year.

Mr. Chairman,

A quarter century ago, at the first Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD I), a document was approved by consensus which is considered as the Constitution of the Disarmament. The Final Document of the SSOD I set out the principles and priorities on which the whole structure and machinery of disarmament are based. This structure bore fruits when the world bipolar system collapsed, and CWC in 1993 and CTBT in 1996 were concluded and the negotiations of the BWC Protocol were intensified. All of these positive developments are the outcomes of adherence to one core principle, namely "Multilateralism". This principle, however, has seriously been challenged.

An influential circle which found a stronghold in the administration of the only superpower began challenging the principle of multilateralism by weakening its pillars not only in the field of non-proliferation and disarmament but also in other areas. One should not lose sight of the fact that the withdrawal from the Kyoto environmental agreement and then rejecting the BWC Protocol and withdrawing from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the events in the UN Small Arms Conference, all occurred before September 11.

The tragic event of September 11 could have been a point of departure for promotion of multilateralism and cultivation of more unity among the Member States. Indeed, the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council and their implementation were signaling the emergence of that propitious development. But,

unfortunately the said unilateral tendency considered the September 11 event as an opportunity to pursue the unfinished ambition of forging a new world order through applying military power for reshaping arbitrarily one of the most strategic regions in the world. The unsanctioned Iraq war was openly advertised as the first attempt in this direction.

The waging of the war under the pretext of removing the threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction not only undermined the international disarmament and non-proliferation regime but also weakened the whole concept of multilateralism and the United Nations. It seems, now, that the predictable consequences of the unlawful Iraq war have forced the occupying powers and indeed the advocates of unilateralism to think twice and send signals for their possible return to the multilateral mechanisms.

Turning to the United Nations could be a positive sign if the unilateralists truly and in good faith abandon their misguided approach. The following, however, does not support this speculation:

- 1- The occupying powers have not agreed to the central role of the United Nations in Iraq and are yet to agree to a timetable for returning sovereignty to the Iraqi people;
- 2- Threatening other countries with pre-emptive attacks and encouraging others to do so continue, and even the plans for developing new mini nuclear weapons and preparations for testing of such weapons in clear contravention of international instruments including the Non-Proliferation Treaty are on the agenda;
- 3- Opening parallel tracks to the UN and international regimes and setting up of exclusive groupings under the pretext of arms control and security, which could bear no outcomes but mistrusts, is also being pursued vigorously.

Therefore, it is not surprising that those Nuclear Weapon States that have continuously worked to ensure that their ability to transit nuclear weapons is not hindered by regional nuclear weapons free zones, are currently advocating selected interdiction of such suspected materials or any other materials even with civilian applications to and from certain states under the pretext of preventing proliferation. These countries themselves transfer the largest amounts of missiles and weapons to other states, even to the non-parties to non-proliferation and disarmament treaties every year. The reports of which are well documented in the UN Register System.

Mr. Chairman,

It seems that the actual intention of the unilateralists for returning to the UN system does not stem from any real change in their approach; rather it signified a shift in employing required means. The recent attempts aimed at achieving objectives of the same unilateral approach by utilizing the potentials of international bodies are noticeable. Those who pursue this approach are of this conviction that their power warrants them to use all means even within the international bodies to realize their objectives. The new suggestions for bringing some exclusive control initiatives already created outside, into the United Nations to legitimize and generalize them, is yet another sign of the shift in

tactic. This will obviously have a negative impact on the international cooperation among States, particularly in the area of security and disarmament.

It seems that advocates of this approach also tend to influence the reform process within the UN organs in a direction compatible with their own objectives. My delegation welcomes any proposal aimed at enhancing the efficiency of the UN bodies, including the first committee. In this endeavor, however, the views of all Member States must be taken into account and priority should be accorded to the long-sought objective of humanity, namely nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Chairman,

Developments in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation during the period between our last and current session are not promising. Following the collapse of the 10-year negotiations of BWC Protocol and the continued blockade in the Conference on Disarmament, last year the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) and the Working Group on fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD IV) both failed to reach conclusions due to the persistence of the unilateralists. Even some Nuclear Weapons States during the course of deliberations and negotiations of these two bodies called into question their unequivocal undertakings for total elimination of nuclear weapons.

One Nuclear Weapons State continued its ideological opposition to CTBT by non-participation in the Third CTBT Facilitating Conference and more dangerously by re-examining its testing policy for development of the new nuclear weapons. Convening a two-day secret conference on the development of new nuclear weapons in Nebraska in the very week of the anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima was shocking. Without a doubt, this runs contrary to the claim of the same State that its policies help to curb weapons of mass destruction.

The reduction of the strategic offensive nuclear weapons in the framework of the Moscow Treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States has been widely advertised, while it is notably weaker than the previous treaties, namely START II and III, and certainly it cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and total elimination of, nuclear weapons.

