



Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran

to the United Nations Office and
other International Organizations in Geneva

Statement

by Mr. Mohammad Hossein SAYYADNEJAD

Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran

before the Plenary of the Conference on Disarmament

Geneva, 12 March 2026

In the Name of God, the Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful

Mr. President,

I would like to thank you for convening this meeting under Agenda Item 1. I would also like to express our appreciation to the panelists for their valuable contributions to the discussions of this meeting.

As it is also affirmed by the Final Document of the First Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Disarmament (SSOD-I), nuclear disarmament and the establishment of a world free of nuclear weapons remain the most important objective and priority of the Conference on Disarmament.

We continue to believe that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) constitutes the cornerstone of the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime. When it comes to nuclear disarmament, Article VI of the NPT is recognized as a binding international legal obligation, the existence of which was also affirmed by the International Court of Justice in its 1996 Advisory Opinion. The NPT Review Conferences have also identified specific commitments with regard to nuclear disarmament, which unfortunately, have not only remained unfulfilled but have even experienced setbacks.

The conclusion of the NPT was the result of a grand bargain, under which nuclear-weapon states committed themselves to the elimination of their nuclear arsenals, while non-nuclear-weapon states undertook not to manufacture or otherwise acquire such weapons. The Treaty also recognized the inalienable right of its members to the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

The indefinite extension of the NPT should not be interpreted as the indefinite possession of nuclear weapons by nuclear-weapon states. Unfortunately, these states have not only failed to fulfill their obligations under Article VI, but have in fact acted in ways that run counter to those commitments. The modernization of nuclear arsenals, the increase in the number of nuclear weapons, and the growing reliance on nuclear weapons in military doctrines are examples of such actions. Moreover, some of these countries, within the framework of NATO, have expanded nuclear deterrence arrangements and have stationed nuclear weapons on the territories of several members of this alliance.

Not only have the commitments under Article VI not been implemented, but the excessive emphasis on non-proliferation related issues and the discriminatory and selective implementation of Article IV have also undermined the delicate balance embedded in the Treaty.

The situation we are currently witnessing in the Middle East is the result of ignoring and using as a pretext my country legitimate right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

In order to address fabricated concerns regarding its nuclear activities and to guarantee that it is not seeking to acquire nuclear weapons, Iran entered into negotiations with the United States twice within less than a year. On both occasions, however, Iran was subjected to military attack and aggression in the midst of those negotiations. The United States has demonstrated that it has no intention whatsoever of resolving the issue of Iran's nuclear program and merely uses it as a pretext for military aggression against Iran.

The action of the United States in joining a non-party to the NPT in attacking Iran and its safeguarded nuclear facilities has inflicted serious damage on the credibility, integrity, and coherence of the NPT.

Through their conduct and behavior, the United States and the Israeli regime are sending a dangerous and misleading signal to the world: that, it is possible to remain outside the Treaty and, under the protection and immunity provided by certain countries, continue clandestine and non-transparent nuclear weapons activities.

The approach and conduct of the United States and some Western countries—through political pressure, security threats, and even existential threats—may push some to consider another path.

France and the United Kingdom, including through the upgrading and modernization of their nuclear weapons, nuclear capabilities, and delivery systems, and Germany through its participation in extended nuclear deterrence and its hosting of United States nuclear weapons, continue to act in violation of their obligations under the Treaty.

The establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons was also part of the decision that led to the indefinite extension of the Treaty and will remain valid until it is fully implemented and realized. Some European countries, including France, the United Kingdom, and Germany, while hypocritically expressing support for a Middle East free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, in practice continue their unconditional support for the Israeli regime.

It is a clear mockery of the international community to speak, on the one hand, of a Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction, while on the other hand continuing, in practice, to provide full support to the only possessor of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

Nuclear-weapon-free zones are addressed in general in paragraph 33 of SSOD-I, while the establishment of such a zone specifically in the Middle East is referred to in paragraph 63(d) of the same document. Until it is fully realized, this objective will remain one of the unfinished mandates of the Conference on Disarmament.

Thank you.