

Conference on Disarmament

18 September 2020

Original: English

Note Verbale dated 16 September from the Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran addressed to the Secretariat of the Conference on Disarmament and transmitting Statements delivered by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the 1543rd and 1546th Plenary meetings of the Conference of Disarmament on 13 of August and 16 September 2020

The Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva presents its compliments to the United Nations Office for Disarmament, in its capacity as the Secretariat of the Conference on Disarmament, and has the honour to request that the attached statements delivered by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran during the plenary sessions of the Conference on Disarmament on 13 August 2020 and 16 September 2020 be registered and circulated as official documents of the 2020 session of the Conference on Disarmament.

The Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the United Nations Office for Disarmament the assurances of its highest consideration.



**Statement by H. E. Mr. Esmaeil Baghaei Hamaneh,
Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Islamic
Republic of Iran before the Conference on Disarmament
(CD)**

Geneva, 13 August 2020

Mr. President,

My delegation would like to congratulate Bangladesh and you, Mr. Ambassador, on your assumption of the CD's presidency and assure you of our support and cooperation. I also thank the Secretariat for their efforts.

Mr. President,

Since this is the first occasion within the past two weeks to appear in an official multilateral format, I would like to take this opportunity to convey our heartfelt condolences to the people and Government of Lebanon for the tragic explosions in Beirut. Our thoughts and prayers are with the great nation of Lebanon.

Mr. President,

The international security environment has not only been deteriorating but is also getting increasingly alarming. The rule of law at the international level as well as the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter have come under severe attacks from coercive and reckless unilateralism. The credibility and efficacy of the United Nations system and multilateral institutions are badly challenged by the United States (U.S.). This would cause irreversible fatal damage to the legal and institutional constructs evolved over the past decades. It has put the entire edifice of post-war multilateralism at serious risk.

Mr. President,

The United States, particularly under the current regime, has engaged in a barrage of outrageous assault against international treaties and multilateral institutions by aggressively violating many international agreements and by recklessly withdrawing from international organizations. The U.S. is the only State that has simultaneously withdrawn from Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), Paris Agreement, World Health Organisation (WHO), Human Rights Council, Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) and Open Skies Treaty. The U.S. has also thickened its criminal records by intensifying its indiscriminate genocidal unilateral sanctions against huge populations across the globe at the cost of violating basic human rights of the targeted people.

The CD is just one long standing victim of this malicious approach. The U.S. has blocked nuclear disarmament and nuclear arms control processes in defiance of its international obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) at the international level while developing new generations of nuclear weapons in the meantime. The U.S. regime has not only militarized internet domains and cyber space by turning it into a tool of coercion and sabotage, but also is set to militarize the outer space as well.

Mr. President,

August 2020 marks the 75th anniversary of the horrific bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by two harrowing nuclear devices. The U.S. gained the infamy of becoming the first and the only user of nuclear weapons against another nation. The international community must join hands for the total, transparent and irreversible elimination of all nuclear weapons and never let any State to use or threat to use them again.

Mr. President,

There is every reason to be concerned about the danger of nuclear weapons in West Asia. While the Israeli regime, the only possessor of nuclear weapons in our region, persists in its blatant defiance of international law by refusing to become committed to relevant

international legal regimes and by further enriching its nuclear arsenal, the Saudi Arabia's nuclear programme is adding another complexity to the already volatile region.

We wish distinguished Ambassador of Saudi Arabia addressed this concern in his remarks this morning instead of bothering to fabricate a thick smokescreen by blaming others for all the wrong-doings, mistakes, and atrocities the Saudi establishment has knowingly been committing with the support and approval of the U.S. across the region.

Saudi Arabia, as a member of the NPT, of course has the right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and which we fully recognize. However, despite the fact that Saudi Arabia is a party to the NPT and has a Comprehensive Safeguard Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), it has questionably failed to abide by its commitments. Lack of transparency and cooperation with the IAEA's inspectors has generated real concerns about the objective and dimensions of Saudi nuclear programme. We call upon Saudi authorities to honour their obligations under the NPT and the Safeguards Agreement and extend cooperation with the IAEA inspection regime.

The IAEA and its Board of Governors have the responsibility to carry out their inspection/verification mandate and submit a report on the status of Saudi's nuclear activities and prevent any misuse of old safeguard loopholes.

It remains to be clarified why the Agency has preferred to be silent in this regard. This, especially in the light of the unjustified haste and prejudices about Iran's peaceful nuclear programme, which is under the IAEA's most robust verification/inspection regime, could raise questions over the Agency's impartiality and unbiasedness. The IAEA is best advised to shield its credibility, impartiality, independence and professionalism against any suspicion to the contrary.

