



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/41/PV.51
30 October 1986

ENGLISH

Forty-first session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 29 October 1986, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh)
later: Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda)
(Vice-President)

- 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: draft resolution [24]

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 24

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: DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/41/L.14)

The PRESIDENT: I propose that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed today at 12 noon. If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Iraq, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/41/L.14.

Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Once again we come to the General Assembly to discuss the item relating to Israel's act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor. We do so because it is our firm belief that the dangerous precedent set by Israel when it committed its act of aggression against our nuclear installations, which are under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), will most certainly be repeated in the current circumstances, which are characterized by the absence of any undertaking not to repeat such aggression in the future. That naked act of aggression has had grave consequences for the international community, the credibility of the resolutions and actions of international organizations and the established right of all States to use atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The international organizations and the States of the world are not unaware of those grave consequences. The concern they feel was reflected in the stern tone of the resolutions adopted in condemnation of that act of aggression.

However, we should stop and look at what has been done to bring about the implementation of those resolutions and the action taken to force the aggressor to comply with them. We have noticed an obdurate stand on the part of the aggressor

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

in the face of the many resolutions adopted with the aim of deterring further aggression. Israel has continued, through the statements of certain members of its government, to make threats that it will attack the Iraqi nuclear facilities whenever it decides unilaterally that those facilities constitute a threat to its security. Since its act of aggression of June 1981, Israel has made more than 20 threats to repeat that attack. Those threats have been made by the Prime Minister and other government officials. This has made it necessary for Iraq to request the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to shoulder their responsibilities to deter Israel and prevent a repetition of Israel's act of aggression.

In its resolution GC/27/409, of 1983, the General Conference of the Agency called upon Israel, the aggressor, to give a clear, unambiguous undertaking that it would not repeat its act of aggression against Iraq or any other State. However, Israel gave ample proof of its aggressive intentions by continuing to prevaricate and avoid giving such an undertaking. It insisted on being the sole judge as to whether the nuclear facility is used for peaceful purposes. Despite all this obduracy and intransigence, Israel considers that it has co-operated with the Agency and has not encroached on the Agency's major responsibility, adopting the stance of the self-styled alternative to the Agency's safeguards régime. The Agency had no choice but to repeat in its resolution GC/28/425, of 1984, its request that Israel give the required undertaking.

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

While the Director-General of the Agency was busy making contacts to obtain that undertaking from Israel not to repeat its act of aggression, Ariel Sharon declared, on 21 March 1985, that Israel would attack any nuclear reactor that Iraq may build if Israel considered it to be a threat to its security. In the light of the report of the Director-General of the Agency, it is now clear that Israel has not given the required assurances for which the Agency's General Conference has been asking for years and that it has refused to implement the resolutions of the Agency and the General Assembly.

At the Twenty-Ninth General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the representative of Israel made an ambiguous statement, then claimed that his statement had satisfied all the Agency's requirements. However, that statement which lacked precision, did not refer to Iraq explicitly and did not include a clear-cut definition of Israel's concept of a peaceful nuclear facility. The statement fell short of the conditions embodied in the Agency's resolutions. The reason for that is clear. Israel, which has committed the act of aggression and continues to threaten to do so again, cannot produce such a definition and satisfy the Agency's requirements at one and the same time.

Israel's prevarication and its refusal to withdraw its threat and undertake not to commit further acts of aggression are ample proof of its aggressive intentions. Israel's manoeuvring does not stop at that. It has now introduced a new dimension into its prevarication, by claiming that Ariel Sharon's statements do not represent the point of view of the Government and that only the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs are authorized to make such statements. Yet Sharon, who was Minister of Defense when the act of aggression took place, or any other advocate of such aggression, could easily become the Prime Minister or the leader of the Government of Israel.

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

Such trickery should not deceive the international community in dealing with one of the gravest situations it has ever faced. It is indeed this type of trickery that makes us more determined than ever to expose it and lay it bare under the eyes of international organizations so that they may take the necessary action in line with their responsibility.

We regret Israel's refusal to make a clear and unambiguous undertaking not to repeat its act of aggression or to threaten to do so. The absence of such an undertaking makes it our duty to strive to obtain such a guarantee.

Iraq presented a draft resolution to the Twenty-Ninth General Conference of the IAEA in which it requested the Agency to shoulder its responsibility with regard to the obtention of such an undertaking. The draft resolution obtained 41 votes in favour, yet regrettably it was rejected because of a procedural trick played by the President of the Twenty-Ninth Conference of the Agency. The result was the adoption of another resolution which obtained only 31 votes. This enabled Israel to voice its reservations on the resolution.

This was yet another link in the chain of trickery and prevarication to which Israel has resorted in order for it not to commit itself to a definite undertaking vis-à-vis the international organizations.

Israel's refusal to give the required undertaking was not the only Israeli behaviour denounced by the international organizations. It has ignored the repeated calls to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It has refused to place its nuclear facilities under the supervision of the Agency. It has refused to declare that it will not acquire nuclear weapons and has refused to end its nuclear collaboration with the racist Pretoria régime. It has also refused to agree to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, in defiance of the wishes of the international community.

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

The reason for this year's draft resolution is our firm belief and conviction that Israel intends to repeat its aggression in the future. It has not hesitated to make that clear through its constant threats.

I should like, on behalf of the following delegations, to introduce the draft resolution on this subject. These delegations are Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen and Yugoslavia.

Operative paragraph 1 calls upon Israel urgently to place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards in accordance with resolution 487 (1981) adopted unanimously by the Security Council.

Operative paragraph 2 conveys a clear enough fact that is known to all delegations, namely, that the General Assembly considers that Israel has not yet committed itself not to attack or threaten to attack nuclear facilities in Iraq or elsewhere, including facilities under IAEA safeguards.

Operative paragraph 3 reaffirms that Iraq is entitled to compensation for the damage it has suffered as a result of the Israeli armed attack on 7 June 1981, as was stipulated in Security Council resolution 487 (1981).

Operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution requests the Conference on Disarmament to continue negotiations with a view to reaching an immediate conclusion of the agreement on the prohibition of military attacks on nuclear facilities.

Operative paragraph 5 decides to include the item in the provisional agenda for next year, with the Secretary-General reporting on implementation of the resolution.

We hope that this draft resolution will be supported by the States Members of the United Nations.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): Sir, as this is the first time I am speaking at this podium, I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the Presidency of the forty-first session of the General Assembly and for the splendid job you are doing in conducting it. One of the quips about the United Nations is that it is the house of eternal life. Nothing ever dies here. Some, if not most resolutions stand a good chance of achieving immortality - especially anti-Israel resolutions.

This is the case of the resolution before us. Iraq first introduced it in 1981, then in 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, and now, yet again, in 1986. Never mind that the key clause in the resolution, the clause that justifies its annual resurrection by Iraq, is patently false. For operative paragraph 2 asserts that Israel has not yet committed itself not to attack nuclear facilities, including those under IAEA safeguards.

But what does the International Atomic Energy Agency say about that? What does it think, as the body that has extensively dealt with this question? In 1985 it accepted as satisfactory Israel's oral and written assurances that it would not attack, or threaten to attack, peaceful nuclear facilities. In its resolution 443 it said:

"Israel has thereby committed itself not to attack peaceful nuclear facilities in Iraq, elsewhere in the Middle East, or anywhere else." (GC(XXIX)/RES/443)

The IAEA, in fact, decided to drop the matter completely from its agenda.

But it was not the only one to drop it. So did Iraq. In the 1986 General Conference of the IAEA in Vienna, it did not even bother to raise this matter.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

The question is: why not? And the answer is: because Iraq knew perfectly well that in such a forum, so intimately familiar with the details of this case, it could not muster support for a preposterous resurrection of what is effectively a dead issue.

Not content with that, and eager to carry its obsessive campaign against Israel to the United Nations, Iraq now attempts to bypass the IAEA's decision by slipping a refurbished model of the resolution into the General Assembly. Iraq is betting that many Member States will suspend their better judgement - that which they demonstrated in Vienna - and allow the adoption of a distorted and irrelevant resolution in New York. And I have to say that, alas, when it comes to most matters relating to Israel, the record of the General Assembly makes this a plausible assumption.

