

BoG June 2003

Islamic Republic Iran Statement

By H.E Ambassador Salehi

IN THE NAME OF GOD, THE BENEFICENT, THE MERCIFUL

Thank you, Madame Chairperson,

Allow me at the outset to sincerely thank the Director-General and the DDGs Dr. Cetto and Dr. Goldschmidt for their introductory statements. Due to the specificity of this Board Session with regards to my country, allow me, Madame Chairperson – coming from a land boastful of its culture and heritage – to resort to some poetry and words of wisdom, emanating from our prominent world known poets such as Rumi and Hafez, that normally convey a world of meaning in such concise manner – pardon me for the inapt translation:

Indeed the state of your eyes allured war

We were wrong in perceiving peace in them

Oh eye, remember, I had a thousand wisdom and sanity

But now that I am under an illusion, prudence is not to be sane.

I sincerely hope, Madame Chairperson, that under your able leadership, diplomatic skills and experience the Board takes the right course and is steered in the proper direction. Our goal is to get to a destination that is aimed by all and therefore any attempt made otherwise shall certainly not be conducive to the ultimate resolution of the issue at hand.

I would like to express our deep gratitude to the members of Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) for their solidarity, constructive and fruitful deliberations and rendering support to my country. I should also thank His Excellency Ambassador Haniff, Chairman of NAM in Vienna, for delivering the statement on behalf of the NAM members.

Allow me at this point to refer to the report GOV/2003/40. Let me start by a friendly criticism of the way the report was drafted and disseminated. The report has an apparent factual format, but our assessment is that the report could have been crafted in a more partial, fair and balanced manner. Given the political rhetoric in the past few months and the early and awkward directives issued at certain influential capitals on the form, the content and the final conclusion and judgment of the report, one has no other choice but to be realistic and be satisfied with what is at hand – namely the report in front of us. There is still a point of hope holding that not all international organizations have yet come at the stage of total submission.

Madame Chairperson,

It was indeed not very appealing to see a restricted report to be almost thoroughly discussed in CNN the day it was released. Here, I humbly implore all my colleagues in this room to be more vigilant about the possible

unendorsed circulation of restricted reports in the future, so as not inadvertently harm the security interests and rights of any of the Member States. Moreover according to article 5 of Model Safeguards Agreement INFCIRC/153 and article 5, part 2 of item b of INFCIRC/214, summarized information on nuclear material subject to safeguards may only be published upon decision of the Board if the states directly concerned agree thereto. To the best of my knowledge neither my state nor any a priori Board decision has authorized the revelation of the content of this report. Of course, I didn't raise this as a point of contention, but only to stress more watchfulness about, God forbid, similar cases that might pop up in future.

Madame Chairperson,

The crux of the report in front of us deals only with a small amount of 0.13 effective kilogram of natural uranium that we imported in 1991. The material is to be used for the various testing of the different processes involved in our Uranium Conversion Facility (UCF). To remind the Board, this facility has been under the Safeguards Agreement ever since the actual construction of the facility started and that is before my country accepted the Modified Subsidiary Arrangement – a vivid display of my country's transparency and openness. Despite the subtle differences in the interpretation of articles 95 and 34 of INFCIRC/214, nevertheless my country declared the material to the Agency and it is now under its full safeguards. Assuming we admit the negligence in delayed declaration of this small amount of nuclear material (in other words 0.13 effective kg of uranium) that is far below the inspection thresholds of the Agency (i.e. eight kg of Pu; eight kg of U-233; twenty-five kg of U-235), how

one can then explain the following list of essential failures in the SIR 2002, GOV/2003/35.

1- Page 56 paragraph 187- Of the remaining 357 facilities with 1 SQ or more of nuclear material evaluated for 2002, 34 facilities (10%) in 15 states failed to fully attain the quantity component of the inspection goal; and 32 facilities (9%) in 15 states failed to fully attain the timeliness component.

2- Page 59 paragraph 198- At six facilities, the quantity component of the inspection goal has not been attained for several years because the measures foreseen in safeguards approaches could not be implemented.

3- Page 60 paragraph 205 - At six LWRs (seven in 2001), the quantity or timeliness components of the inspection goal couldn't be attained because spent fuel had been loaded into casks for shipment and was therefore unavailable for verification during inspections.

4- The transfer of uranium shielded ammunition into a country in hundreds of kilograms; have they been reported to the Agency's Safeguards either by the country of their origin or by the receiving country in this case, namely Iraq?

The SIR 2002 report clearly shows that hardly any Member State can claim to be impeccable. However, an important trait to seek here is the willingness of the Member States to rectify their possible failure. If indeed our collective purpose is to settle issues and to not turn them into international problems with far reaching repercussions, then we should wisely join in all our forces to

avoid the practice of double standards – a practice normally emanating from political motivation.

Madam Chairperson,

To save you of other questions, could I only and humbly ask the merit of the open question **d** on page 8 of the report? Is there any legal obligation on the part of any Member State to come up with justification on any of its peaceful nuclear activities? Or is it that it is only required of it to report the activities to the Agency and abide by its commitments within the framework of its Safeguards Agreement? Is not the acquirement of peaceful nuclear technology- within the framework of the NPT- the inalienable right of all Member States?

Allow me, Madame Chairperson, within the Vienna spirit, which is the spirit of understanding and cooperation, state my country's principle positions as stated by our Vice President His Excellency Mr. Aghazadeh here at the Agency headquarter in May, 2003 and my own personal convictions.

The Islamic Republic of Iran has fulfilled its obligations under all provisions of the NPT. Iran's position, of denouncing the nuclear option, as a matter of principle, and placing its peaceful nuclear facilities under the full-scope Safeguards Agreement, is a clear manifestation of our commitment to a strong NPT. Iran considers the acquiring, development and use of nuclear weapons inhuman, immoral, illegal and against its very basic principles. They have no place in Iran's defense doctrine. They do not add to Iran's security nor do they help rid the Middle East of weapons of mass destruction, which is in Iran's supreme interests.

The Islamic Republic of Iran believes that all provisions of the NPT are of equal importance. Maintaining the balance of the “rights and obligations” enshrined in the treaty, preserves its integrity, enhances its credibility and encourages both NPT’s universality and its full implementation. Iranians know that more capability necessarily prompts more responsibility. We would prove that accountability is part and parcel of our quest for full nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. We are enforcing our national laws and regulations on the control of nuclear and radioactive material and equipments. We welcome any constructive interaction with other parties including the Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG).

Madame Chairperson,

Many of my colleagues here and the Secretariat are well aware that ever since I started my mission here in Vienna, I have all along done my best to promote the level of cooperation between my country and the Agency and keep the process unhindered and ongoing. Clearly, confidence building requires its own tools and means, one of which is the acknowledgement of each other’s signs of cooperation and sincere intentions and the other is the use of the right language for dialogue. The language of force and threat will be futile and not conducive to the final achievement of our common goal. I ardently hope that the Board takes this essential fact into consideration.

In conclusion, Madame Chairperson, my delegation hopes that rational clarification of points of fact pervade. We wish to reiterate once again that promotion of cooperation and confidence building are best addressed amicably and in an environment of peace. And in this vain, we would like to state over

again our positive consideration of the additional protocol. Certainly, the positive outcome of this session will be conducive towards the settlement of this issue. And finally, Madame Chairperson, we are all here to succeed and not to fail.

Thank you.