



CONTENTS

Agenda item 130:

Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security (*continued*)

Page

951

*President:* Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq).

**AGENDA ITEM 130**

**Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security (*continued*)**

1. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): Immediately after the Israeli air force attacked the Iraqi nuclear installations on 7 June this year the Security Council convened to consider the question. As the Japanese delegation made clear at that time,<sup>1</sup> the Government of Japan finds it extremely regrettable that Israel took such an outrageous action, and strongly condemns it. Japan considers the violation of the territorial airspace of Iraq and the destruction of its facilities to be a flagrant breach of international law and the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly those relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes and the non-use of force. Japan's view, which I have just outlined, has also been conveyed by Foreign Minister Sonoda to Israeli leaders on various occasions.

2. On 19 June this year the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 487 (1981), which clearly expresses the will of the international community on this question. At that meeting of the Security Council,<sup>2</sup> however, Israel stated that it rejected the resolution. It must be noted that Israel's rejection of this Security Council resolution is an obvious indication of its disregard of the Security Council and of the United Nations in general. Indeed, it demonstrates that Israel has chosen not to heed the voice of the international community. The Government of Japan appeals strongly to Israel to reconsider its attitude and to implement that resolution. We are heartened, on the other hand, to note that the use of force has not escalated since the attack last June. We highly value the self-restraint which Iraq and the States friendly to it have been exercising.

3. Japan has on many occasions expressed its view that Israel and the Palestinians, together with the Arab countries, should recognize each other's position and that a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East should be achieved through a process of peace talks. Japan for its part has been exerting efforts towards this end. From this standpoint as well we find it regrettable

that the Israeli attack on Iraq's nuclear installations has impeded the achievement of peace in the region and we urge Israel to refrain from carrying out similar action in the future.

4. The Japanese people are particularly disturbed by the incident since it involves the question of nuclear development. Japan, the only nation to have experienced devastation by the atomic bomb, has been actively promoting nuclear disarmament as the item of first priority in the field of disarmament as a whole. It has also been exerting vigorous efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The incident is particularly serious since it constitutes a grave challenge to the safeguards system of IAEA and indeed to the régime of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*].

5. I wish to conclude my remarks today by reaffirming Japan's position that further efforts must be made to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and that the countries which are not yet party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, including Israel, should accede to it as soon as possible.

6. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to begin my statement by congratulating the State of Antigua and Barbuda on its admission to the United Nations. We hope that its admission and its participation in our work will help us to achieve the ideals and objectives of the United Nations.

7. We are dealing in this meeting with a new question which the General Assembly is considering, namely, the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations. This issue reflects at the same time the continuance of the aggressive expansionist policy pursued by Israel since its usurpation of the Arab lands in Palestine and the new aspect of the Israelis' appetite, which this time extended to the economic establishments of the Arab States.

8. What Israel did on 7 June of this year ought not to be taken at its face value as just another in a series of Israeli acts of aggression, but also as an alarm signal to all States that want to make use of technology in all its forms in the service of their economic development programmes. This Israeli aggression should also be seen as reflecting Israel's hostility to and obstruction of any economic and social progress by any other State in the region. This was truly expressed by the French newspaper *Le Monde*, when it said on 10 June 1981 that Israel cannot dominate the area without the technical assistance of the West, particularly the United States of America, and that it has a great interest in keeping the Arabs in a state of underdevelopment.

9. The Iraqi nuclear installations were intended to train 500 Arab engineers and technicians. That is what Israel wanted to stop—as if it could halt the scientific progress of a whole nation. It is a contradiction that Israel, which possesses the technical know-how to make nuclear weap-

ons, which has had working nuclear reactors since the 1950s and which refuses to adhere to the international Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or to accept the safeguards of IAEA, is, at the same time, opposing Iraq's basic right, guaranteed by international law, to have nuclear installations to be used for peaceful purposes although Iraq has committed itself to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and accepted the IAEA safeguards.

10. With its military arsenal Israel is obviously disregarding the simplest international laws, conventions and norms. Israel's conduct in the pursuit of its illegitimate objectives is dictated solely by the logic of force. This attitude has even been challenged by certain Israelis. I should like to quote something that was said by Mr. Moshe Sharett, the first Foreign Minister and the second Prime Minister of Israel, in his diary, parts of which have recently been published in the United States. He said:

"What shocks and worries me is the narrow-mindedness of our military leaders. They seem to presume that the State of Israel may or even must behave in the realm of international relations according to the laws of the jungle."

Furthermore, the former Israeli official stated, with regard to Israel's use of the concept of legitimate defence:

"The phenomenon that has prevailed among us for years and years is that of insensitivity to acts of wrong . . . to moral corruption. . . . For us an act of wrong is in itself nothing serious, we wake up to it only if the threat of a crisis or a grave result—the loss of a position, the loss of power or influence—is involved; we do not have a moral approach to moral problems but a pragmatic approach to moral problems."

11. The Director General of IAEA put forward a new concept of the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations when he said, on 9 June 1981:

"This attack on the Iraqi nuclear centre is a serious development with far-reaching implications. The Agency's safeguards system is a basic element of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. During my long time here, I do not think we have been faced with a more serious question than the implications of this development. The Agency has inspected the Iraqi reactors and has not found evidence of any activity not in accordance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty. A country [which is not a party to the Treaty] has evidently not felt assured by our findings and about our ability to continue to discharge our safeguarding responsibilities effectively. In the interest of its national security, it has felt motivated to take military action. From a point of principle, one can only conclude that it is the Agency's safeguards régime which has also been attacked. Where will this lead us in future? This is a matter of grave concern . . ."

12. The new concept reflected by the Director General of IAEA is that Israel is not only an expansionist State, practising aggression and preventing peoples and States from fulfilling their right to economic progress, but also one that seeks to destroy agencies and institutions accepted by the international community as instruments to observe and develop its technological activities. At a meeting on 25 September 1981, IAEA adopted resolution GC/(XXV)/RES/381, which referred to the Israeli aggression under discussion as aggression against the Agency and its monitoring and safety systems. That resolution is

indeed an expression of the international awareness of the very concept of the Israeli policy that we are discussing.

13. My delegation believes that it is time for the international community, having realized the true Israeli objectives—and their aggressive nature does not require any further evidence—to deter that country and compel it to accept the responsibilities to which it has committed itself and the consequences of its acts, and force it to respect the principles and agreements accepted by the international community.

14. Security Council resolution 487 (1981) on the Israeli aggression, adopted on 19 June 1981, is considered by my delegation to be the minimum action to be taken by an international body which is responsible for preserving world peace and security and ensuring States' compliance with, and implementation of, the principles of the Charter. We all wish to express our disappointment that the operative paragraphs of that resolution have not yet been implemented. This compels us to demand that urgent and decisive steps be taken against Israel for its disregard for the Security Council resolutions, compelling it to abide by those resolutions. There are Articles in the Charter which deal with such a situation, and the remedy should be sought there.

15. My delegation calls upon the General Assembly to safeguard Iraq's full right, and for that matter the right of all States, particularly the developing ones, to have a programme for the utilization of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes and economic development. My delegation also calls upon the Security Council to take the necessary effective measures to prevent Israel from repeating its aggression and its violation of the right of other States to live freely, peacefully and prosperously.

16. Moreover, we call on all the Powers which supply Israel with the military and economic capability which enables it to perpetrate its aggression to desist from doing so forthwith and force Israel to respect international principles and rules.

17. We have before us a draft resolution [A/36/L.14] submitted by a group of States, including my country, Kuwait. Our aim is not merely to secure the adoption of this draft resolution but also to serve world peace and security, and in particular the right of States to achieve economic progress. Therefore we hope that it will be dealt with promptly and seriously.

18. Mr. AL-QASIMI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The fact that a large number of delegations agreed that this item should be discussed by the General Assembly in plenary meetings shows its importance, and the seriousness of the Israeli aggression against peace not only in our region but throughout the world. Moreover, it makes clear the serious consequences of such aggression as regards the system of safeguards and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The fact that we have brought this matter to the General Assembly means that we are not satisfied with Security Council resolution 487 (1981) so far as the question of the aggression and the condemnation of that aggression are concerned. As we all know, that resolution does not correspond to the seriousness of the act and its consequences; its shortcomings are the result of the position of some countries and their threat to use the veto. We trust that after its discussion of this question the General Assembly will fill the gaps and adopt a resolution commen-

surate with our hopes, so that Israel will not repeat such acts of aggression and will be held accountable for them.

19. The aggression committed against the Iraqi nuclear reactor, after criminal bombings of refugee camps in the south of Lebanon and of civilian installations in Beirut, is another act of a series of Israeli attacks on Palestinians and Arab countries. This act of aggression goes even further, since it exemplifies a recrudescence of aggression in terms both of strength and of distance. In the past Israel had limited itself to attacking neighbouring countries but in this case it extended its criminal actions to a non-neighbouring country, Iraq. That means that the other Arab countries that are far away from Israel, including my own country, are also exposed to such acts of aggression and bombings whenever Israel wishes.

20. My country, an oil-producing country, refuses to accept the logic of Israel that the oil-producing countries do not need other sources of energy because they have oil. If we were to admit that racist logic, our communities, our societies, would remain technologically underdeveloped and we should be deprived of all the advantages of modern technology in regard to the environment, medicine and other achievements necessary for the progress of our society.

21. We are faced with a very serious and unique case: Israel's disregard of all relevant resolutions adopted by the Organization and the specialized agencies. But Israel's misdeeds do not end there. There is also the falsification of all the ideas of scientists and jurists and even of the Charter itself, which has not escaped Israel's distortion. I need not go into the details, since they were all stated at the June 1981 series of Security Council meetings on this subject.

22. Since the international community has condemned Israel's brutal aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, as have the members of the Security Council, is the international community going to do something about this, knowing that Menachem Begin, at a press conference in Tel Aviv on 10 June of this year, said that if Iraq ever reconstructed its reactor, Israel would do everything in its power to destroy it again?

23. That is a logic that is rejected by the international community and by the Charter, which reject the use of force and the threat of force. It is a logic that is rejected also because it is Israel that sows terror by possessing the atomic bomb, not Iraq. It is rejected because it is a logic founded on odious racism, which permits Israel alone to be the sole judge of the acts of other States.

24. Such Israeli aggression against Iraq constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charter and of the norms of international law. To justify that brutal act of aggression Israel claims to have resorted to the right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter. The members of the Security Council, individually and collectively, rejected that argument. A large number of countries, including countries friendly to Israel, in the statements by representatives of their Governments have rejected that argument and condemned that act of aggression. Therefore, Israel has abused that right and distorted the meaning and scope of that right.

