

STATEMENT

By

**H. E. Ambassador Soltanieh
Resident Representative
of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the IAEA**

At the Board of Governors

8 March 2006

In the Name of God, the Compassionate the Merciful

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates,

At the outset, I would like to put on record the sincere appreciation of my Government for the valuable support of the Member States belonging to the Non-Aligned Movement and associate myself to the positions declared by the distinguished Ambassador of Malaysia in her capacity as the Chairperson of the NAM.

Mr. Chairman,

Once more, allow me to congratulate the Director General and the Agency on the Nobel Peace Prize. As Dr. ElBaradei stated, this award reinforces the Agency's authority, yet simultaneously, heightens expectations and intensifies its responsibility. To meet the challenge, the Agency has to demonstrate, more than ever before, its commitment, ability and candor in facilitating and assisting development of peaceful nuclear energy—its principle objective—while safeguarding nuclear programs from diversion to prohibited purposes. It must, in the mean time, uphold a proper balance between nuclear non-proliferation, for which it plays a central role, and nuclear disarmament, which is the cornerstone of the Treaty. The task is taunting.

Mr. Chairman,

In recent years, systematic attempts have been pursued to redefine the NPT as a single-purpose treaty. Undertakings on nuclear disarmament are all but forgotten, access to material and technology for peaceful use is blocked, while commitments on non-proliferation are sharpened unabatedly. Latest ambitions:

further, deeper and harsher restrictions on the supply of nuclear technology fastened with total monopolization of nuclear fuel production.

This twisted approach to the world nuclear order betrays fundamental tenets of nuclear non-proliferation and stretches way beyond the borders of absurdity.

The reincarnated non-proliferation mode prescribes exclusive rights of nuclear technology to nuclear weapons holders and supporters, plus outright proliferators, and deprivation for those who have made a vow against weaponisation of this God-Given Gift.

Mr. Chairman,

The message could not be any clearer. The entry ticket to the nuclear club hinges on specific requisites. Seekers of this prestigious, highly rewarding membership may only be pre-qualified if they match one or more of the following categories:

- 1) Persistent, stern and sustained position on maintaining nuclear arsenal and defying nuclear disarmament.
- 2) Systematic and institutional reliance on nuclear arms as a prominent tool of security and promoting its use against real and imaginary threats.
- 3) Refusal to undertake non-proliferation commitments and consistent pursuit of nuclear weapons production and stockpile.

Mr. Chairman,

As outrageous as it sounds and looks, there is no way denying that this is the prevailing reality which governs the new nuclear order.

The NPT received a severe blow when the Review Conference failed to produce the slightest common ground in New York. With recent developments, it has cracked wide open.

It is already contended, however astonishing, that to seek, develop, produce, extend and expand nuclear weapons in full secrecy is legitimate, for any one who has stayed outside the Treaty. Nuclear weapons programs may further be aided, through full fledged nuclear cooperation and opening of the vaults which house nuclear material, technology and equipment.

Let me assert that these comments are by no means directed at India, as India is a friend and partner in the region. India had never been shy in rejecting NPT's discriminatory approach and never hid its intentions to possess nuclear weapons.

The concern is that same model is bound to be adapted and adopted for Israel, with whom the United States enjoys an intimate relationship, and to whom it has already offered assistance in developing nuclear weapons and getting away with it. Efforts to confine the objective of Middle East Free of Nuclear Weapons into territories surrounding the Persian Gulf are telling indications of things to come. As events unfold today, it is by no means inconceivable that Israel's nuclear arms will soon come out of the secret bunkers to gain recognition and reward. Indeed, while bashing Iran, Ambassador Bolton could have gone further and broken this good news to the Israel's supporters. That, would have surely, received a much louder applause.

It is in this same midst that The United States champions the fight against Iran's peaceful nuclear program.