Meanwhile Iran invites Saudi authorities to act like a responsible actor in the region, end carnage and ruthless destruction of Yemen, de-link from violent extremism and terrorism that has ravaged some Arab countries and let the countries in the region re-build collective trust and capitalize on deep – tied bonds of solidarity and good neighbourliness to live in peace and harmony.

Mr. President,

The deterioration of the security environment across the globe has made the Conference on Disarmament and its mandate more relevant than ever before. The declining security climate should not be invoked as an excuse to further exacerbate the arms race or unravel the existing arms treaties; it shall rather serve as an urgent motivator to expedite disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament.

The nuclear weapon States should demonstrate their political will to achieve nuclear disarmament. The only guarantee to remove the threat of nuclear weapons, is transparent, irreversible and total elimination of all nuclear weapons. Under NPT's Article VI, as unanimously confirmed by the International Court of Justice (ICJ), "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control". This is an explicit legal obligation with no ambiguity or conditionality.

Lack of political will to make progress in nuclear disarmament could not be compensated by an over-emphasis on non-proliferation.

Mr. President,

I would like to reaffirm the role and mandate of the CD as the single multilateral negotiating forum devoted to disarmament. Political will is the prerequisite for any meaningful negotiations to implement this mandate. This is all the more critical in the era of radical and reckless unilateralism that has tremendously risked the fundamentals of multilateralism, and the basic rules of civilized engagement. The international community should not be bullied into inaction nor should it be coerced into appeasement.

Mr. President,

In response, partly to the United States' representative and partly to the Saudi Ambassador that along with the Israeli regime are the only actors that have maliciously

aimed at torpedoing the JCPOA and the relevant United Nations Security Council resolution 2231, out of their contempt for international law and the United Nations Charter, I would rather read out some excerpts from a very recent written opinion published by Minister Zarif, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, as following.

In July 2015, Iran, the United States, Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany signed a landmark agreement to satisfy any concerns over the exclusively peaceful nature of our nuclear program while relieving the Iranian people of inhumane and unjust sanctions. As part of the JCPOA, the U.S. and other signatories also jointly co-sponsored United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231, which embraces the nuclear deal and to which its full 90 pages are attached, thus enshrining the accord into international law. However, in May 2018 the U.S. administration declared that it had unilaterally opted for "ceasing participation" in the JCPOA. Since then, Iran and the rest of the international community have been left in the extraordinary position of watching the U.S. become the first government in United Nations history that not just violates a binding resolution it itself sponsored, but also punishes those governments and companies that uphold international law by implementing its provisions. As I warned the Security Council last month, this status quo is neither desirable nor sustainable. We are thus at a crossroads.

The U.S. administration's disinformation campaign — including false and forged claims regarding a regional consensus about the consequences of the remaining signatories to the JCPOA upholding the deal's provisions, including normalizing Iran's defense cooperation with the world in October — is a ruse to disguise its real, more malevolent motivations: having failed to collapse Resolution 2231 after over two years of the most brutal "maximum pressure" ever imposed on a nation — including depriving ordinary Iranians of access to medicines and medical equipment amid the deadliest pandemic the world has seen in many decades — the U.S. now hopes to abuse its mal-interpretation of the provisions of the same resolution it abandoned in 2018 to finally destroy it. This deeply malicious U.S. behaviour is evident throughout the United Nations, where it seeks to use the United Nations itself to effectively destroy the world body.

There are several key issues and consequences to consider in this equation.

First and foremost, one may wonder why or how the collapse of a single United Nations Security Council resolution on a niche subject relates to the bigger picture. It does, for most notably it would be a generational setback for the cause of multilateralism should the Security Council be bullied into torpedoing its own resolution. Unless all powers respect the principles which the Council was created to embody, it cannot perform its duties, nor can any nation acknowledge its authority.

If the U.S. is allowed to continue on this path, the world will slide backwards toward a "might makes right" standard. And while this may sound appealing to Cold Warriors looking for new targets, even that standard has its limits. For both superpowers of the past century witnessed the unravelling of their international influence in their military defeat in Afghanistan, a country with a GDP that is 14 times smaller than Apple Inc.'s annual revenue.

We have also seen in past years how the U.S. administration has — in parallel with its assault on international institutions and accords — sought to supplant international law with its own domestic laws. In practice, this has meant that it is now the U.S. Treasury and not European national governments which decide with whom European companies can do business — be it under Resolution 2231 or their own North Stream gas lifeline.