25. This is not the first time that Israel has distorted reality and destroyed the legal principles established by generations of people. Israel has accused the United Nations and the whole world of hypocrisy. Has not the inter-

national community said that the occupation by Israel of the West Bank and Gaza and the establishment of settlements are illegal acts, whereas Israel claims that they are legal? In defiance of the international community Israel has changed the name of the West Bank, calling it Judea and Samaria, as it has previously changed the names of other Palestinian cities. Has not the international community condemned the illegal attempts by Israel to distort the history of Al Quds Al Sharif (Jerusalem) and the holy Al-Aqsa Mosque, while Israel has accused the international community of ignorance and underdevelopment?

26. But let us concede Israel's point that the international community is hypocritical. Does Israel consider that the late President Eisenhower of the United States was being a hypocrite when he rejected Israel's justification of its attack on Egypt in 1956 as an act of self-defence and warned Israel that he would cut off all military and economic assistance if Israel did not withdraw from Egypt?

27. The principle of self-defence in international law is based on two main elements: first, there must be an urgent need to exercise that right; and, secondly, there must be a certain proportionality between the right of self-defence and the threat of danger. The Iraqi reactor was clearly not a danger to Israel, because according to the evidence of IAEA experts who regularly inspected that reactor—the last inspection was in January 1981—there was no sign that that reactor was devoted to the production of atomic bombs. So the element of urgent need does not apply here. With regard to the second element, that is, proportionality, the brutal act of aggression by Israel against the Iraqi reactor and the destruction of it, with the murder of many civilians, and the violation of the airspace of two countries cannot be considered to be commensurate with the danger of the existence of the Iraqi reactor, which was devoted to peaceful ends. That reactor posed no danger to Israel. It is clear that the logic of right does not support the allegations with which Israel seeks to justify its actions in saying that the reactor could have produced atomic bombs in the future. Israel took upon itself the right to attack the Iraqi reactor even though it represented no danger. It was simply a prejudice that the reactor constituted a threat to Israel.

28. International logic has already rejected the arguments of Nazi Germany. How, then, can the international community accept the arguments of Nazi Zionism? The international community rejected the Nazi argument that its aggression against Poland was necessary because of certain border incidents because there was no element of proportionality with the seriousness of the danger. Even admitting there was urgent need, the brutal German attack by sea, air and land against Poland in 1939 could not be justified in terms of its being commensurate with the danger that Poland posed.

29. Israel alone and individually could never be the sole judge for recourse to that right. That is a principle established and recognized in international law and affirmed by Oppenheim in his treatise on international law:

"It does not follow from the character of the right of self-defence—conceived as an inherent, a natural right—that the States resorting to it possess the legal faculty of remaining the ultimate judges of the justification of their action."<sup>3</sup>

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.

30. This element was also affirmed by the Tokyo Tribunal in the 1948 trial of Japanese war criminals. That Tribunal said that the right of self-defence does not confer upon the State resorting to war the authority to make a final determination upon the justification of its action.

31. Recourse to the right of self-defence by Israel or other countries is subject to the Charter and the authority of the Security Council, which alone has the right to justify or reject the exercise of that right. This has also been affirmed by Mr. Oppenheim, as follows:

“Unless it is to become an occasion for licence and lawlessness, an inherent right must be controlled by and accountable to a higher authority. . . . The clear terms of Article 51 adequately express that general principle of jurisprudence.”\*<sup>3</sup>

32. To justify its attack on the Iraqi reactor, Israel alleges that Iraq is manufacturing nuclear weapons. That groundless allegation, which has been rejected by everyone, casts doubt on the international safeguards system and is a threat to its existence. This act of aggression creates a most serious precedent, which will have dire consequences for international peace and security.

33. As we all know, many countries possess nuclear reactors which they use for peaceful purposes. Those countries have somewhat strained relations with neighbouring countries. If one or more of those countries were to follow Israel's example and destroy reactors of neighbouring countries, that would be a reversion to the law of the jungle and a violation of the established international system, as well as a threat to international peace and security.

34. In the light of my statement concerning the Israeli act of aggression, and the examples I have cited, the General Assembly is in duty bound to punish Israel and to take measures to deter it, if there is to be peace and security in the world.

35. Mr. SULAIMAN (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): General Assembly resolution 32/50, of 8 December 1977, on the peaceful use of nuclear energy for economic and social development, contains one of the basic principles concerning the legitimate rights of States to develop or acquire technology for the peaceful use of nuclear energy. This is not a right conferred on some and denied to others, because all countries are equal when it comes to the utilization of science and technology; all have access to technical know-how and to all other opportunities offered by atomic energy for economic and social development, whether those countries produce other sources of energy or not. Furthermore, this is considered to be a basic principle that should guide the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, to be held at Geneva in 1983.

36. The installation of the Iraqi nuclear reactor came as a positive result of international co-operation to ensure that nuclear science and technology would serve peaceful purposes and economic development once Iraq became a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Needless to say, the co-operation in installing that reactor was in keeping with that Treaty and in accordance with its principles. Iraq, therefore, submitted its reactor to the inspection and control of the competent authorities—IAEA. According to that Agency and to the

States which assisted Iraq in building the reactor, it served exclusively peaceful purposes. In this connection I would cite the following testimony of the Director General of IAEA before the Board of Governors on 9 June 1981:

“Iraq has been a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty since it came into force in 1970. In accordance with that Treaty, Iraq accepted Agency safeguards on all its nuclear activities. These safeguards have been satisfactorily applied to date, including during the recent period of armed conflict with Iran. The last safeguards inspection at the Iraqi nuclear centre took place in January of this year, and all the material there was satisfactorily accounted for. This material included the fuel so far delivered for the Tamuz reactors.”\*

37. In the light of the foregoing, we can appreciate the gravity of the act of aggression and of the consequences for the established safeguards system. We can also see how serious are the consequences for the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, as well as for international peace and security. For all those reasons, the delegation of Oman, together with other delegations, requested the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the General Assembly.

38. The international community has condemned this odious act of Israeli aggression, and the Security Council adopted resolution 487 (1981), which recognized the inalienable sovereign right of Iraq to establish programmes of technological and nuclear development to develop its economy and industry for peaceful purposes. No one has believed the false allegations and claims made by Israel to justify its brutal act of aggression; Israel has violated the basic principles of the Charter and the rules of international law, as well as the provisions of United Nations resolutions, such as General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), concerning the use of armed force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State.

39. From the legal standpoint, there is no justification for Israel's claim that the act of aggression was an act of self-defence. For, in principle, there can be no talk of self-defence as long as there is no actual or imminent armed attack. There would have to be certain elements, of which we are all aware, for such self-defence to be valid: a direct attack, for instance, when there is hardly any option and the situation is clear-cut.

40. In modern-day international relations, it is not permissible to resort to so-called preventive war in order to forestall an expected danger. The Charter has put an end to this idea of preventive war, to which some Powers have resorted in the past, given the danger inherent in that concept. For countries which have undertaken aggression have arrogated to themselves the right to decide what constituted a “threat” or an “expected danger”. Moreover, the Iraqi nuclear installations were designed for peaceful uses, not military or aggressive ones.

41. The Israeli representative went even further in his statement in the Security Council last June<sup>4</sup> by stating that the Israeli attack was a moral act of self-defence. We have the right to wonder whether, after having laid bare the illegal aspect of the Israeli allegations, it is a question of occupying the territory of others by force or of attacking innocent civilians, or whether it is not rather a recourse to the law of the jungle—to a surprise attack and a premeditated criminal act. Israel's record here is replete with that

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.



country's indifference to international values and ethics, and we must never consider Israeli aggression as an isolated act. We can never regard it as an isolated act separate from other acts, for all the Israeli practices are identical, unless this one is meant to crown its various violations of international law, of its annexation of other territories by force, of its non-compliance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention with regard to occupied territories. Furthermore, Israel does not recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and continues to launch attacks against refugee camps and against its neighbours. This contempt of morality was illustrated by Moshe Sharett, the former Israeli Foreign Minister, in the diary that was published after his death:

"The phenomenon that has prevailed among us for years and years is that of insensitivity to acts of wrong, to moral corruption. For us, an act of wrong is in itself nothing serious. We wake up to it only if the threat of a crisis or a grave result—the loss of power or influence—is involved. We do not have a moral approach to moral problems, but a pragmatic approach to moral problems."\*

42. It is clear that Israel, after its attack on the peaceful Iraqi nuclear reactor, revealed its intentions of imposing its technological and strategic superiority in the region. It is a proof of Israel's refusal to accept any peaceful solution in this sphere, for the fact that Israel seeks to impose its supremacy and its superiority by force obviously shows that it disregards all the efforts the Organization has made to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

43. The serious nature of the situation arises from the fact that Israeli aggression is a direct threat to international peace and security, since endangering the system of international guarantees is also tantamount to endangering the United Nations system and the Charter. It must also be regarded as a sign of contempt for IAEA and its continuing efforts in behalf of the peaceful uses of atomic energy throughout the world.

44. In addition, everyone knows that Israel has so far refused to become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Israel does not open its nuclear installations to any inspection or allow them to be subject to any control. Israel is continuing to co-operate with the racist régime of South Africa in the nuclear sphere, and there is abundant evidence that the two régimes are carrying out nuclear experiments in the South Atlantic. There is also proof that Israel possesses the material that would enable it to produce a nuclear weapon, if it has not already done so, as was mentioned in the report of the Secretary-General on Israeli nuclear armament [A/36/431].

45. In the face of the aggressive Israeli acts condemned by the international community, we consider that it is the Organization's duty to take effective measures to dissuade the criminal aggressor in conformity with draft resolution A/36/L.14, which is now before the General Assembly.

46. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): From the beginning, Romania has clearly expressed its position concerning the Israeli attack against Iraqi nuclear installations which is the subject of the agenda item before the General Assembly, which was included at the request of more than 40 countries.

47. The Romanian delegation is once again taking part in this debate, first of all to reaffirm my country's unwavering position on problems of the greatest importance relating to the inadmissibility of the use or threat of force, the need to ensure strict respect for the independence, territorial integrity, the right of every country to develop and to devote all available resources to that development, and to ensure that the international conduct of all States is fully in accord with those principles. Any act that violates those principles and those basic norms of international law must give rise to the most severe response and condemnation on the part of all the States of the international community.

48. The Romanian Government and public opinion in my country have from the very outset forcefully condemned that act of armed aggression as a serious violation of the basic principles and norms of international law. This is clearly set forth in the statement of the Romanian Press Agency authorized by the Romanian Government and distributed as a Security Council document<sup>5</sup>, as well as in the statements made by the Romanian representatives in the Security Council and in bodies of IAEA.

49. The Israeli air raid caused deep concern throughout the world and was rejected by all States as a flagrant violation of the Charter and an act intolerable in present-day international relations. That widespread condemnation was most clearly expressed in Security Council resolution 487 (1981), in the decisions and statements of the Board of Governors of IAEA and in other international organizations and meetings, as well as in most States.

50. As we have already stated, the premeditated and unjustified attack by Israel constitutes a serious violation of the norms of behaviour which govern relations between States, of the basic principle of independence and national sovereignty, of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, of territorial integrity and of non-recourse to the threat or use of force.