But even here, in the plenary Assembly, Iraq has encountered some problems. Two years ago, the Iraqi draft resolution lost 17 votes of support; last year, it lost another 18. So, obviously, a growing number of Governments were sending a clear message to Iraq: they had had enough; they would like the issue dropped once and for all. To stave off a further deterioration in support this year, Iraq changed a few words here and there and is presenting the draft resolution now before the General Assembly. It would be regrettable if as a result of this ruse the effort to rescind the resolution altogether were to be set back. Because the body of the resolution, that which makes it inapplicable and unacceptable, remains unchanged.

Israel committed itself a long time ago, on many occasions - including several occasions from this very rostrum - to refrain from any attack on any nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful purposes, wherever they may be. The IAEA correctly says that that has been the pertinent development regarding this issue since it was first raised, in 1981 - indeed, closing it once and for all.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Now, Iraq cannot have it both ways. Either we are dealing with a narrow interpretation of the issue at hand - namely, the question of protecting nuclear facilities; or we are dealing with a broader subject - namely, the maintenance of international peace and security. If we are dealing with the narrow subject of attacks on nuclear facilities, then what we should be discussing is not Israeli assurances, which have been given and accepted, but Iraqi assurances.

After all, something has happened in the intervening years. On three separate occasions Iraq has attacked the nuclear facilities of Iran at Bushehr: first on 24 March 1984, then on 12 February 1985, then on 4 March 1985. I do not know whether our colleague the Ambassador of Iran would care to expand on this here. Of course, he has already done so in written communications to the Secretary-General and in official complaints by Iran. But we would welcome a further discussion this morning.

So if Iraq persists in bringing up this subject year after year, we must demand that it produce assurances of the kind that Israel has already given.

Now, what about the broad view of this draft resolution - that is, the one that argues that it ought to address the general questions of international peace and security? And, incidentally, those words "international peace and security" appear at the tail end of the title of this draft resolution. Well, if that is the context in which we should annually engage in this debate - and the Assembly has just had an example of this in the speech by the representative of Iraq here - then we are entitled to ask: what has been Iraq's contribution to international stability and the preservation of peace since a resolution on this item was first adopted, in 1981? We all know the answer. Iraq has pursued an aggressive war of monumental proportions against Iran - indeed, the bloodiest war since the Second World War. Iraq's professed aim was conquest, pure and simple. In the course of

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

this war, Iraq has waged and is still waging chemical and gas warfare. That has been confirmed beyond doubt by a Committee of United Nations experts recently established, as well as in official statements by the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council. Now, the waging of such warfare is in direct violation of international conventions of which Iraq is a solemn signatory.

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) states this in its 1985 Yearbook:

"On the accumulated evidence, and despite its protestations to the contrary, Iraq stands exposed as a violator of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, an international criminal".

I repeat: "an international criminal".

But, as the saying goes, that's not all. Iraq has tortured and murdered prisoners of war; Iraq has attacked neutral shipping; Iraq has bombed open cities; Iraq has harboured and launched international terrorists, including the notorious Abu Nidal, and, most recently, the master of the Achille Lauro affair, Abul Abbas, who travels with an Iraqi diplomatic passport. Iraq, of course, is not alone in its long-standing practice of using its diplomatic facilities and its embassies as fortresses of terror. It competes with its traditional enemy, Syria, and Syria's junior partner, Libya, for the most egregious violations of diplomatic privilege. But, given the recent exposé of the activity of its embassy in London, Syria appears to have taken the lead.

Needless to say, all these Iraqi activities flagrantly violate the principles of the United Nations Charter. But the list would not be complete without the example of blatant Iraqi aggression directed against my country. Let me rephrase that - because I think the word "aggression" does not fully capture it. Aggression usually denotes the aim - in this context, we can say the partial aim - of conquest

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

or pillage or subjugation. But what Iraq seeks in its aggression against Israel is something else.

I think it is best to let Iraq's dictator explain it in his own words.

Saddam Hussein has said:

"The Arabs must not give their signature and agreement to the recognition of the Zionist entity, even within the borders of 5 June 1967".

And what this means has been further spelled out by Iraq's Foreign Minister, who said:

"Iraq cannot agree to the existence of Zionism - neither as a movement nor as a State. ... The struggle against Zionism is for us a struggle in which there can be no compromise".

In other words, by its own admission, Iraq seeks the total liquidation of a Member State of the United Nations. And this is the régime that is making these sanctimonious noises about international probity, international responsibility, international law. So if in the name of international peace and security Iraq persists in dredging up this resolution again and again, we should demand that it first address its own intolerable practices in this regard.

How long will Iraq continue to waste the time and the resources of this body in its time of crisis? How long will it force us to debate this item? Through 1987? 1988? 1989? 1990? Perhaps the year 2000? Because, make no mistake about it, next year and the following years Iraq can always reword the resolution, sometimes making it more extreme, sometimes making it less extreme - all in accordance with shifting expediency.

How long should the General Assembly be subjected to this game? How long will it continue to succumb to Saddam Hussein's concept of what the United Nations is good for? The only proper thing to do with this superfluous resolution is to deny it the immortality sought by Iraq, and consign it to the dismal past where it belongs.

Mr. AL SAADI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): Today's debate on the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations acquires particular importance in the light of the reports by international and Israeli experts which leave no doubt that Israel has become the sixth ranking nuclear Power in the world. According to one of its own experts, Mordecai Vanunu, who was recently kidnapped in London by the Mossad and forcibly returned to Tel Aviv, Israel has between 100 and 200 nuclear warheads, produced at its Dimona installation in the Negev, in occupied Palestine, on the basis of advanced technology Israel illegally obtained from certain European countries. Israel can today produce about 400 kilograms a year of plutonium, enough to build 10 very powerful atomic weapons.

This then is the country which committed aggression against Iraq. Iraq built its nuclear installations for peaceful purposes and has been a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty since 1970. Iraq has accepted the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and, according to the Agency, has always fulfilled its obligations - faithfully, unlike Israel, the aggressor. As everyone knows, Israel still refuses to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In its resolution 39/14 of 16 November 1984 the General Assembly condemned Israel's nuclear ambitions and its attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations and urged it to place its own installations under IAEA safeguards. The General Assembly also asked the Security Council to take the necessary measures to ensure Israel's compliance with United Nations resolutions on this issue.

The new information to which I have just referred and Israel's continued refusal to implement United Nations resolutions are proof positive that its real objective is to be the possessor of the nuclear capability to ensure its continued domination over the Arab territories it occupies. To this end, Israel flouts the wishes of the international community and compounds its defiance by co-operating with the racist régime in South Africa, which continues to occupy Namibia

(Mr. Al Saadi, Oman)

illegally, just as Israel occupies Arab territories. That co-operation was recently confirmed by the present Prime Minister of Israel, Yitzhak Shamir. It is known to all that the two racist régimes in Palestine and South Africa are in close collaboration with each other, especially in the nuclear, military and economic fields. They have managed between them to plunge the Middle East and southern Africa into the maelstrom of the nuclear-arms race and have thus compounded the dangers which threaten international peace and security, curtail the prospects of development in the countries of both regions and obstruct their attempts to reach the desired levels of social and economic development.

The Israeli aggression against Iraq's peaceful nuclear installations was not the last in Israel's acts of aggression against the countries of the region. Its aircraft have bombed and continue to bomb peaceful, distant countries such as Tunisia and Lebanon. Israeli leaders continue to threaten to bomb the nuclear installations of any country of the region within reach of Israeli aircraft.

The United Nations should adopt strict measures against Israel, which continues to commit acts of aggression. The international community must force that country to implement Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which was adopted unanimously, and to put an end to its aggression against Iraq's peaceful nuclear installations and the vital interests of the Arab countries. The States of the world and international organizations should discontinue all forms of nuclear collaboration with Israel now that the grave consequences of such collaboration have become abundantly clear.

We reaffirm Iraq's right to compensation for the material and moral damage it has suffered as a result of Israel's naked aggression. We hope that all countries that cherish peace and freedom will stand by Iraq and help it rebuild the installations destroyed by Israel. We also look forward to full support for draft resolution A/41/L.14, which is sponsored by a large number of countries, including my own. This is the ideal stand to be taken in the present circumstances.

Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): In his statement the Israeli representative touched upon several points, but not the point under discussion. This is the Israeli delegate's way of leading us away from the issue. It is really strange that after three years of obfuscation he does not realize the boredom he causes, thanks to his habit of endlessly rehashing the same old arguments in dealing with any and every item. We could answer him and take the trouble of refuting his lies, which have become threadbare, but we do not wish to accommodate him by falling into that trap. To be drawn into such polemics would mean that we should do his work for him and enable him to duck the issue. The best answer is to focus the item on the General Assembly's agenda.

