



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

S/14619
24 July 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 24 JULY 1981 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF IRAQ TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF
THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to refer to the letter dated 29 June 1981 addressed to you by the Permanent Representative of Israel as contained in document S/14576, which referred to the statement made by Mr. Al-Qaysi of Iraq at the end of the Security Council 2288th meeting on 19 June 1981, with regard to the quotation from a lecture by Sir Humphrey Waldock included by the said representative in his statement to the Council on 12 and 19 June 1981.

I should like first to point out that the purpose of Mr. Al-Qaysi's statement was not to quote Sir Humphrey Waldock in defence of Iraq's position, but rather to set the record straight by correcting the misquotation of Sir Humphrey Waldock by the Israeli representative. Now that the correction has been acknowledged by the Israeli representative, his expression of regret does not dispel the strong impression that he intentionally approached his sources selectively and with scant regard to intellectual honesty.

Furthermore, the Permanent Representative of Israel alleged that "Mr. Al-Qaysi saw fit to omit, in his statement, a highly pertinent sentence contained in the very same paragraph of Sir Humphrey Waldock's lecture." For him, the relevance of the said sentence to the matter then before the Council is obvious, as it is equally obvious why Mr. Al-Qaysi, it is alleged, should have chosen to ignore it. The said sentence reads as follows:

"Indeed, in the Atomic Energy Commission (Document A.E.C./18/REV.1, p. 24) it has been suggested that - assuming Atomic weapons to be controlled by Convention-preparations from Atomic warfare in breach of the convention would in view of the appalling power of the weapon, have to be treated as an 'armed attack' within article 51."

The allegation of the Israeli representative is utterly baseless, for the above-mentioned sentence supports Iraq's position rather than that of Israel. To begin with, the word "assuming", the phrase "in breach of the convention", and the fact that Sir Humphrey Waldock's lecture was published in 1952, are very significant in this connexion. At the time, there was no N.P.T. and indeed no I.A.E.A., and the assumption became a fact only in 1970 when the N.P.T. entered into force. It is Iraq and not Israel which is a party to the N.P.T. and which

has placed all its nuclear activities under the I.A.E.A. safeguards system. The I.A.E.A. has attested on numerous occasions that Iraq has conducted no activity whatsoever in contravention of the N.P.T. and the I.A.E.A. safeguards system. It is Israel which has been in possession of nuclear weapons for some time. Consequently in 1981, and on the basis of the interpretation placed upon the above-mentioned sentence. It is the Arab States parties to the N.P.T. including Iraq, which are entitled to treat the Israeli nuclear weapons as an "armed attack" within Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Salah Omar AL-ALI
Permanent Representative
of Iraq to the United Nations