51. It has been the consistent position of Romania to support and strongly defend the absolute value of those principles, and to promote their strict application between all the countries of the world. In the light of those principles, of generally recognized imperative norms, one could not in any way or from any quarter, in any circumstance or under any pretext, accept the use of force, acts of aggression or armed attacks against other peoples.

52. Such acts are inadmissible because they constitute the greatest challenge to the sovereign rights of peoples and States and seriously endanger the security of all countries and of the whole world, bearing in mind the spectre of the most devastating of wars. The international community must reject even more strongly the thesis of pre-emptive strikes or wars, especially when one seeks to establish it as a political doctrine, because pre-emptive strikes and wars are unacceptable from the point of view of respect for the fundamental rights and duties of States and are particularly serious and dangerous for the maintenance of international peace and security.

53. Romania, like other States, has stressed the fact that such an act would constitute a very dangerous precedent of extreme seriousness in the international situation today.

54. It is an unquestionable truth that one cannot guarantee the security of any State by armed aggression against other States. Quite to the contrary, the use of armed force and all aggressive actions are a source of insecurity be-

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.

cause they are inevitably followed by reactions and responses with serious repercussions for the peoples concerned and for world peace and security.

55. It is well known that Romania has set as one of the fundamental objectives of its policy the promotion of exclusively peaceful solutions to disputes between States and to all international problems. It was at the initiative of Romania that that problem has been considered in the Organization for two years. As the President of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, has affirmed many times, there is no conflict or contentious problem in the world that cannot be settled politically. There is no reason for Governments to resort to weapons to resolve their differences. Rather, the interests of every people and the general interests of peace absolutely require that recourse to force and to military action be excluded once and for all from international life, and that problems between States be settled only through negotiation.

56. The delegation of Romania would also like to take this opportunity strongly to reaffirm the inalienable right of every country to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, its right of access on a non-discriminatory basis to scientific discoveries and know-how in that field, to nuclear equipment and to technology. Any act aimed at preventing or restricting the exercise of that right would violate a fundamental principle of the Charter, that of the sovereign equality of all States. It would affect international co-operation, placing new obstacles in the path of the solution of the social and economic problems facing all countries, particularly the developing countries, which in turn undermines world peace and security.

57. Whatever the requirements or the implications of the safeguards system for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, whatever the opinion which a State may have as to the effectiveness of that system, no one can deny or prevent, in any form or under any pretext, the exercise by another country of its right to make use of nuclear energy for purposes of economic and social development or to invoke that system in order to attack the sovereignty, independence or security of other States. Just as with the right to territorial integrity and sovereignty, the right of a State to select the means and the resources for its development cannot be questioned. It is even less admissible for the rights of other countries in that field to be questioned by a State which is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and which has not accepted any commitment in that regard.

58. Respect for the inalienable right of every country to the fullest use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes is a fundamental principle which has been embodied many times in resolutions of the United Nations and of IAEA and which has been even more forcefully brought out in the discussion that has just concluded on item 14, concerning the report of the Agency.

59. Consequently, one of the conclusions which the General Assembly should express after our debate must be the reaffirmation of the sovereign and inalienable right of every country to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, the right of access to scientific know-how and nuclear technology, as an integral part of its right to development.

60. The consideration of this agenda item once again confronts us with one of the most serious and long-standing conflicts the world has ever known, namely, that of the Middle East. The fact that such an extremely dan-

gerous act can take place is not unrelated to the particularly tense situation in that region, which contains an enormous explosive potential.

61. While strongly condemning the military action of Israel, Romania has continuously maintained that such a complicated situation in the Middle East can only be resolved by political means, by way of negotiations. Developments in the Middle East show that it is more than ever necessary to proceed without further delay to the attainment of a just and lasting global settlement of that conflict. Romania has stated more than once, from the beginning of the conflict, that a viable solution should provide for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Arab territories occupied after the 1967 war. At the same time, it is necessary to recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including the right to the establishment of its own independent State. The course of events continuously shows that one cannot conceive of an equitable solution of the conflict and the achievement of a climate of peace and security in the Middle East without resolving the Palestinian problem, which is a fundamental component of a lasting settlement in the region. A peace settlement should also include guarantees for the independence and territorial integrity of all States in the region.

62. The Romanian Government and President Ceausescu have often expressed the view that, given the conditions in the area, the most appropriate framework for reaching a global peace settlement would be the convening of an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO]. In present-day conditions, the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East is dictated not only by the urgent needs of all the peoples in the region fully to apply their material and human potential to economic and social development, but also by the vital need to put an end to the arms race in that area and to prevent at all costs the stationing or production of nuclear weapons in the Middle East.

63. At the end of this debate, the General Assembly should firmly condemn, as the Security Council did last June, the Israeli attack as being a grave violation of the Charter and of the fundamental standards governing the conduct of States. The clear conclusion which should be drawn by the General Assembly and by every Member State is that the international community is resolved not to tolerate such acts which jeopardize the interests of all peoples and the maintenance of peace and security, and that no one can for any reason or under any circumstances violate the sovereignty and independence of another State.

64. It is the imperative duty of every Government and every politician to ensure that the interests of peace prevail and to put an immediate end to any acts which might further endanger the situation in the Middle East or place new obstacles in the way of a peaceful political settlement.

65. We believe that in present-day international circumstances the United Nations should place the question of resolute action against the threat or use of force before all others so that the use of military means to settle international problems may be renounced for ever. Romania has decided to exert every effort to that end.

66. Mr. SOMOGYI (Hungary): First of all, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate and

welcome to our midst, on behalf of the Hungarian delegation the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda, the one hundred and fifty-seventh Member State, upon its admission to the membership of the United Nations.

67. On 7 June 1981 the Israeli air force bombed Iraq's nuclear research centre, Osirak. The details and the direct consequences of this armed aggression are well known to all of us and therefore there is no need to recall them here. But it must be reiterated once again at this time that by committing this premeditated attack deep in the territory of Iraq, Israel flagrantly violated the Charter of the United Nations, which provides in its Article 2, paragraph 4, that

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations".

68. The violation was a fact and it has remained a fact in spite of all the manoeuvres and prevarications by Israel aimed at making the world believe that the Iraqi nuclear installations were destroyed in the exercise of the right of self-defence. Not a single sober-minded person accepted the allegations that the mere existence of the Iraqi nuclear reactor, where the regular international safeguards inspections had never found evidence of any activity not in accordance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty, constituted a direct threat to Israel's security that had to be countered by an armed aggression.

69. Taking into consideration the facts, the Hungarian delegation welcomed the provisions of Security Council resolution 487 (1981) strongly condemning the military attack by Israel and fully reaffirming the sovereign right of all States to carry out technological and nuclear programmes for peaceful purposes, consistent with the internationally accepted objective of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Israeli armed aggression not only challenged the safeguards system of IAEA and called into question the legitimacy of the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, but at the same time further increased the tension in the Middle East. And it was not an isolated event; it was not Israel's first unprovoked action of this kind. Rather, it was yet another manifestation of Israel's bellicose policy.

70. In view of the series of such actions by Israel, directly threatening the peace and security of neighbouring countries and the other States in that region, my delegation holds that it must be obvious to everyone that the root cause of the whole Middle East crisis, as well as the main obstacle to the solution thereof, lies in the aggressive policy of Israel. This expansionist political course, together with the huge arsenal of sophisticated offensive weapons accumulated in Israel, carries within itself the danger of the explosion of the situation, the more so because it is the threat of violent military actions that the Tel Aviv Government uses in order to blackmail its allies, to try to impose its will upon the international community and to force public opinion to accept Israel's aspirations and ambitions.

71. It is well known to everyone that Israel has repeatedly violated the Charter and the norms of international conduct and continuously defied the numerous resolutions of the various United Nations bodies. This behaviour is particularly strange and unacceptable from a State that owes its very existence to the Organization. But I think

that it is no secret to anybody that the courage of the Israeli Government in pursuing a course of this kind derives from the active support of its well-known major ally.

72. Nevertheless, aggression and other endeavours of that kind will never lead to any positive result. They must be halted. Effective measures should be taken in order to stop the manoeuvres aimed at settling the burning problems of the Middle East in accordance solely with Israel's unfounded selfish claims. The Hungarian delegation is firmly convinced that the solution of the Middle East crisis requires a comprehensive approach and can be achieved only by peaceful, political means at an international conference, with the active participation of all the parties concerned naturally including the PLO.

73. A comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of this crisis must be based on the withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, on respect for the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to a State of its own and on the right of all States of that region to live in peace and security.

74. Mr. SIOSTRONEK (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Czechoslovak delegation supported the decision to include in the agenda of the current General Assembly session the item on the consequences of Israeli armed aggression against the Iraqi nuclear research centre, an act of aggression committed on 7 June of this year. We share the view of the overwhelming majority of Member States and of the world public to the effect that the sneak attack by the Israeli air force on the Osirak peaceful nuclear centre was unlawful, extremely dangerous and fraught with the most serious consequences for the entire international community. The exposure of the reasons behind this act of aggression and its condemnation in the international forum of the United Nations is, in the view of the Czechoslovak delegation, a necessary prerequisite for the elimination of its illegal consequences and the prevention of its recurrence in the future.

75. The facts have shown incontrovertibly that, after sustained preparation Israel subjected to premeditated and totally unjustifiable attack installations of a sovereign, non-aligned State in violation of the basic principles of the Charter, an act which endangered international peace and security. Israel attacked a centre which quite obviously was designed in full compliance with article IV of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, on the use of such installations for peaceful purposes.

76. Israel's unprecedented attack was committed against an installation built in a State which had become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons at the time the Treaty came into force in 1970. Therefore, all the research activities on atomic energy at the Osirak nuclear facility are under strict and constant international control. In striking a blow at nuclear installations monitored by IAEA, Israel has shown its flagrant disregard for the system of safeguards established by that agency. In so doing it also attacked the international system for the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and the system of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as a whole. That was done by a State which, in spite of many appeals, stubbornly continues to refuse to become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, disregards the appeals of the Security Council to conclude relevant agreements with IAEA on safeguards and, in accordance with many statements it has made, intends to assemble its own nuclear weapons.

77. The so-called pre-emptive strike by Israel against the Iraqi nuclear centre clearly reveals the fatal dangers inherent in all such similar doctrines. The Czechoslovak delegation believes that a discussion of the consequences of the piratical act by Israel against the Iraqi nuclear centre cannot be held without taking into account the expansionist goals being pursued by Israel and those forces supporting it through this and all similar acts of aggression in the Middle East. These goals are to suppress the national liberation movement of the people of Palestine, to thwart a genuine solution of vital historical problems in that region as a result of the creation of the State of Israel, to perpetuate the results of aggression and to impede social progress in the area as a whole.