As we all know, the General Assembly reiterated at its last session its strong condemnation of all military attacks on all nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes, including the military attacks by Israel on the nuclear facilities of Iraq. It did so in resolution 40/6, wherein it requested the Security Council to take urgent and effective measures to ensure compliance by Israel with the Council's resolution 487 (1981), in which the Council upheld, inter alia, the inalienable sovereign right of every State, especially the developing countries, to implement nuclear programmes for the purposes of development and other peaceful pursuits. In that resolution the Security Council strongly condemned the Israeli military attack on the Iraqi nuclear facility and declared it to be a violation of the Charter and the norms of international behaviour. The Council considered that Iraq was entitled to appropriate compensation for the damage it has suffered as a result of the Israeli attack, called upon Israel to refrain from further threats or acts of this nature and urged it to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the IAEA.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

We may well ask ourselves, so many years after the adoption of the resolution, the following questions. Has the resolution been implemented? Has Israel accepted IAEA safeguards? Has Israel consented to place its own nuclear facilities under international control? Has it stopped its blackmail and its threats of a repetition? The answer to all these questions is no; nothing has happened. The Security Council has been rendered impotent by the power of the veto, the mighty sword that protects Israel and enables it to trample the Council's resolutions underfoot with impunity.

Military attacks on peaceful nuclear installations are a very serious matter indeed. For one thing, they may cause the escape of lethal radiation into the atmosphere and thus pollute the common human environment in such a way as to threaten the lives and health of present and future generations of the Earth's inhabitants. It is indeed strange that the States of the world pay great attention to accidental nuclear disasters while they seem to lack the energy to do anything to prevent a nuclear disaster such as that which could result from a military attack such as the Israeli strike against the Iraqi facility. Failure to make an undertaking never to repeat such acts of aggression puts a special and historic responsibility on all States, in particular the permanent members of the Security Council, to enable the Council to take effective measures and use all the means at the disposal of those States, which are by no means insignificant, to bring pressure to bear on Israel and force it to implement the Security Council's resolution so that we can safeguard ourselves against a man-made nuclear disaster, which is much more likely to overtake us than any accidental or inopportune happening beyond human control.

We can see clearly the intentions of Israel and its real objectives in its persistent refusal to abide by the aforementioned Security Council resolution and its refusal to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

It has been revealed recently by neutral sources that Israel has so far stockpiled about 200 atomic bombs of various sizes. Each one of those bombs, irrespective of size, is an extremely destructive device which, in the hands of Israel, is an effective means of nuclear coercion and nuclear blackmail in a region where Israel is the only country with nuclear capability. Then it has the effrontery to attack a nuclear facility that is under international safeguards and, as everybody knows, dedicated to peaceful purposes.

In view of the fact that Israel is the sixth ranking nuclear Power in the world, the United Nations has a special responsibility to intensify its efforts and mobilize the efforts of the whole international community to declare the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

This is the subject that has been before the General Assembly since its twenty-ninth session, that is, for 12 years. Our own Arab response has been clear. The Arab countries' answers to what has been requested by the General Assembly have been unambiguous, while the Israeli response has been and continues to be an adamant refusal to accede to the requests of the General Assembly. Israel is hiding behind a smoke-screen of so-called reservations, prevarications and trickery. One has only to read its reply in document A/40/383 to get a taste of such tactics.

The continued nuclear co-operation between Israel and the racist South African régime continues to cause my country and the other countries of the Middle East and Africa great concern, since it is fraught with terrible dangers and extremely serious consequences for more than one area of the world and constitutes a threat to world peace and security. The racist Pretoria régime has also refused to adhere to the Treaty and rejects IAEA safeguards, just as Israel does.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

The Israeli attack on the peaceful nuclear facilities in Iraq was a horrifying act without precedent in the history of the world. It was unique in its effrontery. It branded its perpetrators for all time and must be a reminder of the radiation disasters which could befall the whole world. It is only natural that the General Assembly should continue to consider this item year after year and remain seized of it until the Security Council finds it possible to take practical measures to guarantee that such aggression will never be repeated. This will not happen as long as Israel has the unconditional support that it has been receiving and the umbrella of the veto, which covers its every excess, in the Security Council. The hand that wields the heavy bludgeon of the veto must share, in the eyes of all men and the eyes of history, the grave responsibility, such criminal disregard of the fate of mankind. My delegation hopes that reconsideration of this unjustifiable stance will result in a change that will allow the Council to have a free hand in discharging its duties and safeguarding the security and safety of the world. The way to do this is clear: the norms of international legality have to be upheld. The aggression we are discussing is the most serious example of deliberate and cynical flouting of those norms.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): In the past few years the United Nations General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), as well as the overwhelming majority of the international public, have on many occasions expressed their clear and unequivocal position and their assessment of the Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations, which were under IAEA control. In the troubled region of the Middle East that aggressive attack will remain recorded as a drastic example of a blatant and unprovoked policy of force and a violation of the basic rules of international behaviour. The manner in which it was carried out and the objectives of the Israeli raid gave the Middle East crisis a new and dangerous dimension the potential consequences of which it is unnecessary to explain in great detail.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

At their summit Conference in Harare the Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries

"requested IAEA to seek additional measures to effectively ensure that Israel undertakes not to strike or threaten peaceful nuclear installations in Iraq or elsewhere in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and in violation of the IAEA safeguards system".

The overwhelming majority of the international community and our Organization firmly rejected the Israeli explanation that it had been a preventive act of self-defence. They assessed it as a brutal violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent country and an attempt to deny its right to independent technological development in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The dangerous consequences for peace and security in the region, as well as for overall international relations, make it incumbent upon all of us not to forget that act and thus set a precedent for similar future actions.

Such actions constitute a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the basic norms of international behaviour and are a constant source of tension and instability in the Middle East and in international relations in general.

Yugoslavia condemned the Israeli attack, proceeding from the principle of the inadmissibility of interference in the internal affairs of other States and the use of force in international relations, irrespective of the origin of such actions and under what pretext they are committed. Such aggressive acts are contrary to the demand of the international community for a lasting, just and comprehensive solution of the Middle East crisis, which for years has been one of the most dangerous sources of international tension, and to the right to peace and security of all countries of the region. Such a solution implies, above all, recognition of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to establish a State of their own, withdrawal by Israel from all Arab territories occupied since June 1967 and renunciation by Israel of the policy of force, violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other countries of the region, and interference in their internal affairs.

Mr. AL-SABBAGH (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): Once again the General Assembly returns to the armed Israeli attack in June 1981, on the peaceful Iraqi nuclear facility and its grave consequences for international peace and security. The passage of six years and the repeated discussions have not diminished the shock of that brutal act of aggression. The item will remain on our agenda as long as Israel persists in its refusal to comply with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

The international community has condemned the Israeli attack on the peaceful nuclear facility in Iraq. The Security Council, in its resolution 487 (1981), unanimously branded the attack an unprecedented act of premeditated aggression and called upon Israel to refrain in the future from such aggression against the security and safety of Iraq.

(Mr. Al-Sabbagh, Bahrain)

That act of aggression was a serious blow to the safeguards régime of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which is the basis for the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It was perpetrated against a country which is wholly committed to the safeguards system and the Non-Proliferation Treaty and has placed its nuclear facilities under the IAEA system.

Israel was not content with its naked aggression. It has continued to threaten a repetition in the future. This attitude undermines every collective effort aimed at preventing the use or threat of force in international relations. It is an obvious threat to international peace.

The General Assembly has adopted one resolution after another and has repeatedly called for an end to Israel's threats to launch yet more attacks on nuclear facilities in Iraq and elsewhere.

Israel's aggression is but one aspect of the policy of State terrorism which it systematically practises against Iraq and other Arab countries. It is a policy based on the belief that Israel has the right to threaten at will the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab States, interfere in their internal affairs and dictate to them. This outlook was certainly behind the premeditated act of Israeli aggression against the Palestine Liberation Organization's headquarters in Tunis in 1985, which violated Tunisia's sovereignty and territorial integrity and trampled underfoot all the norms of international law.