While it has so far primarily been the U.S. that has sought to expand the jurisdiction of its domestic laws, there is nothing to suggest that it will retain a monopoly on it.

Thus, the international community in general — and the United Nations Security Council in particular — face an important decision: do we maintain respect for the rule of law, or do we return to the law of the jungle? While Iran has proven its resilience and decisive response to coercive bullying, I am confident that — in the next few critical weeks and months — members of the Security Council will refute the campaign struggle of a beleaguered U.S. administration to turn what was the diplomatic achievement of the 21st

Century into an exercise in futility, and in the process annihilate what is left of multilateralism and international law.”

I thank you Mr. President.

Statement by Mr. Nabi Azadi Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran before the Conference on Disarmament

Geneva, 16 September 2020

Mr. President,

My delegation would like to appreciate all your efforts in steering our collective consultations to finalize the draft report of the Conference on Disarmament (CD).

Mr. President,

While reaffirming the role and mandate of the CD as the single multilateral negotiating forum devoted to disarmament, we urge all CD members who value the rule of law, international law based order and multilateralism to demonstrate political will in order to advance the mandate of the CD and by adopting a comprehensive, balanced and inclusive programme of work on four core issues in next year session in accordance with the final document of the SSODI.

Mr. President,

As we are approaching the end of 2020 Session of the Conference on Disarmament, we regret that the CD failed again to break its long stalemate due to lack of political will and sense of responsibility on the part of certain nuclear weapon actors. The continuing dominance of radical unilateralism in the U.S. foreign policy has negatively affected many multilateral institutions including this body. No State that values international law, the rule of law at the international level as well as international peace and security can remain indifferent to this destructive and malign approach.

The U.S. regime's obsession to destroy multilateral institutions and discredit the United Nations was very recently manifested in their ill-advised attempt to unilaterally demolish the United Nations Security Council resolution 2231. They first tried to force the Security Council to undo certain part of that resolution in the hope that their move would lead to annihilation of the JCPOA. That attempt failed thanks to the general recognition by the Council's membership that the US' move was absolutely baseless, totally unjustified, legally invalid and extremely consequential for the credibility and functioning of the Security Council.

The U.S. has now made another malevolent attempt to corner the whole international community by bullyingly abusing the provisions of the JCPOA. It illegally abandoned in May 2018 to level a fatal last blow to the JCPOA. The response given by the overwhelming majority of the Security Council was only responsible and thoughtful. We do hope that each and every member of the Security Council recognize their historic responsibility in defending the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter as well as the basic tenets of law and justice against the malice of those who have long sought to flatten the fundamentals of multilateralism and rule of law.

Mr. President,

We are living in a world where the president of the country that has the most sophisticated weapons of mass destruction (WMD) arsenal, is proudly talking about assassinating leaders of other countries and in fact has already committed such crime.

On 14 September 2020, the President of the United States of America, made a baseless allegation against the Islamic Republic of Iran and threatened to use force against my country. Such a provocative statement constitutes a gross violation of the very fundamental principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, particularly its Article 2(4) that clearly prohibits the threat or use of force. Of course this is not the first time that the President of the United States has threatened to use force against Iran.

Following the horrific assassination of Major General Qasem Soleimani, he threatened on five different occasions to use force against Iran. We seriously warn about

any further military adventurism against Iran by the United States who must bear the full responsibility for all consequences.

The irresponsible policies and unlawful practices of the United States pose a serious threat to international peace and security. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the United Nations Security Council to demand that the United States put an end to its threats and provocative and destabilizing policies and hold the U.S. authorities accountable for its wrongful and very dangerous acts.

The Islamic Republic of Iran will not hesitate to exercise its inherent right to self-defense to protect its people, defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity and secure its national interests against any aggression.

Mr. President,

Our position with regard to the draft report of the CD is clear. We still are of the view that the best practice is to mention the names of the CD members that served as the presidents for the 2020 sessions in paragraph 4. We are not against para 5 as it is proposed. After almost 40 years of CD's activities, it is very weird that the CD is disallowed to name its presidents. It is very unfortunate that the CD is being played by one delegation, when they opposed reflecting the names of the 6 presidents in Para 4 and at the same time they accepted mentioning the names of the very 6 presidents in other paras.

It should be mentioned that if the presidents of the 2020 Session compromised on their right not to state their names in Para 4, this format should not be interpreted in any way as setting a precedent for future. We believe that Para 5 is not a substitute for Para 4.

I thank you Mr. President,