78. In carrying out those goals, Israel is acting as an obedient accomplice of imperialism, led by the United States of America, with whose knowledge and blessing Israel is carrying out its aggressive acts. The criminal attack on the Osirak centre could not have been carried out without the direct agreement and support of the United States of America, which at a critical time hardly concealed its great concern over the construction of the Iraqi nuclear centre. On the contrary, its concern was demonstrated to one and all. Apparently, the signal was picked up in Tel Aviv that the piratical act under preparation was going to be given the green light and that it would go virtually unpunished. As is well known, Israel used in the raid F-16 bombers, which the United States continues to supply to Israel as previously.

79. World public opinion was not misled either by the awkward show of surprise by Washington immediately after the attack, or by the spectacular temporary halt in the supply of F-16s to Israel, or by the empty assertions that American aircraft, which are provided with long-range radar equipment and airborne warning and control systems—AWACS—in Saudi Arabia, did not pick up this raid. In actual fact, the United States has cynically concealed all its aggressive actions, and in its activities in the Security Council, it has prevented the adoption of effective measures against the aggressor pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter. Thanks to the protection and understanding of the United States concerning the bombing of the reactor near Baghdad, Israel has been given elbow room to threaten a new attack if Iraq restores the destroyed nuclear installation. These examples demonstrate that the strategic partnership of the United States and Israel is a bulwark for Israel's aggressive policies, and provides a military, political and economic basis for the aggressive activities of Israel in the Middle East.

80. Czechoslovakia has stated its principled position on condemnation of the terrorist attack by Israel on the Iraqi research installation, both in the statement of 11 June 1981 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia<sup>6</sup> and in the statement of the Permanent Representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in the Security Council on 16 June 1981.<sup>7</sup> We continue to hold the view that we must adopt and implement strict sanctions which will prevent the possibility of such aggressive acts in the future, and which would compel Israel to compensate fully for the damage done.

81. The Czechoslovak delegation would like to emphasize once again today, now that five months have passed since the cowardly act of aggression of Israel, that the aggressive acts of Israel against the sovereignty of Iraq are directed at the same time against a peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East. The Israeli attack has further aggravated the tense situation in that part of the

world. As a result of the position taken by the United States of America, the discussion in the Security Council of the Israeli act of aggression failed to produce effective results. Security Council resolution 487 (1981) does not contain the necessary sanctions against the aggressor. The escalation of Israeli aggression against Lebanon in recent months bears witness to the fact that the adoption thus far of piecemeal and compromise measures for a settlement in the Middle East will not achieve that purpose and cannot and will not lead to an end to Israel's aggressive acts.

82. The Czechoslovak delegation is of the view that as a result of the further aggravation of the situation in the Middle East we must undertake forthwith a comprehensive discussion of possible ways and means of ensuring a just and lasting settlement in the region. The most appropriate step in this regard would be the implementation of the proposal put forward by the Soviet Union on convening an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all interested parties, including the PLO. Without a collective discussion of the situation and a constructive quest for effective measures leading to a just and realistic settlement of the situation in the Middle East there is a danger that that tense situation will erupt into a conflict, the scope and possible consequences of which would extend far beyond the region of the Middle East.

83. Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The sneak attack on 7 June 1981 of American Phantoms flown by Israeli air pirates on the Iraqi nuclear research centre near Baghdad once again has shown the whole world that the rulers of Israel continue unashamedly to flout all the norms of international law, as they arrogate to themselves the right to hold sway over other peoples and resort in the pursuit of their goals to even the most barbaric means. The concept propagated by those in the militarist ruling circles of Israel of a pre-emptive strike and retaliation by terror, which is used as justification for the gangsterism used against other countries and peoples, is in flagrant violation of the generally agreed norms of international relations.

84. The premeditated aggressive military action against the Iraqi nuclear centre is not only an irresponsible violation of the sovereignty of other countries and a flagrant infringement of their inalienable right to develop science and technology and to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and for the well-being of their own peoples, but also a blow to the system of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the international safeguards system for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy carried out by IAEA. This is clearly stated in Security Council resolution 487 (1981); it was also stated in the resolution adopted at the most recent session, the twenty-fifth, of the General Conference of IAEA, as well as in the statement of the Director General of that Agency, Mr. Sigvard Eklund, the day before yesterday at the 50th plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

85. While Iraq is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has subjected its nuclear installations to IAEA control, Israel refuses to take upon itself any type of obligation in accordance with that Treaty. Israel stubbornly refuses to open its nuclear installations to international control through IAEA.

86. The peaceful nature of the Iraqi nuclear centre has been repeatedly reaffirmed in official statements by IAEA officials. These statements have already been cited during



the course of this discussion. All the subterfuge used by Israel in order to cast doubt on the peaceful nature of the Iraqi nuclear research centre has been refuted by the many inspections of that centre, including the most recent ones; by IAEA experts. Since it cannot deny the truth of this obvious fact, Israel, pursuing its tactics of rejecting everybody's doubts, and, indeed, everything that might prevent it achieving its criminal goals, is violating the safeguards procedures and monitoring carried out by IAEA on behalf of the world community.

87. Indeed, the development of international co-operation in the sphere of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the exercise of the inalienable right of all States to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes are impossible without respect for and strict observance of the international norms which have been adopted in that area.

88. The outrageous Israeli aggressive act against Iraq, for which there are no legal or moral grounds, is a serious blow to international security and to the prospects of peace in the Middle East. Full responsibility for Israel's defiant acts of aggression lies with the imperialist forces of the United States of America, which are giving Israel total and ever-increasing support.

89. According to the Definition of Aggression in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974, bombardment by the armed forces of a State of the territory of another independent State, regardless of a declaration of war, shall qualify as an act of aggression. Paragraph 2 of article 5 of the Definition states that aggression gives rise to international responsibility. This aggression by Israel should not go unpunished, since it has been condemned unanimously throughout the world. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR favours the adoption against Israel of the sanctions provided for in the Charter. Israel must comply unconditionally with Security Council resolution 487 (1981) and must appropriately compensate Iraq for the destruction of its nuclear installation and the human suffering involved.

90. Bearing in mind that through its activities Israel had virtually excluded itself from membership of IAEA, the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic supported the resolution adopted at the last session of the General Conference of the Agency. That resolution, in particular, made continued membership by Israel in the IAEA dependent on compliance with the requirements of Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which calls upon Israel urgently to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. All States must implement the provisions of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the complete cessation of nuclear and military co-operation with Israel.

91. Guided by what we have just said, the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will vote in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.14.

92. Mr. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus): Once again the General Assembly is dealing with an item included on its agenda following an act of aggression and the violation of basic principles of the Charter and the internationally accepted norms of conduct among States.

93. The premeditated Israeli air attack on the Iraqi Osirak nuclear installations in Baghdad on 7 June 1981 constitutes an unjustifiable act against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Iraq. It constitutes yet another manifestation of the blatant use of military force

by one Member State against another, with grave implications for international peace and security.

94. The Government and the people of Cyprus immediately condemned the attack upon Iraq, which occurred at a particularly sensitive time for the Middle East and has created additional dangers to peace in the region, with unforeseen consequences. Cyprus, itself a victim of aggression, adheres strictly to its obligations under the Charter and the principles of non-alignment and thus firmly opposes and strongly condemns any aggression and any threat or use of force for any reason or under any pretext whatsoever. There can be no justification for military intervention which runs counter to the principles and purposes upon which the Organization is based. Any misrepresentation of Article 51 of the Charter to justify a blatant act of aggression is not acceptable to the international community. The grave dangers of accepting such a justification are obvious to all, for it would set a precedent undermining the rule of law and would create complete chaos and anarchy in international relations.

95. The grave consequences of the Israeli attack for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security are a matter of deep concern to humanity as a whole. Every country has the sovereign right to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. For developing countries, the peaceful use of nuclear energy is of paramount importance in their quest for a better future.

96. Iraq has been a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty since it came into force in 1970. It has accepted the Agency's safeguards in all its nuclear activities. As the Director General of the Agency stated during the deliberations of the Security Council last June,<sup>2</sup> the attack on the Iraqi nuclear centre is a serious development with far-reaching implications and, from the point of view of principle, it is the Agency's safeguards system that has also been attacked. We fully share his view that this is a matter of grave concern to IAEA, and add that the consequences of that act have given a new and dangerous dimension to the already tense situation in the Middle East.

97. It is my Government's firm view that the Middle East crisis can be settled only through a comprehensive, just and lasting solution and not through the threat or use of force and the continuation of the policy of creating *faits accomplis* or through aggression and domination. There can be no viable solution of the crisis in that sensitive area without the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, and the right of all refugees and displaced Palestinians to return to their homes and property and their right to establish their own State in Palestine. Israel should withdraw from all territories occupied since 1967 and the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of every State in the region should be respected within internationally recognized boundaries. It is my delegation's view that any solution not including these basic principles would fail to provide the long-awaited peace and security in the region.

98. Israel's premeditated use of force against the nuclear installations of Iraq set a dangerous precedent in international life. It is high time—indeed this is long overdue—for the United Nations to perform its primary responsibility under the Charter: the maintenance of international peace and security, which is gravely threatened by such acts. My delegation was among the States that requested

the inclusion of the present item in the agenda because of our strong condemnation of that flagrant act of aggression and our position of principle against any act of aggression, under any pretext whatsoever, whether it occurs in the Middle East or elsewhere.

99. Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): The General Assembly is now discussing the item entitled "Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security".

100. As is known, in June this year, the world public learned with profound indignation the news of the premeditated piratical attack carried out by United States-made aircraft of the Israeli Air Force against the Iraqi nuclear reactor installations near Baghdad. The Israeli aggressors, creeping in like thieves in the night, wantonly attacked the Iraqi nuclear installations, thus adding to their long record another grave act of aggression which, in addition to violating Iraq's national sovereignty, violated the airspace of those other countries which the Israeli planes flew over in pursuit of their ugly piracy, thus increasing tension in the already explosive region of the Middle East. With this act of aggression the Israeli Zionists showed once again that for them the United Nations Charter is but a dead letter and international law but empty talk.

*Mr. Anderson (Australia), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

101. It is no secret to anyone that the Zionist State of Israel has its own nuclear installations and is at present in possession of nuclear weapons; and it was none other than the Israeli authorities that after the attack threatened Iraq that if it should rebuild the reactor Israel would destroy it again. Can arrogance in international relations be manifested more preposterously than this?

102. For more than three decades now the world has been witnessing the reality in the Middle East—an area which has been turned into a battlefield, where fighting, aggression and killing go on. The Palestinian people have been left without a homeland, while Arab territories have been occupied and annexed. All this has resulted in immeasurable suffering and incalculable destruction for the Arab people.

103. It is common knowledge that this grave situation in the Middle East is closely linked with the fierce rivalry between the two super-Powers—the United States and the Soviet Union—with their policies of zones of influence, as well as with the aggressive, expansionist and anti-Arab policies of Israel, that tool of United States imperialism in the Middle East. The recent Israeli act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor, which the Tel Aviv Zionists shamelessly declared to have been carried out allegedly for self-defence purposes, shows that Israel will stop at nothing when it comes to justifying its gangster-like logic and activities. However, the democratic and progressive countries and peoples have seen in the Israeli attack a blatant act of aggression which befits the Zionist State of Israel, which has been assigned the role of the gendarme of United States imperialism in the strategically important region of the Middle East.