Israel has always tried to mask those acts of aggression by claiming the need for safety and security. This sort of perverted logic is not in consonance with the fact that it is Israel that pursues a policy of aggression and expansion against its Arab neighbours. Suffice it to refer to Israel's repeated acts of aggression against Lebanon, especially in the south. We do not need to speak in detail of Israel's invasion of Lebanon in 1982 and its repeated violations since that date of that country's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

(Mr. Al-Sabbagh, Bahrain)

This unending aggression is Israel's policy. It has decided that it has the right to practise international terrorism at State level. In so doing, it ignores the basic provisions of the United Nations Charter and the norms of international law. It pursues a policy of intimidation and brutal force in furthering its aggressive, expansionist schemes not only against its direct Arab neighbours but against any Arab State irrespective of geographical distance. Its aggression against Iraq created a dangerous precedent which it now views as the basis of an acquired right to launch any act of aggression against other States whenever it feels like making a strike, in total disregard of the norms of international law.

Iraq is a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and is committed to its provisions. Iraq has accepted the IAEA safeguards and has willingly placed its nuclear facilities under those safeguards. Israel has adamantly refused to adhere to the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It continues to develop its nuclear facilities without any international supervision. It does so in furtherance of its expansionist, aggressive goals, which are a constant source of danger to all the States of the region. This has had the effect of intensifying the arms race in the Middle East and has aggravated an already serious situation of tension and instability.

Iraq's aim was to acquire advanced nuclear technology for the purpose of development, prosperity and the welfare of its people.

For the sixth year running the Assembly is debating this item. It is clear that the international community is concerned and wishes to put an end to this type of aggression and ensure that it will not be repeated. Such naked aggression violates the United Nations Charter, the rules of international law and the principles governing relations between States, including the principle of the non-use of force or the threat of force in international relations.

(Mr. Al-Sabbagh, Bahrain)

After years of debate, it has become sufficiently clear that denunciation and condemnation are of no avail in the case of a State blinded by its arrogance and fascinated by its muscle-flexing. Iraq must be compensated for the serious damage inflicted upon its nuclear facilities. In addition, it is necessary to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Israel in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

The General Assembly and the Security Council should take concrete action to force Israel to comply with their earlier resolutions and desist from this aggressive policy.

The State of Bahrain finds that the draft resolution before us under this item meets the minimum requirements in respect of the question involved and believes that the General Assembly should adopt it, in accordance with the responsibility of the United Nations as a whole to safeguard international peace and security, the rule of law and international legitimacy.

Mr. BELONOGOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): For some years now the General Assembly has had to continue its consideration of the question of Israel's armed aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations. This question has not ceased to be topical; the harmful consequences of that outrageous act of State terrorism for the cause of peace and international security and for efforts to ensure a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East problem are more noticeable than ever before.

Peace cannot be brought to the Middle East through power politics or by imposing separate deals. The solution to the problem must be political and comprehensive and take into consideration the interests of all the peoples of the region. It is precisely this kind of large-scale programme for a comprehensive Middle East settlement that is contained in the well-known Soviet proposals. In our view the main instrument for the achievement of a just settlement must be an international conference on the Middle East.

The readiness of the Soviet Union to co-operate constructively with all who sincerely seek a just and lasting peace in the Middle East has been reaffirmed at the present session of the General Assembly. Speaking in the general debate, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Eduard A. Shevardnadze, proposed, as a practical step in that direction that a preparatory committee be set up within the framework of the Security Council to do the necessary work for convening such a conference.

Israel opposes this approach, which meets the interests of the overwhelming majority of the States of the region, by its destructive course of action in pursuing an aggressive policy against the Arab countries, by violating their national dignity and sovereignty and, recently, by its quest for nuclear hegemony in the Middle East. The Soviet Union, like many other countries, has strongly condemned Israel's piratical attack against the nuclear reactor in Tammuz and

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

branded it an act of aggression. And each year Israel's expansionist policy becomes more dangerous, in view of its well-known nuclear aspirations.

As noted in the report by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, Israel reached "the threshold of becoming a nuclear-weapon State" (A/40/520, p. 5) at least 10 years ago. Bearing in mind its nuclear facilities, the availability of nuclear materials required for their operation, the existence of the scientific and technical knowledge and of an adequate number of well-trained, experienced staff, the Group of Experts which prepared that report emphasized that it had no doubt that Israel was capable of manufacturing nuclear weapons within a very short time, if it had not already crossed that threshold.

There have long been reports in the world press that Tel Aviv is developing nuclear weapons in strict secrecy. The most recent such report was the sensational disclosure in the English newspaper The Sunday Times of 5 October 1986 of convincing material, including photographs, confirming the existence in Israel of an underground facility for nuclear-weapon production at the Dimona centre in the Negev desert, where apparently 100 to 200 nuclear bombs have already been stockpiled.

The existence of this programme has been carefully concealed by the Israeli Government for many years. From time to time, however, reports have filtered through the shroud of absolute secrecy surrounding the very existence of the nuclear centre, which was established in Dimona in the 1960s, indicating that the facility, built according to Western technology, is developing nuclear weapons. For example, over the years the Israeli Government has procured in Western countries, circumventing their legislative provisions prohibiting the export of nuclear technology, equipment for manufacturing nuclear devices, the detonators needed to set them off and nuclear materials.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

In this context, the fact that Israel stubbornly refuses to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons appears particularly ominous. The Soviet delegation stresses once again that the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is a major factor in ensuring international peace and security. Based on the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), this Treaty serves as a reliable barrier to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and at the same time effectively ensures international co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Israel's attack on the peaceful Iraqi nuclear installations appears to be an even more cynical act of State terrorism if we take into account the fact that Iraq has been a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty since it came into force in 1970. Iraq has accepted the IAEA safeguards with regard to all its nuclear activities and fulfils in good faith the relevant obligations.

In the view of the Soviet delegation, consideration of the question of Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations is particularly relevant, because Israel has persisted, with the connivance of its protectors, in its aggressive policies and has not renounced its threat to carry out such an attack on the nuclear installations of other States of the region if and when it considers it necessary - and all this despite the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, which clearly condemn the piratical actions of Tel Aviv.

The Soviet Union believes that the General Assembly should take the most drastic measures to curb Israel's nuclear ambitions and strive to ensure the implementation of its decisions aimed at limiting Israel's capacity to pursue a policy of aggression and blackmail against Arab countries and strengthening world peace and security.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Experience tells us that the peaceful atom too can conceal great risks. This has been demonstrated by the consequences of the 150 accidents at various nuclear facilities in the world that have been recorded.

The international community is making significant efforts to establish a system for the safe development of nuclear energy. One major achievement was the signing of two Conventions, one on early notification of nuclear accidents and the other on assistance in the case of a nuclear accident or radiological emergency, at the first special session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), devoted to consideration of measures to strengthen international co-operation in the area of nuclear and radiation safety. Those agreements are designed to unite the efforts of many States in the decades to come in the cause of ensuring trouble-free operation of nuclear plants, and provide a good basis for a comprehensive programme for the stable and safe development of nuclear energy.

One of the States which signed both of those Conventions is Israel. It remains a mystery, however, how the participation of a State in those important international legal instruments, intended first and foremost to prevent possible accidents at nuclear plants and to deal with the consequences should such accidents occur, can be compatible with its proclaimed right to attack the peaceful nuclear installations of another State which are under IAEA safeguards.

The question of protecting peaceful nuclear facilities from armed attack is now being discussed at the Conference on Disarmament. It is to be hoped that, despite the complicated nature of this problem, the Conference on Disarmament will next year take up the consideration of this question with a view to a speedy completion of the drafting of an agreement on international measures to prevent actions which would lead to the deliberate destruction of civilian nuclear facilities. The conclusion of such a treaty would be a useful addition to the

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Conventions recently concluded in Vienna, and would contribute to the establishment of an international régime for the safe development of nuclear energy.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation has been taking part in the discussion of this item, namely, Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation in Tammuz, since Israel first committed those acts of armed aggression against the Iraqi installation in 1981. The fact that the United Nations continues to consider this matter confirms the following facts.

First of all, resolution 487 (1981) of the Security Council, which was unanimously adopted in 1981, has not yet been implemented by Israel. That resolution included two essential conditions which Israel, the aggressor, was called upon to fulfil: the first was an undertaking not to attack Iraqi nuclear reactors in the future, or to threaten to do so, and the second was an undertaking to submit its nuclear installations to the IAEA safeguards system.