Mr. Chairman,

In sharp contrast to proliferators, Iran has:

stated, stressed, confirmed and reiterated that it rejects nuclear weapons and considers their possession immoral, illegitimate and illegal, worked closely with the Agency towards verification of its peaceful nuclear program, corrected initial failures stemming from western embargo on material and technology, to the best of its ability, stayed committed to the safeguards and applied the Additional Protocol for three consecutive years, voluntarily suspended its activity for a sustained period to promote confidence, received full and verified accountancy of its declared material and activity by the Agency, continued cooperation with the Agency towards the rarely established ruling of absence of undeclared material and activity.

To war-mongers in Washington, however, facts are not relevant, speculations are. These mind-readers, rely on sheer clairvoyance to pass judgment on Iran's intentions. That judgment is then propagated as the basis for action. Easy does it, as no evidence is required to question intentions rather than facts.

How can't cast doubt in the intentions of a state that in one hand clearly based its policies on regime change in Iran and allocating budget and continuously planning for that and in other hand claims itself as global peace maker and advises about the international interest peace and security and tries to justify its unilateral approach in the framework of the international law and organization. We need to ask the people around the world that how much they trust the United States and how much they worry about the invasion and threats of the United States? Particularly in our region every day people show it.

By looking at the countries that were supporting the US in opposing with the peaceful nuclear program of Iran, one can categorize them as follows:

- Some of them have extended their nuclear arsenals and continuously update them
- Some other very recently announced that the use of nuclear weapon in an conventional conflict is legitimate and based it as their military doctrine
- Some other do not possess nuclear weapons but they permitted the Nuclear Weapon States to pile up a lot of nuclear weapons in their territories or officially support the military Pacts who benefit from nuclear arsenals and they share in planning for the use of nuclear weapon.

Attributing non-compliance to Iran's nuclear program is by far the biggest blunder in the Agency's history that definitely will put the credibility of international organizations at jeopardy and create a serious deviations from the statutory mandate of these organizations such an approach would cause damage to the international peace and security.

This is all real-politics, and is not a source of surprise. Question is, though, what purpose would all this brouhaha serve at the end of the day.

This technical and legal question, has from the outset, been transformed to a highly charged and deeply politicized issue. Taking the matter to the Security Council, by application and implication, transcends it to a security issue. This would leave us with no choice but to consider it in that context, hitherto.

Mr. Chairman,

Despite all these odds, we have made a sincere offer for a settlement. The basics were simple:

YOU RESPECT OUR RIGHTS – WE RESPECT YOUR VIEWS.

We examined all the diplomatic channels through Non-Aligned Movement, Russia, China and European countries towards the peaceful and just resolution of the issue. We keep the doors open for negotiation and resolving the issue. We are of the believe that time is needed that this effort bear fruit. But those who hastily and with defiance following a different agenda, do not want to see that other players in international arena can succeed in their efforts.

The offer we made for a compromise was not out of concern about the Security Council.

Surely, we are not naive about the United States sensation and desire to flex muscles. But we also see the bone fractures beneath.

The United States has the power to cause harm and pain. But the United States is also susceptible to harm and pain. So if that is the path that the US wishes to choose, let the ball roll.

Our compromise offer was, in its true essence, a sincere effort to resolve a politicized matter politically, before it gets out of hand.

We Iranians are stern on our principles, but are also fair and able deal-makers. Hence our proposal for a deal ad-interim, to promote diplomacy against confrontation.

A genuine opportunity for diplomacy and collaboration, so compellingly called for in our troubled region, was thus kicked out of the window. Whether and when such opportunity may knock on our doors again, is any body's guess.

For now, we will have to review the situation, adapt our policy, and adjust our approach to conform with the new exigencies.

Mr. Chairman,

Due to the time constraint, I refrain from detail analysis of the DG report and the nuclear dossier in general. My delegation has prepared comprehensive clarification text, which is available for distinguished delegations under INFCIRC/672.

I request my statement to be put on record of the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your attention.