104. Those who speak so fluently about the urgency of the measures to be taken against so-called international

terrorism—by which they diabolically allude to the national liberation struggle—should know full well that sovereign countries and peoples will not confound these two diametrically opposed notions. They are capable of identifying this recent Israeli attack with real international terrorism.

105. There is no doubt that it is because of the all-round support in the form of massive military, economic and political aid and backing that Israel has been receiving for decades and continues to receive at present from its Washington patrons that it is able to stand on its feet. It is this aid and support which encourages Israel to carry out continuous acts of aggression against the Arab peoples, demonstrating unprecedented hostility and arrogance towards the victims of this aggression, as well as towards public opinion throughout the world. It is the Zionist State of Israel that for many years now has been systematically and methodically carrying out military aggression and large-scale air raids against Lebanon, thus endangering the very existence of that Arab State, and practising a policy of savage genocide against the Palestinians.

106. It follows from all the foregoing that the Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations is part and parcel of a carefully-thought-out strategy, accompanied by specific tactics, which the Israeli Zionists are using with a view to spreading panic and creating a psychosis of fear among the Arab peoples, by showing that they are determined to preserve their nuclear monopoly in the region of the Middle East, hoping in this manner to minimize and, if possible, to neutralize the Arab peoples' solidarity with and support for one another, and particularly for the just cause of the Palestinian people. In addition, this premeditated act is part of the persistent and conscientious efforts of Israel to keep alive and substantiate the idea of "Greater Israel", an idea which affects not only Israel's immediate neighbours but also those Arab States far beyond its borders.

107. The fact that Israel carried out the air attack against Iraq's nuclear installations at a time when it was boastfully propagating far and wide statements that it was allegedly engaged in a great process of peace, connected with the Camp David agreement, is only proof of the falsity of the bombastic statements by the Tel Aviv Zionists. It also supplies correct answers to such questions as the following: Who is it that pulls the threads and manipulates the criminal hand of Israel against the Arabs? Who is it that stands behind and stimulates the Israeli aggressiveness? Without doubt the answer is: it is United States imperialism, United States arms and dollars, that propel the Zionist Israeli war machine forward on that rabid anti-Arab course.

108. It should be borne in mind that the Israeli attack was carried out at a time when a year had hardly elapsed since the tragic conflict between Iraq and Iran had broken out. This timing on the part of Israel for the launching of such an attack against Iraq proves that the State of Israel remains a sworn enemy of the Arab peoples and of the peoples of the Middle East.

109. While the super-powers continue constantly to stir up trouble and hatch plots against the freedom and independence of the countries of that region, Israel never fails to exploit the turbulent situations and the ensuing local conflicts to the detriment of the unity of the Arab peoples, so as to undermine and, if possible, extinguish their anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist struggle.

110. The Albanian people, who have on more than one occasion shown that they stand on the side of the just cause of the Arab peoples, in this case, too, firmly condemn the adventurist and piratical act of Israel against Iraq, just as they have condemned and denounced the Israeli policy of aggression against Arab peoples. We have unreservedly supported and will continue to support the Arab peoples' struggle in defence of their sovereign rights, the essence of which is the struggle of the Palestinian people to regain their homeland.

111. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In June this year, while taking part in the meetings of the Security Council to consider the Israeli armed aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, the Cuban delegation<sup>8</sup> described that action as one of flagrant aggression against a State Member of the United Nations and as an action that typified the policy of State terrorism practised by the Zionist régime of Israel.

112. There is no doubt that the question—as the majority of representatives who have spoken here earlier have agreed—is one that elicits the profound and legitimate concern of the international community, not only because of its barbarous nature, in contravention of all the rules of law, but also because of its serious implications for all countries of the region and for international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This is compounded by the incredible impudence with which the aggressor proclaims its responsibility for the events and enunciates the so-called doctrine of pre-emptive strike, by which it tries to justify its misdeeds. In the name of “security”—as we said a few months ago—the Zionist régime bombs the Iraqi nuclear installations; in the name of “security” it tramples underfoot the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and illegally occupies Arab territories; in the name of “security” it massacres the population of southern Lebanon and now threatens invasion. A strange concept of security indeed, based on aggression and spoliation.

113. What is truly unprecedented is that such a policy, which cannot be described as anything but Fascist, should receive the shameless support of a permanent member of the Security Council and that an unblushing attempt has been made to explain that act of aggression by assertions that Israel had a “right” to think that its security was threatened and that its act of banditry should be considered an “act of self-defence”.

114. The recommendation made in this Hall this morning can be but of one purpose—that we consider the matter in a so-called global context. Only those who in the delirium of power wish to reduce the world to a vital zone for their national interests and security are capable of going so far in justifying an act which has been condemned by the overwhelming majority of the membership of the Organization. Actually, no one has any doubt that the expansionist and criminal policy of Israel exists only because the United States, its most intimate ally, encourages the Zionist régime—as it does the Fascists of Pretoria against the countries of southern Africa—in its aggression against the Arab nation, providing it with the necessary economic and military means for it to perform its role as a figurehead of imperialism in the Middle East.

115. In our view, the General Assembly should condemn unequivocally all economic and military collaboration, especially in the nuclear field, with the Zionist régime of Israel. The act of aggression against the Osirak nuclear reactor also constitutes a serious blow against the

safeguards system established by IAEA and, therefore, against international co-operation in that field. To a certain extent the destruction of the Iraqi installations is also an ominous warning to developing countries which—like Cuba, for example—need to use non-conventional sources of energy, since they lack others. Who can assure us that tomorrow the so-called doctrine of pre-emptive strike will not be invoked against any of our States to destroy our peaceful nuclear installations? It is not by accident that the Board of Governors of IAEA, in June of this year, and the General Conference of the Agency, in September, adopted resolutions which, *inter alia*, considered that Israel's act of aggression was an attack against the Agency and its safeguards system, and decided to suspend all types of assistance to Israel.

116. It is obvious that Israeli aggression and the dangerous military doctrine of the Zionist State constitute a serious threat to international peace and security which the Organization cannot ignore without compromising the very principles on which the United Nations system rests. It is also obvious that the Assembly cannot tolerate any kind of cover being given to the distorted interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter adduced by the Zionist régime, for that would be introducing one more prejudicial element into the already precarious security of the world in which we live. Nor, obviously, can we permit an attempt to be made by this or other means to restrict the development of peaceful nuclear programmes in third-world countries.

117. Consequently, the delegation of Cuba considers that the Assembly should condemn in the strongest terms the Israeli aggression against Iraqi nuclear installations; reiterate to all States, and particularly to the United States of America, the obligation immediately to suspend deliveries of weapons and any material which would enable Israel to commit acts of aggression against other States; and call on the Security Council to institute enforcement measures against the aggressor and demand that, given its avowed responsibility for that act of aggression, Israel pay appropriate compensation without delay for the material damage and loss of life suffered by Iraq.

118. Mr. KORNEENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The discussion of this item in the General Assembly at the current session has shown quite convincingly the deep concern of the States Members of the United Nations at Israel's unprecedented act of aggression against the Republic of Iraq in the form of the piratical raid by Israeli aircraft on the Baghdad nuclear research centre, which is under the IAEA safeguards system. The overwhelming majority of States have sternly condemned this unprovoked act by Israeli militarists and regard it as one link in a long chain of criminal acts committed against Arab peoples and countries. The latest Israeli act of aggression will have the most serious consequences. It is a threat to international peace and security, both in the Middle East and in other parts of the world, and is directed against the régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the IAEA safeguards system. It is also an infringement of the right of peoples to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

119. In continuing a policy of aggression, annexation and expansion, disregarding the norms of international law and the requirements of the international community, Israel is attempting by every means possible to undermine a just settlement in the Middle East, to retain there a hotbed of tension and to establish a stronghold in occupied Arab territories.

120. We are greatly concerned at the fact that, in spite of the stern condemnation of Israel for the military attack against the Republic of Iraq by the Security Council, the Board of Governors and the General Conference of IAEA and world public opinion, Israel is endeavouring in every possible way to justify its actions and thereby put itself beyond the pale of international law and the elementary norms of international conduct. Moreover, it is threatening in the future, when it sees fit, to make military strikes against any installations in any neighbouring State. Such adventurist actions, which are a threat to the cause of world peace, must be stopped.

121. Israel, condemned by the General Assembly for its action in assembling nuclear weapons, is trying to argue that the Iraqi nuclear installations were geared to military activities, but those allegations are rightly regarded the world over as yet another attempt by Tel Aviv to justify its continuing and increasing act of aggression against Arab countries and peoples.

122. The Director General of IAEA stated on 19 June 1981 at a meeting of the Security Council:

"In fulfilling its responsibilities the Agency has inspected the Iraqi reactors and has not found evidence of any activity not in accordance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

"... From a point of principle, one can only conclude that it is the Agency's safeguards system that has also been attacked."<sup>2</sup>

123. It is crystal-clear from the discussion and from the statements of many delegations that without outside support—particularly from the United States—the ruling circles of Israel would not have undertaken such action. The political, economic and military support and assistance given to Israel by the United States, including deliveries of the latest American military aircraft and weaponry used in the bombing of the Iraqi nuclear centre, is what the ruling circles of Israel are banking on in escalating their State policy of international terrorism. Therefore, it is clear that Washington, which has an agreement, and a so-called strategic partnership, with Israel, bears direct responsibility not only for the raid by Israeli warplanes on the peaceful research centre near Baghdad, but also for the entire aggressive policy of Israel, which has dire consequences for international peace and security.

124. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR sternly condemns the Israeli act of aggression against the Republic of Iraq and regards it as a flagrant violation of the Charter which cannot go unpunished. We support the demands of many delegations that the Security Council adopt sanctions against the aggressor, in accordance with the Charter. Security Council resolution 487 (1981) should be fully implemented, including paragraph 6 thereof, which calls for compensation by Israel for damage stemming from its military attack.

125. On the basis of the foregoing, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports draft resolution A/36/L.14 and will vote in favour of it.

126. Mr. KRYSTOSIK (Poland): This is not the first time that the Polish delegation is speaking in the United Nations to emphasize our position on the question before the General Assembly. The point of view of the Polish People's Republic was presented at a meeting of the Security Council in the debate concerning Israel's armed at-

tack on the Iraqi installations, held in June this year.<sup>7</sup> The representatives of Poland made statements on this matter of grave concern at Geneva, on 23 June at the session of the Committee on Disarmament, and at Vienna, on 23 September at the twenty-fifth session of the General Conference of IAEA. Only two days ago, at the 51st meeting, speaking from this rostrum, we pointed out that the attack had also dealt a heavy blow to the safeguards system, which constitutes a basic element of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

127. Today, as the General Assembly is considering this item, we wish once again to express Poland's strongest condemnation of the flagrant act committed by Israel against Iraq.