Secondly, in the course of the past five years, the General Assembly in its various resolutions has stressed the need for Israel to accept those two obligations, and the Assembly has, inter alia, condemned Israel for its aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation. That condemnation was in addition to those contained in the resolutions of the General Conference of the IAEA.

Thirdly, in attacking the Iraqi nuclear installation, Israel was attacking not only Iraq and the Arab nation, which is in a state of war with Israel, but also the third world countries and their legitimate right to use ways and means likely to further their economic development. We must emphasize here how important it is for the developing countries to be able to make use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in order to achieve economic development. Israel's aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation constitutes an attack on the IAEA safeguards. The former Director of the Agency, Dr. Eklund, said that the act of aggression

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

perpetrated by Israel constituted an attack on the IAEA safeguards system, a system which is the cornerstone of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Fourthly, Israel's aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation is an act of the State terrorism perpetrated by Israel whenever it can against Arab States. It would be idle for me to relate the many acts of aggression committed by Israel against the Arab countries in applying its plans for expansion and the establishment of settlements, while compelling the Arabs to leave their homeland.

Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear installation and its non-compliance with the resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly cast doubts on the usefulness of repeated condemnations of Israel. We feel that so long as the General Assembly takes no radical measures against Israel, in particular through the implementation of Chapter VII of the Charter, Israel will go even further in its insolence and will continue to flout the resolutions of the General Assembly.

I should recall the following for the benefit of delegations here. Did not Israel reject resolution 487 (1981) of the Security Council? Did it not reject all its provisions? Has Israel ever accepted any paragraph in any of the General Assembly resolutions adopted year after year on the subject under discussion? Has Israel placed its nuclear installations under IAEA safeguards? Has Israel acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a sign of good will? Has not Israel repeated its threats, declaring that it will continue its military attacks on Iraqi nuclear installations and on others that may be found in neighbouring countries, installations that are devoted to peaceful purposes? Did Sharon not declare that Israel had the right to attack any nuclear installation built by Iraq which represented a danger to the security of Israel? Have we forgotten the declarations of Begin when he was at the head of the Israeli Government, that his country would destroy any new nuclear installation which might be built by Iraq or any other Arab country? These are the facts and the declarations which the General Assembly must face squarely.

(Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab
Republic)

Instead of those declarations, we should have heard Israel undertake not to attack peaceful nuclear installations again, to submit its own nuclear installations to the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency and to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

We are not surprised at Israel's behaviour, nor at the excuses put forward by it. Israel owes its existence to acts of aggression and banditry, with which its history is fraught, to say nothing of the international plots that led to the birth of that State, plots for which some of those responsible are still among us in this Hall.

The argument of self-defence which Israel adduces in explanation of its attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor is no longer valid. Israel has used the same pretext for all its terrorist attacks. It did so when it occupied Arab territories, expelling hundreds of thousands of refugees. It did so when it bombarded and occupied Beirut. Israel annexed the Golan Heights and established settlements on the pretext that it was defending its right to existence, the same reason being given for its massacres and violations of the United Nations Charter and the norms of international law. That is why we ask: how far will the concept of self-defence go? Is Israel to be allowed to do anything in the name of such a concept? Could Israel have defied the international community unless it had had the support and encouragement of its strategic ally, the United States of America? It is regrettable that Washington should have encouraged Israel to pursue its policy of terrorism against the Arab States. The Government of the United States encouraged and supported Israel in its wars against the Arabs, the destruction of their infrastructures and installations and the displacement of their populations. Even Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor was justified by the American Administration. Did not President Reagan, after the aggression declare:

(Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab
Republic)

"Israel had every reason to be concerned at the existence of that Iraqi nuclear installation which its aircraft destroyed. Israel acted in legitimate self-defence."

The General Assembly is invited today to preserve the right of developing countries to use every available means likely to enable them to achieve economic and social development for their peoples. The Assembly must condemn Israel for its act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor and ask it to undertake never to commit such acts of aggression again. The fact that Israel does not carry out its obligations empowers the General Assembly to take the necessary steps to prevent Israel from repeating such acts of aggression.

The General Assembly must now know that Israel has built up a nuclear arsenal which threatens the security of the Middle East region. Information is available confirming Israel's vast nuclear capacity. I refer to the article in The Sunday Times of London dated 5 October quoting Mordecai Vanunu, an Israeli expert who escaped from Israel. He said that Israel had some 100 to 200 nuclear bombs. The international community must put an end to the nuclear capacity of the racist Zionist régime. The international community must also put an end to the nuclear capacity of the racist régime in South Africa. It should impose strict controls on those two régimes, to prevent them from committing acts of genocide against Arabs and Africans. The nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa is well known. Those two countries are helped by the United States of America and certain other Western countries. It is therefore not surprising that those two régimes should refuse to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or to submit their nuclear installations to the safeguards of the IAEA.

Mr. KOVACIC (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The General Assembly this year again, for the sixth time in succession, is considering the

(Mr. Kovacic, Czechoslovakia)

question of Israel's attack in June 1981 against Iraq's nuclear facilities - facilities which, in accordance with article IV of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, are intended for exclusively peaceful purposes. That unprecedented act of aggression, which became a striking example of Israel's policy of State terrorism, is something which the international community unequivocally and most decisively condemned. At its thirty-sixth session the General Assembly adopted a resolution intended to thwart Israel's threat to repeat such an aggression. However, that resolution has not been implemented; therefore our Organization has once again been forced to consider the question of Israel's aggressive action against Iraqi nuclear facilities. We are talking about an act which is extremely dangerous for overall peace and security, an act which is in no way justified, an act which our Organization cannot allow to go unnoticed without taking effective measures to prevent the repetition of such acts in the future. That is necessary because Israel has not foresworn its aggressive piratical practices. Evidence of that is the attack it carried out last year against the headquarters of the Palestine Liberation Organization in Tunisia and its conduct in Lebanon, which it does not acknowledge as being a sovereign and independent State. It occupies part of its territory and unceasingly carries out armed raids against that country.

We also know about the statements made by Israeli politicians, statements in which the repetition of aggression against nuclear facilities is said to be allowable "if necessary".

Our Organization cannot ignore the fact that Israel, despite numerous appeals, has systematically refused to accede to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It has refused to conclude relevant agreements on guarantees and according to available information it is carrying out research in order to acquire its own nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Kovacic, Czechoslovakia)

By the same token, we are seriously worried by the news that part of the important technical facilities and materials used by Israel in its research comes from other countries. There is no doubt that giving that kind of technical assistance contradicts the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Moreover, measures must be taken to prevent the export of important information and equipment, even through illegal means.

If we bear in mind the fact that Israel has from the very outset striven at any cost to maintain its military superiority over Arab countries, then there is no justification for not believing this information either. However, on the other hand, it is hard to imagine what it would mean if nuclear weapons were to fall into Israel's hands, bearing in mind its unrelenting expansionist aggressive ambitions and its flagrant disregard for fundamental standards of international law. The very fact that Israel struck against Iraqi nuclear facilities must be considered as an attack with the use of a nuclear weapon and consequently as a most serious crime against mankind.

The important significance of our Organization's consideration of the question of Israel's aggression against Iraqi nuclear facilities is becoming quite clear, especially today when the international community is faced with the grave task of ensuring maximum protection and security for nuclear facilities. This refers also to the protection of peaceful nuclear facilities against armed terrorist attacks which represent a serious threat for all States and all peoples of the world.

Therefore, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic vigorously demands that Israel guarantee that it will not repeat its act of aggression against any nuclear facilities and will respect the right of States to technical and scientific development. At the same time, we support the legitimate demands of Iraq for appropriate compensation for the damage it suffered as a result of Israel's acts of aggression against its peaceful nuclear facilities.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community.

On 7 June 1981, in an attack which was in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct, Israeli aircraft destroyed the Osirak research reactor near Baghdad. The attack was strongly condemned by the Security Council in its resolution 487 of 19 June 1981, which was adopted unanimously. The matter was thereafter raised at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and at subsequent sessions.

The Twelve's attitude was and remains clear. We condemned the attack. We endorse the repeated appeals made to Israel to comply in full with the provisions of Security Council resolution 487 (1981). We reaffirm our belief that every State has the right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy under effective international safeguards in strict conformity with the aims embodied in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is moreover of the greatest importance that any State should refrain from acts of violence which inevitably aggravate existing tensions in the Middle East.

