FOV before the vote- "The Risk of Nuclear Proliferation in the Middle East"

Mr. Chairperson,

The resolution entitled "The Risk of Nuclear Proliferation in the Middle East", which Israel will vote against, is as close to an absurdity as it comes. We could explain at length why this resolution is politically biased and motivated by the design of its authors to deflect attention from the real proliferation threats, in all their aspects, in the Middle East that include Iran, Syria, Hezbollah and ISIS, but that would simply be to state the obvious.

In a region that has witnessed violations of the NPT by four regional countries; use of chemical weapons in a number of instances in recent years; the wholesale proliferation of rockets and missiles including to states and terrorist organizations; the horrendous slaughter of journalists and aid workers videotaped to ensure terror to the extreme, and the ever-growing proliferation of advanced weapons to terrorist groups in the Middle East; if after all these phenomena this body of the UN can only produce this draft resolution, it says so much more about the misguided intentions of the co-sponsors of the draft than it does about Israel.

To vote for such a resolution is not only to participate in an illusion that Israel is a proliferation risk but also to perpetuate the illusion that the real threats to the Middle East regional security do not exist.

Mr. Chairperson,

We could also point out that the draft resolution's treatment of the whole issue of the Helsinki Conference is perplexing to say the least. While the authors of this resolution do not fail to express their regret that the conference has not been convened in 2012, they conveniently omit the fact that five consultation rounds have been convened by the Finnish
Under-Secretary Laajava in order to promote among regional states the consensus essential for such a meeting. One should not underestimate the importance of these meetings, as this is the first time in many decades that a direct regional discussion has taken place on this complex issue. Israel, for its part, participated in all five consultation rounds at senior and authoritative levels, and has clearly expressed its willingness to participate in another, sixth, round. Other regional states have, unfortunately, chosen to be represented in previous rounds by lower level or to be absent altogether. The Arab group's agreement to participate in a sixth consultation round is pending now for several months.

Israel finds curious the fact that the authors of this resolution prefer to lament the delay of the Helsinki Conference and promote one sided, confrontational and biased resolutions, rather than engage seriously and earnestly in the preparatory work required. One would have to wonder whether the authors are indeed committed to this process and conference as they purport to be.

I thank you.