128. The bombing by the Israeli air force of the Iraqi nuclear centre constituted an unprecedented act of international terrorism. It was yet another example of Israel's pursuit of a hostile policy towards the Arab States, an illustration of brutality and arrogance—a short-sighted approach, however, which in the final analysis cannot but be detrimental to the vital interests of the Israeli nation itself. For the sole guarantee of attainment of national security by the countries of the region, including Israel, and the only way towards a genuine solution of the crisis can be and is not a policy of aggression but a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region. It is the only course responding to the interests of all States and peoples in the Middle East and leading towards the fulfilment of their just aspirations. Such a peace cannot be established without the withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied territories and without the achievement of a just solution of the problem of Palestine on the basis of attainment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the establishment of its own independent State.

129. The bombing attack, being a clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct, created yet another threat to international peace and security. Its premeditated character proves once again that the policy of adventurism of the Israeli authorities is a stumbling block on the way to finding a solution to the Middle East crisis. The act of aggression can only aggravate the situation which, being of a really combustible nature, threatens to explode. Knowing the sensitive character of the region, one need not emphasize its grave implications.

130. It has been stressed in this chamber that no country can be denied the right to peaceful uses of nuclear energy. It has also been stressed that the safeguards system, the very backbone of the non-proliferation régime, is based on solid foundations of scientific experience, supplemented by the goodwill and mutual confidence of the parties to the Treaty. Israel has chosen to question the effectiveness of the system through an act of aggression against another State, based on the unfounded claim of "national security reasons". This attack was perpetrated against a State which was from the very outset a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and which had therefore made all its nuclear activities subject to the relevant IAEA safeguards; its nuclear development programme had been placed under the control of IAEA. The nuclear centre under construction in Iraq was not, as the authorities of that country have repeatedly stated, intended to serve military purposes. This was corroborated by the experts of IAEA.

131. Poland deplores with indignation acts of aggression, which can only have an adverse impact on the inter-



national situation. No State's security can be based on the violation of the rights of other States and on diminishing their security. This is particularly true in this sensitive region where lasting peace is the only alternative and where other solutions can lead to catastrophe. The policy of acting in defiance of the norms of international law will never yield positive results. The doctrine of the legitimacy of pre-emptive military strikes cannot be condoned. That is why my country supported firm and decisive action by the United Nations, convinced as it is that such action will prevent the repetition of such acts. The code of international conduct provided for, *inter alia*, in the Charter of the United Nations cannot be replaced by textbooks on preventive military operations.

132. The use of force, the resort to the threat of force and acts of aggression and armed attacks against sovereign States cannot be accepted, justified and tolerated. The solution to the problem of one of the most crucial regions of the world can be found only in conformity with the interests of peace and international security and in respect for the norms of international law.

133. Mr. OULD HAMODY (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): For the Israeli Government, the entire world is wrong and only Israel is right. For it, any condemnation of its adventurist expansionist policy can be nothing other than the reawakening of the old spectre of anti-semitism. If there is one constant in the policy of the Zionist movement since its creation in Central Europe, it is the opportunistic and abusive recourse to any means—blackmail, falsification, threat or terrorism—in order to achieve its ends. The founding fathers of Zionism, among their many and contradictory arguments in favour of the creation of a "Jewish homeland in Palestine"—which was their modest initial objective—began by presenting themselves to the colonial Powers of the period as a potential "advanced bastion of civilization against the barbarous continents"—meaning, of course, Asia and Africa.

134. In June of this year, Israel showed that it was capable of being the true and sole heir of barbarity and obscurantism. The attack against the peaceful atomic installation at Tamuz on that day is part of a long process in which intolerance and racism vie with suicidal adventurism and short-sighted policy. Indeed, several centuries ago, other aggressors made an attempt to stamp out science and any will to resist in the Arab Machrehg by burning libraries in Baghdad and decimating the intellectuals in that prestigious and historic city. Yet the incredible attack on Tamuz is the fruit of many unhealthy, and above all new, reactions, which include the outrageous, arrogant and inadmissible claim to divine right in contempt of universal understanding and the decision on 7 June that a peaceful atomic energy installation under the competent and permanent control of IAEA was irrefutable proof of Iraq's intention to acquire a nuclear weapon to re-enact the holocaust of the Jewish people against Israel; they include Israel's naive political failing, due to the deference and protection Israel receives, of believing that it can, whenever it wants, engage with impunity in whatever intimidating military action it wishes on behalf of the survival of its people and what it conceives to be its legitimate right to self-defence; they include contempt for so-called backward and barbarous peoples and opposition to the transfer of technology to them. Israel, which has never been a part of a prospect for peace in the Middle East, especially believes that it can halt progress and condemn the Arab people to an irrevocable and definitive technological backwardness. No one in this Hall can re-

main unmoved in the face of this astonishing, dangerous and above all eminently racist logic.

135. Iraq is a country with vast potential and one that has set for itself ambitious goals for comprehensive development in all areas. Must one accept Israel's unilateral decision to consider that Iraq has no need of atomic energy because it is an oil-producing country? Iraq is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Must we believe the specious argument of Israel—which, let us bear in mind, has not become a signatory of that Treaty—that that is merely a ruse? Iraq collaborates faithfully with IAEA and agrees to the periodic control of its installations according to the standards prescribed by the Agency. Must we accept the Israeli justification for keeping its atomic reactors outside that control and its implicit accusations against that respectable Agency, which it accuses either of total incompetence or of collusion with Iraq?

136. For our part, we believe that careful consideration must be given to the unprecedented situation created by the premeditated and unjustified attack by Israel and reach the only conceivable conclusion to condemn its consequences and prevent its re-occurrence.

137. It is unnecessary to go into a more lengthy account of the repercussions of the Israeli aggression here in the Organization or in the capital cities of Member countries. Suffice it to recall the authoritative, important and unequivocal statement by the Director-General of IAEA in the Security Council on 19 June 1981. The Director-General clearly linked the Israeli attack against Iraq to an attack against the safeguards system of the Agency itself.

138. Today, the Assembly must take a stand. It must do so under the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and also to preserve that indispensable system of safeguards. In the view of the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, the General Assembly must, in particular, first appeal for the cessation of all assistance of whatever nature they may encourage or aid Israel in perpetrating such heinous acts or in continuing to constitute the only serious and permanent threat to peace, stability and progress in the Middle East. Secondly, it must impose a total embargo on the deliveries of nuclear material to Israel, and in particular on all collaboration in that area between that country and the specialized agencies of the United Nations. Thirdly, it must demand that all Israeli nuclear installations be inspected and brought under the system of safeguards of IAEA. Fourthly, it must compel Israel to compensate Iraq for the loss in human lives and material damage caused by the Israeli air attack. Fifthly, it must appeal for an increase in individual and collective aid, or assistance through IAEA, to Iraq so that it may pursue its peaceful programme for the use of atomic energy.

139. Israel and South Africa are well known for ignoring international consensuses, for their military collaboration, especially in the nuclear field, for their outspoken racist policies and for the serious threat they constantly pose to freedom, progress and development in Africa and the Arab world. All the States of those two regions, of which our country is an integral part, sincerely wish to devote themselves to development and would like in particular to establish zones free of the manufacture, stockpiling or use of the atomic weapon. Unfortunately, foreign establishments with colonial designs are keeping our peoples from the realization of those legitimate aspirations. Those two entities, Israel and South Africa, aid and abet

each other with an admirable capacity for adaptation, particularly with regard to the technique of terror and aggression. We may perhaps hear in this Hall tomorrow that South Africa decided one Friday to bomb peaceful installations in Zambia, Angola, Zimbabwe or Mozambique in order to be sure of killing only Christian inhabitants. Tomorrow, perhaps, we may hear in the Assembly of an attack by South Africa based on some fallacious interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter. Today, it is incumbent upon us to issue a clear condemnation of the Israeli aggression against Tamuz and, by appealing for appropriate and comprehensive sanctions against it, to discourage it from repeating its misdeed. We will thereby have prevented this dangerous return to the law of the jungle from spreading to other sensitive areas in the world.

140. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): My delegation was among the signatories that requested the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the thirty-sixth session. The request for the inclusion of this item became necessary after resolution 487 (1981) was unanimously adopted by the Security Council on 19 June. That resolution strongly condemned Israel's premeditated military attack on 7 June on the nuclear facility near Baghdad.

141. My own Government's immediate reaction was a categorical condemnation of that attack as a flagrant violation of the Charter and of the norms of international law. Nearly every delegation that came before the Security Council expressed itself in similar terms while at least two delegations whose competence to pronounce on this matter, namely, the delegations of France and Italy, provided convincing data to repudiate Israel's claim that the Iraqi nuclear facility could be diverted to military use.

142. Delegations that participated in the Security Council debate will recall the circumstances and the reasons which precluded the Council from proceeding to take more effective action beyond that strong condemnation. The resolution acknowledged that the attack constituted a serious threat to the entire IAEA safeguards régime, which is the foundation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. While calling upon Israel to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards, the Council also acknowledged Iraq's right to appropriate redress for the destruction and damage which that country suffered.

143. Primarily in order to ensure at least that unanimous condemnation by the Security Council of Israel's violation of the Charter, Iraq was obliged to mute its just claim to effective redress. The international community, and particularly those countries that are signatories of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, had to acquiesce in a situation where a non-party to the Treaty could commit a blatant aggression against a party to the Treaty, defiantly threaten to repeat that aggression, and yet remain unscathed. Since then IAEA, which executes the safeguards system so vital to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, has decided to take the only action available to it, namely, to suspend the provision of any assistance to Israel.

144. We come before the General Assembly in order to support Iraq, whose rights have been violated but yet could get no remedy beyond that strong condemnation in the Security Council. Procedures and different attitudes within the Council precluded that country from receiving tangible redress. There is no compensation and the aggressor still refuses to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. In saying that, we are voicing the legiti-

mate concerns of all parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty that have in that Treaty surrendered some of their sovereign rights for the greater good of a greater number, accepted the validity of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and seek only the right to establish and safeguard programmes of nuclear development for peaceful purposes.

145. As I said, we have come before the General Assembly to seek that vital consequential action which Security Council resolution 487 (1981) was unable to provide. The draft resolution before the Assembly condemns Israel, as did the Security Council. But it also calls on all States to cease the provision of arms and related material of all types which enables Israel to commit aggression and asks the Security Council to investigate Israel's nuclear collaboration with other States and parties. Not least of all, the draft resolution asks Israel to compensate Iraq for the damage caused and the loss of lives.

146. The seeming procession of speakers who have preceded me and others to follow may give the impression that we are engaged in another formality which has perhaps become almost a routine in the Assembly. But that is not the reason. We speak today also because any one of us may have to seek his remedy here if he is the victim of a similar aggression at another time.