Last year the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) concluded its consideration of the agenda item on the subject in question by adopting its resolution 443. That resolution considered that the letter of 23 September 1985 from the resident representative of Israel, and the statement by the representative of Israel on 26 September 1985, contained undertakings on behalf of their Government in response to the IAEA General Conference resolution 425, and noted that Israel had thereby committed itself not to attack or threaten to attack peaceful nuclear facilities in Iraq, elsewhere in the Middle East, or anywhere else.

Without detracting in any way from our position taken on the subject of the attack, we would question whether this item need be included any longer on the agenda. The Secretary-General, in his report this year on the work of the

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

Organization, expressed his belief that the important purposes of the General Assembly under the Charter are seldom served by excessive repetition. The Twelve share this view.

Mr. MAHMUD KHAN (Pakistan): The Israeli attack on an Iraqi nuclear reactor on 7 June 1981 constituted not only an act of blatant aggression against a sovereign and independent State in violation of the United Nations Charter but also a typical example of State terrorism at its worst. The reckless policies pursued by Israel against the Falestinian and Arab peoples demonstrate a complete disregard for the consequences of its lawless conduct for international peace and security. It is for this reason that the international community during the past five years has repeatedly expressed its concern and indignation at the unprovoked attack by Israel and condemned Israeli designs to pursue similar acts of aggression against the Arab and Islamic world.

The Israeli attack on an Iraqi nuclear reactor, which was under full International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, was a deliberate attempt to subvert the tenuous foundations of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the objective of promoting international co-operation for the peaceful use of nuclear energy. It is clear that even those nuclear facilities which are under IAEA safeguards are not exempt from illegal actions aimed at their destruction. The international community and, in particular, the permanent members of the Security Council, have a special responsibility to take affirmative action to prevent recurrence of similar acts by Israel or any other State. In this context, Israel's full compliance with Security Council resolution 487 (1981) of 19 June 1981 is of paramount importance.

Pakistan was among the first countries to underscore in the United Nations and relevant disarmament forums the grave consequences of this irresponsible act by Israel. Our concern about the Israeli act and its implications for international

(Mr. Mahmud Kahn, Pakistan)

peace and security was appropriately reflected in the deliberations of the Conference on Disarmament in its session held shortly after the attack. It is unacceptable that Israel should arrogate to itself the right to carry out military attacks on the basis of its own arbitrary and untenable assertions regarding the intentions of other States which are refuted by all objective evidence.

(Mr. Mahmud Khan, Pakistan)

The Israeli aggression constitutes a violation of the sovereign and inalienable right of any State to acquire and develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. It also contradicts the basic principles outlined in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which provides the only agreed basis on which nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States can develop an international consensus and ways and means to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

In recent years a number of developing countries have acquired or have been in the process of acquiring nuclear technology for the purposes of accelerating their economic and social development. That right of the developing countries is recognized by the international community and was endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 32/50 of 8 December 1977. The nuclear facilities in most of these countries are more vulnerable to military attacks than those in militarily significant States. The danger to which such facilities are exposed is aggravated by the propaganda spread by certain quarters that the peaceful nuclear programmes of developing countries will inevitably result in the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Repetition of such an attack by Israel or any other State - besides its grave consequences for international peace and security - would seriously jeopardize the efforts of the international community to promote nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We therefore believe that nuclear facilities should in no circumstances be the object of military attack or sabotage, for any reason whatsoever. It is for that reason that Pakistan has strongly advocated the urgent need for an international treaty to prohibit attacks on nuclear facilities.

(Mr. Mahmud Khan, Pakistan)

It has become increasingly evident that destruction of nuclear reactors could create effects similar to a limited nuclear exchange and could trigger the escalation from conventional to nuclear conflicts. The question of the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities is serious enough to merit agreement without being linked to non-proliferation concerns or used as a device to press developing countries to accept discriminatory safeguards or restrictions.

The General Assembly should once again reaffirm the need for the expeditious conclusion of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, with a view to achieving the immediate conclusion of an agreement on the prohibition of military attacks on nuclear facilities. We urge the Conference on Disarmament to adopt a comprehensive international convention in this regard, which, if observed strictly, would effectively prevent the danger of a radiological war and would contribute to promoting peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

In conclusion, my delegation extends its full support to the draft resolution introduced this morning under agenda item 24. That draft resolution addresses the international concerns arising from the dastardly Israeli attack against Iraqi nuclear facilities and would contribute to promoting international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, as well as strengthening the non-proliferation objectives so vital to the preservation of the peace and development of mankind.

Mrs. DIAMATARIS (Cyprus): For the sixth consecutive year the General Assembly is considering the Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations at Osirak and its grave consequences.

The world has denounced the Israeli attack and the destruction of the Iraqi installations as an unprovoked and unjustifiable act of aggression. Iraq, a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, had its nuclear facilities under the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguard system at the time when the attack occurred.

(Mrs. Diamataris, Cyprus)

The Cyprus Government and the people of Cyprus expressed their indignation immediately after the Israeli attack, which placed an extra burden on the already deteriorating political situation and opened wider the chasm between the two sides of the Middle East problem.

Cyprus, a victim itself of invasion and occupation, considers it its duty to reiterate its condemnation of the Israeli attack. Cyprus rejects any intervention or interference in the internal affairs of States as well as the use or threat of use of force in international relations.

Israel acted in total disregard of the letter and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, and contrary to principles of international law. It is regrettable that Israel still continues to refuse to comply with the relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

Cyprus strongly holds the view that one of the most serious problems the Organization is facing is the non-implementation of numerous resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. We believe that it is high time for steps to be taken to strengthen the United Nations so that such acts as the one perpetrated against Iraq will not be repeated.

Mr. RATH (India): The issue before us cannot be looked at separately from the general pattern of Israeli behaviour in the Middle East. The views of my Government on the basic problems of the Middle East are well known. Israel continues to defy the will of the international community and has frustrated all major initiatives designed to bring about just and lasting peace in the area. Its military attack on the Iraqi atomic reactor near Baghdad in June 1981 was yet another link in the chain of acts of Israeli adventurism against Arab countries.

The Government of India unequivocally condemned the Israeli action. Immediately after the attack we expressed our solidarity with the Government and

(Mr. Rath, India)

people of Iraq, a nation with which India has close and cordial relations. The international community saw in the Israeli action a new threat to international peace and security. The Israeli action was condemned by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

In a world which is scarce in energy resources the right of sovereign States to acquire and develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes for their development programmes has been widely recognized. Iraq's nuclear installations were a part of that country's efforts to develop and utilize nuclear energy for its social and economic development. Iraq had all along declared that its nuclear programme was devoted to the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Israel's contention that it chose to destroy the nuclear installations of Iraq since the latter was on the verge of producing nuclear weapons was a story that few believed.

In our view, Israel should pay adequate compensation to Iraq for the damage caused and should undertake a commitment not to resort to such actions in the future.

My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution because it clearly expresses the views of the international community about the blatant act committed by Israel against Iraq on 7 June 1981. However, while supporting the draft resolution, I should like to reaffirm that the position of my delegation on issues such as the non-proliferation Treaty and full-scope safeguards, a position which has been repeatedly stated before, remains unchanged.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have first to thank you sincerely, Mr. President, for the very important role your presidency is playing on this vital issue, a very sensitive issue, which is often undermined, underplayed and underrepresented. It is an honour for the whole Muslim world to have a Muslim brother as the President of the General Assembly, under whose presidency we are to discuss one of our common Islamic grievances.

The basic grievance we are talking about today is simply the attack by the military forces of the Zionist base occupying Palestine on the nuclear installations belonging to the Iraqi people. That attack on one part of the territory and property of the Muslim Ummah cannot be, and is not, separate from or isolated from the other aggressions, attacks, acts of destruction and crimes perpetrated by the Zionist forces against the same Muslim Ummah, whose rights have so often been ignored by the General Assembly. It is the General Assembly - not the same ladies and gentlemen, but the same institution - that transplanted that injury, that wound, that cancer from elsewhere to our beloved Palestine. When in those days the General Assembly put that dirty cancer in Palestine, it attacked all of us - all our property, all our values and all our territory.

I ask representatives not to misrepresent the issue. Anyone who wants to defend us should do so fully, honestly and comprehensively. One of our revolutionary writers, who is said to have been assassinated in the early active days of the revolution by agents of the Shah, said in one of his writings that the greatest injustice to an issue is to defend it badly and weakly. That is the point I wish to make. The attack on Iraq's nuclear installations was an attack on the property of the Muslim Ummah and should be viewed only in that perspective.