In examining other areas of arms control and disarmament, one may point to the conclusion of the First Review Conference of the Chemical Weapons Convention and the continued operation of the OPCW which can be viewed as the only successful international disarmament regime. However, this could be considered a success only if a major possessor of the chemical weapons, who continued to claim that it could destroy its stockpiles on time, complies with its obligations for the destruction of its munitions and facilities within the timeframe of the Convention instead of the "naming names" on the basis of baseless allegations.

Admittedly, the beginning of a new process established by the resumed session of the Fifth Review Conference of the BWC in Geneva can not compensate the lost ten

years of negotiations of the Protocol. However, we hope focusing on control measures would not hinder promoting the international cooperation in the field of peaceful use of biotechnology in accordance with Article X of the BWC.

In the field of transparency in armaments, after more than ten years of the operation of the UN Register system, for the first time the Group of Governmental Expert has been able to move some inches forward and add new items to the list of seven categories. While Iran constructively participated in the work of this Group, we repeatedly announced that transparency in conventional arms without transparency in WMD, particularly in the sensitive region of the Middle East where Israeli regime continues developing all kinds of WMD, is imbalanced and lacks comprehensiveness.

On the issue of Missiles, where certain developments in recent years has caused concern at the international level, the report of the first UN Panel of Expert on missiles was welcomed by the General Assembly last year and also by the XIII Conference of Heads of States of Non-Align Movement. They also noted with satisfaction the convening of the second Panel which was decided by the GA resolution 57/71. We will submit a draft resolution in the current session which is identical to the one adopted last year and I am confident that it will enjoy the broadest support of the Committee.

Mr. Chairman,

The calamity of Weapons of Mass Destruction which are amongst the most potent threats to peace and security is not something new. Humanity would never forget the victims of bombing of Hiroshima or Sardasht of Iran or Halabja of Iraq. Being the last victim of the weapons of mass destruction at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century gives the Islamic Republic of Iran a unique position and as it is eloquently stated by the Secretary General in his remarks: “weapons of mass destruction do not threaten only western or northern world. Ask the people of Iran, or of Halabja in Iraq.” I can not but stress that the people of Iran are still anguished by the threat posed to the region by WMD.

Drawing upon its bitter experience with respect to WMD and more importantly based on its religious beliefs, Iran has always demonstrated its determination towards total elimination of weapons of mass destruction from the face of the earth.

Actual adherence to three major international treaties in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, namely CWC, BWC and NPT, through making declarations and receiving inspections have produced little rewards except the continuation of the unjustified restrictions against my country.

In the field of nuclear technology, I wish to underline that the construction of the Bushehr nuclear power plant began before the Islamic Revolution by Western countries at a time when in their views it was completely justified for Iran to diversify its sources of energy. Nobody heard stories of why an oil and gas rich country needs nuclear energy, which today has become a cliché. In fact the US State Department in a memorandum right before the revolution, on 20 October 1978, expressed that the US is encouraged by

Iran's efforts to expand its non-oil energy base, and is hopeful that the US-Iran Nuclear Energy Agreement will be concluded soon and that American companies will be able to play a role in Iran's nuclear energy projects. (Digital National Security Archive).

Iran, thus invested heavily in this project. Without fuel, the Bushehr plant would be an abandoned building. These limitations and persistence of the threats to deprive Iran from fuel of the plant, has led us to work toward self-sufficiency and developing indigenous capability in this respect. Hence, in the area of peaceful nuclear technology we had no choice other than working in different ways, even importing the necessary parts from intermediaries, for guaranteeing the future supply of fuel for our under-construction nuclear power plants.

It has already been accepted that some technical failures like other similar cases in the IAEA, have occurred although in this case it has unjustifiably been politicized. We have worked with the IAEA to rectify these technical failures, but it would not mean that we should give in to unreasonable demands that are discriminatory, selective and go beyond the requirements of non-proliferation in accordance with existing IAEA instruments. The benefits of advanced technologies do belong to humanity and no nations must be deprived from utilizing them for peaceful purposes.

Iran has declared on many occasions that it has never pursued a nuclear weapons program and will never do so. Our nuclear program is solely for peaceful purposes and therefore, we have principally no problem with the transparency, including the implementation of the provisions of the Additional Protocol. In this direction, we worked and continue to cooperate with the IAEA to remove all doubts about the peaceful nature of our nuclear program at the earliest possible time. Hopefully, all outstanding issues would be solved if and when the politically motivated propaganda allows that.

Mr. Chairman

In conclusion, I should emphasize that the issues related to the technical failures would eventually be clarified, however, the noncompliance of the others, including the United States, who after 35 years is yet to implement the provisions of nuclear disarmament under Article VI of the NPT or its noncompliance regarding the transfer of nuclear weapons technology to Israel in clear violation of Article I of the NPT must not remain unaddressed.

And the last but not least, one may contemplate that while some Members of this Committee expressed concern over safeguarded peaceful activities of Iran, why even a single reference was not made in their statements in regard to the continued development of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems by Israel.

Let us hope it was a simple negligence and they, like the other members of international community, will truly advocate the collective wisdom and endeavors to achieve a world free from weapons of mass destruction.

Thank you,