147. My delegation will support the draft resolution in document A/36/L.14.

148. Mr. ADAM (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya considers the armed Zionist aggression against the nuclear research centre in Iraq to be a flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations as well as of those of IAEA and a threat to international peace and security. We have already condemned that barbarous attack in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 18 June 1981.<sup>9</sup>

149. In view of the fact that the Security Council was unable to adopt an appropriate resolution with respect to that matter, as a result of various pressures on the part of the United States, a permanent member of the Security Council, the General Assembly is now considering that question as agenda item 130.

150. The Assembly knows the serious dimensions of this act and all these elements must be studied and an appropriate resolution adopted, since all international bodies have already condemned it.

151. As Mr. Eklund, the Director General of IAEA, said in his report on the activities of the Agency during the discussion on agenda item 14 (a), at the 50th meeting, the bombing of the Iraqi nuclear installation by Israel constituted a violation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and of the safeguards system. What was surprising was that the representative of the Zionist entity should have arrogantly claimed from this rostrum that the bombing by Israel of a nuclear reactor was in exercise of the right to self-defence and said that he was proud of that act of terrorism. We are not in a jungle community. We live within the framework of an international community, with discipline, with rules and with international law. Iraq is a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and its nuclear installations are subject to the control and inspection of IAEA.

152. The arguments of the Zionist entity in claiming that its raid was a legitimate act are fallacious and

groundless. The Zionist entity has since 1949 been trying by all possible means to obtain the largest possible quantity of fissionable material and the extraction of uranium from the phosphate from the Negev desert for the production of nuclear weapons. It is encouraged by its ally, the United States of America, which provides Israel with the funds, the expertise and the necessary technology for the manufacture of nuclear weapons so that Israel may dominate the area and achieve its expansionist aspirations without regard for the rights of the Palestinian Arab people or the Arab nation.

153. It is truly ridiculous that the representative of the Zionist entity alleges in all United Nations organs that he supports the principle of non-proliferation although Israel has refused to ratify the Non-Proliferation Treaty, as it has refused to adhere to the régime related to that Treaty. Israel threatens international peace and security. It continues to threaten to bomb other nuclear installations which are devoted to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

154. Dealing with the arrogance and the barbarity of the Zionist entity, supported by its ally, the United States of America, could be a lengthy process and this is not the right time to go into details with which everyone is familiar. The members of the Assembly must not be satisfied with merely condemning and denouncing the act of aggression against a sovereign State Member of the United Nations. We must also strongly affirm our will to adopt a just resolution and not to extend any assistance in nuclear technology to the Zionist entity. On the contrary, we must ensure that Israel is expelled from IAEA because Israel has again violated, as it has done many times, the principles and purposes of the Agency. We must also affirm the right of Iraq to appropriate compensation for the losses it has suffered as a result of the act of aggression. Sanctions must be imposed on Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter in the interest of the preservation of international peace and security.

155. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): Before I address myself to the item under consideration, I should like to take this opportunity to extend, on behalf of my delegation, a warm and hearty welcome to the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda. We are confident that its participation in the United Nations will strengthen the Organization and further widen international co-operation.

156. The Israeli military attack on Iraq's nuclear installation is not only an unquestionable act of aggression against a sovereign State that cannot be justified under any provision of the Charter, but it is also an ominous development that calls into question the effectiveness of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Essentially, we have before us a situation in which a country which has signed that Treaty and whose nuclear installation is operating in full compliance with the provisions of the safeguards system of IAEA, as agreed to by the country concerned with IAEA, has become the victim of a military attack by a country which refuses to sign the Treaty and to place its own nuclear programme under IAEA supervision.

157. The attack on Iraq's nuclear installation has been condemned by the Security Council as a "clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct" as well as by IAEA and virtually every Member of the United Nations.

158. In our statement in the Security Council,<sup>10</sup> my delegation strongly condemned the Israeli attack. We wholeheartedly supported resolution 487 (1981) adopted by the

Security Council on 19 June this year as proper, not only because the attack violated the most sacred tenets of the Charter, but also because it threatened the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes by developing countries in general and the integrity of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in particular. This unprovoked act of aggression could not be ignored by the international community and we are pleased to note that the Iraqi Government avoided exacerbating the situation by promptly bringing the matter to the attention of the United Nations. My delegation commends Iraq for the restraint it demonstrated and believes that, the Security Council resolution notwithstanding, this Assembly must express its views in a concrete way.

159. The representative of Israel explained the attack as a defensive action justified under the Charter. During the Security Council debate on this item last June we listened to the statements of the representatives of Italy<sup>11</sup> and France,<sup>1</sup> who had focused the attention of the international community on the magnitude and scope of the problem in its various dimensions, since those countries had assisted in the construction of the nuclear installation in Iraq. The representative of Italy stated before the Security Council that the nuclear fuel provided by Italy for that installation could not be used for manufacturing a nuclear weapon. For his part, the representative of France told the Security Council that his Government had made sure that the reactors provided by France for the installation would be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and that it would be impossible to alter the installation for military purposes without immediate detection. Furthermore, no less an authority than the Director General of IAEA vouchsafed before the Security Council that "the Agency has inspected the Iraqi reactors and has not found evidence of any activity not in accordance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty".<sup>2</sup>

160. It is incredible, therefore, that Israel expects the Assembly to believe that IAEA, France, Italy and others were engaged in a grand conspiracy to provide Iraq with the capability to manufacture nuclear weapons to be used against Israel. Israel's attack can only be understood as an indication to countries in the region that, if they decide to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in full compliance with IAEA regulations, they are risking similar pre-emptive strikes. That, of course, is unacceptable to the Assembly.

161. As a member of IAEA and a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Indonesia is naturally concerned in view of the threat to the integrity of the IAEA safeguard system and to the Treaty that the attack represents. The effectiveness of the IAEA safeguard system and the Treaty has never been called into question and there has been no instance since the Treaty came into force 11 years ago in which IAEA has erred in enforcing the provisions of the Treaty.

162. My delegation, therefore, wishes at this stage to underline the sentiments of the Director General of IAEA as expressed in press release IAEA/988 of 9 June 1981:

"The attack on the Iraqi nuclear centre is a serious development with far-reaching implications. The Agency's safeguards system is a basic element of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. During my long time here, I do not think we have been faced with a more serious question than the implications of this development. The Agency has inspected the Iraqi reactors and has not found evidence of any activity not in accordance with

the Non-Proliferation Treaty. A non-Treaty country has evidently not felt assured by our findings and about our ability to continue to discharge our safeguarding responsibilities effectively. In the interest of its national security, it has felt motivated to take military action. From a point of principle, one can only conclude that it is the Agency's safeguards régime which has also been attacked. Where will this lead us in the future?"

163. The Security Council, the Board of Governors of IAEA and the General Conference of the Agency adopted resolutions which condemned the Israeli attack against the IAEA-sanctioned nuclear installation in Iraq. We are disappointed, however, that the Security Council was unable to adopt effective measures to force Israel to abide by its ruling in resolution 487 (1981) which calls for "appropriate redress for the destruction it [Iraq] has suffered, responsibility for which has been acknowledged by Israel".

164. My delegation is in full accord with draft resolution A/36/L.14 and is happy to be one of its sponsors. We would like to draw the Assembly's attention to paragraph 6, which reads:

*"Demands that Israel . . . pay prompt and adequate compensation for the material damage and loss of life suffered as a result of the said act".*

The draft resolution also calls for renewed efforts to have Israel open its nuclear programme to IAEA inspection and to have it become a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. For the Organization to do anything less would call into question the credibility of the Agency, the Treaty and the United Nations itself. If we cannot provide adequate guarantees for the safety and security of peaceful nuclear installations, we may be witnessing the first step in the breakdown of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, with all of the dangerous implications that such a development would represent.

165. Mr. ZAINAL ABIDIN (Malaysia): On behalf of the Malaysian Government I wish to extend a warm welcome to the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda on the admission of that State as a new Member of the Organization. We look forward to fruitful collaboration with the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda in the years ahead.

166. Members will recall the indignation of the international community over the unprecedented acts of aggression committed by Israel against the nuclear installation of Iraq on 7 June 1981, during which the Israeli air force destroyed the Iraqi nuclear installations, which was constructed for no other reason than the development of nuclear energy for peaceful uses. While this attack is one in the series of acts of aggression Israel has perpetrated, in total disregard of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Arab States, this particular incident has a far-reaching consequence which challenges the credibility of the established international system to regulate nuclear development for peaceful purposes.

167. My delegation categorically rejects Israel's justification of the attack on the grounds that the Iraqi nuclear installation was a threat to its national security. On the contrary, my delegation believes that the only real threat in the Middle East is that posed by Israel, which is believed to be in the process of producing nuclear weapons from its nuclear facilities. Not being a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, Israel is able to develop nuclear weapon capability without being subjected to any bilateral, regional or international supervision. Iraq is a party

to the Treaty and its nuclear installation is placed under strict IAEA safeguards, thus ruling out any possibility of diverting fissionable material for the manufacture of nuclear weapons. The real motive of Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear installation was nothing more than deliberately to attempt to intimidate its Arab neighbours and to block their progress, as well as to prevent them acquiring nuclear technology, thus enabling Israel to perpetuate control over occupied Arab and Palestinian territories in violation of United Nations resolutions.

168. The incident is also a major cause of concern to the international community, as the credibility of the international system established to regulate the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes is being blatantly challenged by a State which does not subscribe to the principles of the system. The incident makes it more important that the Non-Proliferation Treaty should be universally accepted as an instrument through which to curb the ominous spread of nuclear weapons. Moreover, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the IAEA safeguards as currently instituted will guarantee the inalienable right of States, particularly the developing countries, to embark on an orderly development in the field of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes through international co-operation. My delegation believes that in view of the serious international implications involved Israeli nuclear installations should be subjected to regular international inspection.

169. My delegation regretted that the Security Council, which met to consider the Israeli aggression, failed to apply mandatory sanctions to Israel as provided under Chapter VII of the Charter. We should not, however, allow Israel to be emboldened by this failure. Its continued threat to launch further attacks must be averted. We must act decisively to find ways and means to ensure Israeli compliance with numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and to prevent it from using its nuclear military potential in the Middle East conflict.

170. We have before the Assembly draft resolution A/36/L.14 which my delegation has the honour of co-sponsoring. Its thrust is to prevent the recurrence of similar attacks in the future and to call upon Israel to stop threatening to make further attacks against Arab nuclear installations. It also calls for Member States to cease supplying Israel with arms and related materials of all types which enable it to commit acts of aggression against others. It further seeks to investigate Israel's nuclear activities and any collaboration between Israel and other States in the nuclear field in order to ensure non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and thus maintain the effectiveness of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The task of investigating this collaboration is entrusted to the Security Council. Finally, the draft resolution calls upon Israel to assume its international responsibility for its acts of aggression and, consistent with Security Council resolution 487 (1981), to pay prompt and adequate compensation to the Government of Iraq for the heavy loss and destruction incurred. As a sponsor, my delegation wishes to appeal to all members of the General Assembly for their support and approval.