My second point concerns the position of the Islamic Republic of Iran on that criminal attack. The people of Iraq, the dignified, great, honourable people of Iraq, are our Muslim brothers and sisters, and our duty to them with regard to the

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

attack on their property remains absolutely independent of, and detached from, the war of aggression that a crazy clique has imposed on both nations, a clique that is still ruling our Iraqi brothers and sisters. We think that even that war of aggression was nothing but the implementation of the aggressive Zionist policies imposed on the entire Muslim Ummah.

In this respect, we should again and again reiterate that we stand beside our Iraqi brothers and sisters against the Zionist aggressors. Here, we have to defend, as our religious duty, the rights of the Iraqis, and therefore we strongly condemn the military aggression by the Zionist forces against the Iraqi nuclear installations, which were intended only for peaceful purposes and peaceful uses. The attack was a violation of, and aggression against, the rights of the Muslim Ummah, the principles of international law and the norms of international morality.

However, the draft resolution (A/41/L.14), if it is to be the final version, is slightly less than we had expected. It is too condoning of, and too friendly to, the aggressor. In order to patch it up and compensate for that shortcoming, my delegation wishes to introduce the following amendment, which will become the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution. The present first paragraph will become the second, and will be renumbered accordingly, as will the others.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

So operative paragraph 1 would read:

"Strongly condemns all military attacks on all nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes, including the military attacks by Israel on the nuclear facilities of Iraq".

That would make the whole draft resolution more balanced, more objective and more to the point, and therefore more acceptable to my delegation.

The other point I should like to raise is with regard to some crocodile tears that the General Assembly saw shed today by the representative of the Zionist base occupying Palestine. He has tried to exploit the issue of the Iran-Iraq conflict in order to divert the attention of the international public from the genuine, correct issue before the present session of the General Assembly. The General Assembly is considering the aggression by the Zionist forces against the Iraqi installations. We have not had any discussion of the Iran-Iraq war today. It is not on the agenda and it is not going to be on the agenda. Therefore, regardless of whether what he said was correct or incorrect, any exploitation of that issue merely in order to divert the attention of the international public from the real issue under consideration is a very dirty Zionist trick which must be condemned. I hope that no individual, whether for us or against us, will pay any attention to this dirty Zionist manoeuvre.

Whether chemical war was or was not resorted to by Iraq, whether civilians were or were not bombarded, these are issues related to the Iran-Iraq conflict. As far as substance is concerned, even if one believes that what he said had some substance, one has to remember that he was underplaying those issues. He was very soft. The issues he raised were far below the reality of the crimes committed against us in the context of the Iran-Iraq war, therefore it was treacherous and

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

dishonest of him. So both as regards substance and from the procedural point of view, as regards the form, those issues were absolutely irrelevant.

There is another point that should be taken into consideration. Even on the most genuine issue, on the most appropriate matter, the most apt comment by an illegal, unauthorized and improper person remains null and void. We, like many of our brothers in the General Assembly, have already expressed our reservations with regard to the credentials of the representative of the Zionist base occupying Palestine, but many who either abstained or were absent, we believe, agree with us. They too believe that the presence of this element in the General Assembly is absolutely illegal and improper.

It is a fact that Palestine is occupied. It is also a fact that under a forged flag, under a forged label, with a forged national anthem, with a forged political identity and with a forged population, a forged State has been constituted and, thanks to the support of the imperialist forces, that forged entity has gained some transient recognition in the General Assembly.

We have all sorts of problems that gradually, we hope, by the grace of God, will just go away. We sometimes become sick, we have ailments and problems, and of course we recover. This is a political ailment, a political sickness, and from this too we shall soon recover. Therefore, we do not recognize cancer. Cancer exists, but we do not recognize it. That is why we are fighting it in every laboratory. Here too we are fighting our political cancer fully and, we hope, efficiently. If one wishes to give recognition, it is only as a cancer that one can recognize this entity. Otherwise it has no recognition and its comments, whether for us or against us, remain absolutely irrelevant.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

I will conclude my statement by adding one final point. The basic problem of the entire people of the Middle East, as many speakers before me today and on many previous days have rightly reiterated, although they were not listened to, is the presence of the Zionist base occupying Palestine. As soon as the dignitaries behind that dirty shop come to the conclusion that that shop must be closed, many problems will be automatically resolved. It is a base for creating division, for destruction, for occupation, for killing Lebanese Muslims, for killing Palestinian Muslims, for attacking atomic installations belonging to the Iraqi people, for bringing all sorts of creative mischief to everybody in the region. We have to get rid of that base. When that base - soon, by the grace of God - comes to an end, we shall all be in a state of relief. For the General Assembly, particularly when the financial situation has attracted the attention of many, it is important to remember that if that base did not exist most of the problems related to the Middle East would simply be deleted from every agenda. Our work would be nice and neat, tidy, to the point and relevant and we should be able to resolve international problems peacefully and with co-operation. But when there is always a wrong element, a mistake, among us, it contaminates all of us.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran has proposed an amendment to the draft resolution. I hope that representatives have noted the amendment. For their convenience I shall read it out as we noted it, and I would request the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to correct me if we are wrong. The Iranian amendment would add a new operative paragraph 1, reading as follows:

"Strongly condemns all military attacks on all nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes, including the military attacks by Israel on the nuclear facilities of Iraq".

(The President)

I call on the representative of Jordan, who wishes to introduce an amendment to the Iranian amendment.

Mr. NASHASHIBI (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran has submitted an amendment to insert a new operative paragraph 1 before the present operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/41/L.14. My delegation would like to put forward the following amendment to the Iranian amendment:

(spoke in English)

"Reiterates its strong condemnation of the military attack by Israel on the Iraqi nuclear facilities, as well as any future attack on nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes".

(continued in Arabic)

My delegation hopes that all States Members will vote in favour of this amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The Observer of the League of Arab States, has asked to make a statement. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V), of 1 November 1950.

Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): While the international community expectantly awaits word of possible super-Power agreement on meaningful reductions in nuclear-weapon stockpiles, an agreement that would brighten mankind's hopes for survival, we in the Middle East continue to face the palpable threat of a nuclear-armed Israel, with no means or prospects of reducing that danger.

Let me remind members that Israel is not a benign, peaceful State, but an aggressive militaristic country which has amply demonstrated its appetite for conquest and expansion and its clear readiness to use maximum force, regardless of the consequences, to attain its ends. It has been expanding since its foundation

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

nearly four decades ago and it continues to cast covetous eyes on neighbouring Arab lands.

The international community has heard with varying degrees of scepticism Israel's demure protestations that it will not be the first to introduce nuclear arms in the Middle East. We have also witnessed the extreme secrecy with which Israel has blanketed all aspects of its nuclear programme. It has refused to sign the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It has rejected any attempt to have its nuclear facilities inspected by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). It has even barred visits to those facilities by scientists from other countries, such as the United States, and by Senators from the United States, which has made vital contributions to Israel's nuclear weapons capability. Only recently news reports had it that Israeli intelligence agents kidnapped an Israeli citizen, a former nuclear technician, who had left Israel and released information about the secret stockpiling of nuclear warheads.

Secrecy and clandestine methods were the hallmark of Israel's nuclear-weapons programme from its inception almost immediately after the founding of Israel. Even then, Israeli scientists were trying to extract low-grade uranium from phosphate in the Negev desert and to acquire technology from the United States and Western Europe that would help them establish a viable nuclear programme.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s Israel acquired nuclear reactors from France and the United States, trained its scientists and developed its technology. The result was the highly secret nuclear facility at Dimona in the Negev, which for years was passed off by the Israelis as a textile factory. The Dimona bomb factory became operational in 1965, more than 20 years ago, and it and other Israeli nuclear-weapon facilities have been producing the means of atomic destruction at a rate that puts Israel's stockpile at more than 100 bombs of 20-kiloton yield or more.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

A wall of secrecy also surrounded the last two incidents, both linked to Israel, involving the disappearance of uranium fuel. In one case, in the mid-1960s, some 200 pounds of weapons-grade uranium disappeared from a plant in Apollo, Pennsylvania, run by the Nuclear Materials and Equipment Corporation, known as NUMEC. The United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) suspected as early as 1968 that Israel had acquired nuclear-weapons capability by using some of the uranium missing from NUMEC. It so informed President Lyndon Johnson, who reportedly ordered the findings kept secret.