171. The PRESIDENT: Members will recall that at the 52nd plenary meeting, held yesterday, the representative of Iraq proposed that the Director General of IAEA be invited to make a statement on the item before us. Because of the relevance of the work of the Agency to the issue we are discussing, may I take it that the Assembly agrees to that proposal?



*It was so decided.*

172. The PRESIDENT: Therefore, after the last speaker in the debate tomorrow morning, Mr. Eklund will make a statement, and then the Assembly will hear explanations of vote before the voting.

173. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

174. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): It is obvious from the statement made by the representative of the United States this morning that the United States delegation, alone among all the Members of the United Nations, stands with Israel in opposing the General Assembly's consideration of the item before us. The representative of the United States alleged that action by the General Assembly on this topic was not called for since the Assembly, she said, had already condemned Israel yesterday. That simply is not true. It appears that Mrs. Kirkpatrick is not familiar with the contents of resolution 36/25 adopted by the Assembly yesterday. Apparently she has not read the text of the resolution. She read the article appearing in today's issue of *The New York Times* about the decision adopted yesterday by the Assembly, but she did not read the resolution. The resolution only stated, as we all know, in a preambular paragraph that the premeditated Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations constitutes a serious threat to the entire IAEA safeguards régime and to the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Nowhere did the resolution condemn Israel. It is noteworthy that the language of that preambular paragraph is based almost word for word on paragraph 3 of Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which reads as follows:

*"Further considers that the said attack constitutes a serious threat to the entire IAEA safeguards régime which is the foundation of the non-proliferation Treaty".*

In spite of the fact that the two paragraphs are almost identical, Mrs. Kirkpatrick had no difficulty at all in transforming the content and the meaning of the ninth preambular paragraph of resolution 36/25 into a "condemnation". If such is her interpretation of the resolution adopted yesterday, it should also apply equally to paragraph 3 of resolution 487 (1981) and she should accept that also as a condemnation of Israel. Yet she also objected to the draft resolution before us as departing in important ways from resolution 487 (1981). Let us see if such is indeed the case. In its resolution the Security Council:

*"Strongly condemns the military attack by Israel in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct".*

175. The definition of aggression adopted by consensus by the General Assembly in resolution 3314 (XXIX) lists the following as an act of aggression, in article 3, subparagraph (b):

*"Bombardment by the armed forces of a State against the territory of another State or the use of any weapons by a State against the territory of another State".* That definition of an act of aggression, together with the Security Council's condemnation of the act in question, clearly brands Israel—which boasts openly of being the perpetrator of the act—as the aggressor. But, according to authoritative reports, Henry Kissinger, when he was Secretary of State, gave Israel an as-

surance that the United States would never allow the Security Council to condemn Israel again as an aggressor. Has there ever been such a blanket guarantee of permanent immunity to any Member State to act with impunity, no matter how intolerable its actions may be in future?

176. The United States, acting as Israel's proxy in the Council, has in fact bestowed upon its protégé a permanent veto power, no matter what action it takes. The United States delegation is now trying, through semantic acrobatics, to prevent the General Assembly from branding Israel as an aggressor in this case—although there has already been universal condemnation of the Israeli act of aggression.

177. Mrs. Kirkpatrick raised another issue, which is a dangerous divergence from the accepted norms of international conduct and international law. She implied that Iraq's refusal to accept Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and its refusal to make peace with Israel—which to us is an aggressor—are mitigating facts to be taken into consideration in judging Israel's military attack against Iraq. This is unheard of. First, resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) are not the issue here. We are not concerned here with who accepts and who rejects those resolutions. We are faced here with a clear case of aggression and a great violation of the Charter. What has the acceptance or the non-acceptance of a resolution to do with that? If we are to accept Mrs. Kirkpatrick's logic, then any State would have reason to attack another if the latter were not to accept a Security Council resolution. By the same token the Arab countries and the Palestinian people have every reason and every right to act towards Israel, which has not only rejected but constantly violated scores of Security Council resolutions, in the same manner and use the same policies of aggression—State terrorism and expansion—which Israel is pursuing.

178. As to the question of United States supplies of arms to Israel, that is a matter which not only involves United States laws but is also of great concern to the international community. The United States representative on the Committee on Disarmament referred to this highly pertinent matter during the meeting held on 18 June, when the Israeli attack on Iraq was discussed in the Committee on Disarmament. A press release issued by the United Nations states that Mr. Charles Floweree:

*"... quoted from a pertinent section of the United States-Israel Mutual Defence Assistance Agreement of 23 July 1952:*

*"The Government of Israel assures the United States Government that such equipment, materials or services as may be acquired from the United States . . . are required for and will be used solely to maintain its internal security, its legitimate self-defence, or to permit it to participate in the defence of the area in which it is a part, or in United Nations collective security arrangements and measures, and that it will not undertake any act of aggression against any other State."*

Surely the Security Council and the General Assembly are entitled to have their say on this constant supply of aggressive weapons to an aggressive State?

179. Mrs. Kirkpatrick also objected to the call made in the draft resolution to the Security Council to investigate Israel's nuclear activities. We all know that the Security Council has already, in paragraph 5 of resolution 487

(1981), called "upon Israel urgently to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards". Israel has adamantly refused to do so. It has no intention of doing so. Surely we have every right here to ask the Security Council to follow up on this call and do what it can to investigate what Israel is doing in its unsafeguarded secret reactors. It is the one in the area which has refused to submit these reactors and installations to international inspection and yet it took it upon itself to take the law into its own hands and stage this criminal attack against Iraq. Surely the Security Council should do something about that.

180. My delegation does not want to go into the pros and cons of the Camp David accords, but again it was the American delegation which raised this issue. The way they speak about the Camp David accords and the repeated references to what Egypt and Israel have achieved through those accords show that the United States in fact is ignorant of what they imply: how different the West Bank is from the Sinai; how differently Israel looks upon the West Bank, which it calls Judea and Samaria, and the difference between what it intends to do in that occupied territory and what it has done in Sinai. I do not want to go into that here, this is neither the time nor the place for that, but I just wanted to point out how wrong it is to make a comparison between these two sides of the Middle East problem.

181. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In my statement yesterday at the 52nd meeting I submitted scientific and technical data showing beyond a shadow of doubt that Iraq was bent on developing a nuclear option. I also repeated a series of questions which I had originally posed to the Foreign Minister of Iraq in the Security Council on 12 June 1981. In all the predictable barrage of abuse heaped upon my country by Iraq and others in the Assembly's deliberations thus far we have not received any answers to the serious questions raised by the technical data I presented. So that these questions should not be lost and submerged under a heap of abuse and hypocrisy, let me therefore address them again to the representative of Iraq.

—First, why did Iraq try, in 1974, to acquire a nuclear-power reactor of the kind designed, *inter alia*, to produce large quantities of plutonium for military use?

—Secondly, why did Iraq insist on receiving a 70-megawatt reactor which has no application as an energy source?

—Thirdly, why did Iraq insist on receiving weapons-grade fuel rather than the less proliferant alternative of Caramel fuel?

—Fourthly, what is Iraq's demonstrable need for nuclear energy given its abundant oil supplies?

—Fifthly, if Iraq has such a need, why has it not developed a commercial nuclear programme? Why has it not made any transactions relevant to such a programme?

—Sixthly, why, if it is generally interested in nuclear research, did it rush to buy plutonium separation technology and equipment?

—Seventhly, why has Iraq been making frantic efforts to acquire and stockpile large quantities of natural uranium, some of which is not under IAEA safeguards?

182. Given the fact that Iraq has been in a state of war with Israel for over 30 years and given its open threats to liquidate my country, is any fair-minded member of the Assembly prepared to suggest that Israel should have ig-

nored the answers to these questions which I have just reiterated? What has been going on here is a feverish effort to line up States to speak at length to blur the issues I have raised. But the questions I have raised will not walk away. They require serious attention and serious answers, even if the representative of Iraq wants to divert attention away from them. Perhaps the Iraqi representative would care to provide the Assembly with some answers instead of engaging in his customary diversionary tactics and in rejecting Security Council resolution 242 (1967). We have, of course, taken due note of his reiteration of Iraq's determination to pursue his country's policy of aggression and belligerency against Israel. It is indeed the height of audacity and impertinence of any representative of Iraq, a country that has been engaged in acts of aggression not only against my country, to try and brand others as aggressors. But we have become accustomed to these manifestations of arrogance and impudence by the representative of Iraq.

183. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Iraq wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply a second time. I would recall that statements made in exercise of the right of reply are limited to five minutes for the second intervention, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401.

184. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): I wish to point out that nobody is as guilty of diversionary tactics as the Zionist representative sitting here. He is in no position to pose any questions to anybody, let alone Iraq. Iraq is not in the dock. Iraq did not commit the act of aggression. The Assembly is not considering Iraq's nuclear programme or its development plans or its oil resources. The Assembly is faced with a serious act of aggression committed by the Zionists, and not only against Iraq, another Member State; it involves also, according to wide agreement, IAEA, the safeguards system, the sovereign right of States to development and the very foundations of the Charter and the rule of law. It is Israel that is called upon the answer for its act of terrorism, its sabotage, its criminal acts to acquire by clandestine means its nuclear capability. Why is it hiding its actions in Dimona? Why is it refusing to accept IAEA safeguards? Why is it refusing to accept even United States inspection? Let him answer the Assembly. It is not Iraq, it is he who should be answering the Assembly.

185. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply a second time. I would again recall that statements made in exercise of the right of reply are limited to five minutes for the second intervention.

186. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I believe that all members are now well aware of the fact that the representative of Iraq has again avoided any answers to the questions I have raised. Having been confronted with the questions that I raised, Iraq, if it were acting in good faith—which it is not, as it is displaying right now—should have had no problem in answering them.

187. Obviously Iraq can proceed in the Organization with impunity. It will not be censured, it will not be questioned, it will not be interrogated, it will not be condemned, because Iraq and other countries enjoy virtual impunity in the Organization. I do not have to go into the reasons for that, they are well known, but it is idle for Iraq and its supporters to masquerade here or elsewhere as the proponents of international law and international justice. The simple fact is that, whatever they do, how-

ever they do it and whenever they do it, they are assured of a built-in majority. The rest is posturing, it is bigotry, it is sheer hypocrisy.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, 2282nd meeting.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 2288th meeting.

<sup>3</sup> L. Oppenheim, *International Law: A Treatise*, 7th ed., H. Lauter Pacht, ed., vol. II Disputes, War and Neutrality (London, Longman's Green and Co., 1955), p. 159.

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, 2280th meeting.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1981*, document S/14528.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/14533.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Year, 2285th meeting.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 2281st meeting.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1981*, document S/14559.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Year, 2287th meeting.*

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 2286th meeting.