On 27 April 1981, Carl Duckett, a former senior CIA official responsible for technical and nuclear intelligence, said on ABC's "Close Up" television programme: "I think the clear consensus in the CIA was, indeed, that NUMEC material had been diverted and had been used by the Israelis in fabricating weapons." In the same programme, ABC News reported that NUMEC files were missing, that the firm's bookkeeping was inaccurate and that security at the Apollo plant was inadequate. Also, intimate business relations existed between NUMEC and Israel.

In the second case, about 200 tons of natural uranium, enough to run the Dimona reactor for 10 years, disappeared at sea in 1968 during a shipment from West Germany to Italy. The uranium was aboard the Sheersburg A, a merchant vessel bound for Genoa out of Antwerp. The ship never arrived in Genoa, but 15 days after it left Antwerp, it docked at Iskenderun, Turkey, with an empty hold. The vessel then proceeded to Italy, where the captain and the crew also disappeared. Investigators from six European countries and the United States later concluded that the uranium aboard the Sheersburg A had ended up in Israel.

Israel has also increased its own production of uranium as a by-product of its large phosphate industry, thus acquiring virtual autonomy in its military nuclear requirements. Experts say that Israel has little or no need to import uranium,

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

even though it is readily available from suppliers such as South Africa, with which Israel has long had close links in the field of nuclear-weapons research and development, and which also is not a member of the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty.

Israel today may be the world's sixth nuclear Power. It has not only a stockpile of nuclear bombs but a constantly improving delivery system. The Israeli air force can provide a mix of jet warplanes to deliver nuclear bombs to their targets, while Israeli-built missiles, such as the Jericho, with a range of 280 miles, can reach other targets, all in the Arab world.

It has been calculated that the Jericho, even if launched from within Israel's pre-1967 borders, can reach Cairo, Alexandria, Helwan and Port Said in Egypt; Damascus, Aleppo, Homs and Latakiah in Syria; and Amman in Jordan. And we know from graphic experience that Israeli planes, refuelled in mid-air, can strike as far east as Baghdad in Iraq and as far west as Tunis in Tunisia. But Israel has not been idle, and it is certain that both the quality and quantity of its nuclear arsenal and delivery system are being upgraded.

The scope of the danger facing the Middle East becomes even clearer when it is realized that Israel wants to be not only a nuclear Power, but the only such Power in the region. It thus has arrogated to itself the task of snuffing out any attempt by any Arab country to reach a level of nuclear technology which could theoretically lead to the acquisition of a weapons capability.

For the record let it be said that not a single Arab country has attempted to turn its nuclear research programme in the direction of weapons development. Several Arab States have nuclear research facilities, but they are all dedicated to peaceful uses and are regularly inspected by teams from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

That was also the case with Iraq, which sought to build facilities for peaceful nuclear research, knowing that nuclear energy would play a major role in the next century, especially as the world's petroleum reserves dwindle and become increasingly hard to exploit.

Iraq is a signatory of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and its nuclear reactor, dubbed Osiraq, near Baghdad, was fully under the inspection of the International Atomic Energy Agency. There was never any doubt that the Iraqi nuclear plant was built specifically for peaceful purposes.

But on 7 June 1981, Israeli warplanes flew 1,000 kilometres, violating the air space of several Arab countries, to bomb the reactor building on the outskirts of Baghdad. The Israeli prime minister at the time, Menachem Begin, charged that the Iraqi reactor was meant to produce nuclear weapons, but he was given the lie by a mass of evidence to the contrary submitted by international experts, including those of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor was a clear case of aggression, and it was condemned as such, unanimously, by the United Nations Security Council. It was also a violation of United States laws, because Israel used American-built planes supplied to Israel under the restrictions of the Arms Export Control Act, which prohibits the use of United States-supplied weapons except for so-called defensive purposes.

And yet, regrettably, the United States, true to its commitment to protect Israel at any cost, did little beyond delivering a tap on the wrist. President Reagan, briefly, suspended the shipment of four F-16 warplanes slated for delivery to Israel and said: "Israel appeared to have violated its weapons agreement with the United States." But then he added that the Israelis might have sincerely believed their action was defensive in nature.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

With such permissiveness on the part of the United States, in particular, even in the face of blatant acts of aggression that drew severe denunciations from most of the United States allies, Israel knew then, as it knows now, that it has a free hand in sowing death and destruction anywhere in the Middle East. And it has sought over the past few years to blackmail its neighbours, hinting not so subtly at the nuclear incineration that awaits Arab population centres in the case of total war.

Despite this nuclear sword that Israel holds over their heads, the Arab States have given the international community, and this Organization in particular, proof of their desire for peace in the region. But we have also insisted that such a peace must be just, lasting and comprehensive. At the Arab Summit Conference in Fez in September 1982, the Arab countries unanimously adopted proposals for settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The most notable was the proposal for a United Nations-sponsored international conference, to be attended by all parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, which would address all the issues.

Israel rejects any notion of peace that does not guarantee Arab surrender of the Arab occupied territories and of Palestinian national rights. We are not lulled by the alleged moderation of some Israeli leaders, such as Shimon Peres, who pretend that they would like to end the conflict. And we know only too well what Peres' successor, Yitzhak Shamir, stands for. The Israeli strategy, unchanged since the foundation of Israel, is to expand at the expense of the Arab countries and to hold on to those conquered acquisitions through nuclear blackmail.

That is the reason Israel today is a nuclear Power, not its alleged concern for its survival, an excuse that is hardly credible, given Israel's conventional might. Apart from its nuclear arsenal, Israel today has the world's fourth most

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

powerful armed forces, which should give an idea of Israel's real intentions. In truth, Israel today is a match for most countries apart from the super-Powers. Does anybody wonder why this small, allegedly democratic and peaceful country needs so much military muscle?

The answer, obviously, is that Israel wants to exercise hegemony over the region, to intimidate its neighbours, to pose as the policeman of the area and to crush any resistance to its aim of eliminating the Palestinian people as contenders for the land of Palestine.

Israel, as it believes, is holding the Middle East hostage with its nuclear blackmail. It has achieved this power because the international community failed to act appropriately when action was called for to curb Israel's greed and acts of aggression. We hear much talk about nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear-free zones, but nothing has been done about forcing Israel to abide by international nuclear rules and conventions.

This is not only tragic but extremely dangerous. No one country can have so much unrestrained power without becoming a threat to the stability and security of a whole region, and perhaps the world at large. Israel's nuclear intimidation in the Middle East is sure to have repercussions beyond our area. Thus, we are not the only ones who are at risk. And in this nuclear age, the ramifications of an escalating conflict are unpredictable.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. RAJAI-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you, Mr. President, for your patience and tolerance and for the very objective and excellent manner in which you are conducting the affairs of this Assembly.

I have asked to speak because the representative of Jordan has already proposed an amendment to complement, or somehow to change, the amendment that we have traditionally added to this draft resolution. It has been done in the past - it was done two years ago. But in order to make the amendment just proposed by the representative of Jordan acceptable to my delegation, I should like to introduce a very small change to his amendment which, if accepted and accommodated by the General Assembly, would certainly meet the points of concern of the representative of Jordan as well as the concerns of my delegation. Surely those representatives who wish to vote for the whole draft resolution will be happy to respond to the concerns of both the delegation of Jordan and the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran. These are the very slight changes we are asking for, and I will just read them out at dictation speed:

"Reiterates its strong condemnation of the military attack by Israel on the Iraqi nuclear facilities."

This part is exactly as it was in the Jordanian amendment. After the full stop I wish only to introduce one independent sentence which says:

"It also condemns all military attacks, both of the past and of the future, on all nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes."

The significance of this small change is that the amendment proposed by the representative of Jordan takes note only of future attacks, but my delegation believes that there is no reason to exempt past attacks on nuclear installations, and therefore it becomes more comprehensive and more to the point.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I have raised a point of order because my delegation wishes to emphasize that, for the purpose of strengthening the principle of the non-use of force against peaceful nuclear installations, the amendment proposed by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran can replace the Jordanian amendment. It completes it, and is in keeping with the desires of the international community, which is working to achieve international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan, who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. HAMADNEH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation has listened to the proposal put forward by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. My delegation considers that the amendment we ourselves submitted is sufficient and does not need to be supplemented or amended, because there is no nuclear reactor in the region which has been the object of a military air attack apart from the Iraqi reactor; consequently my delegation hopes that our amendment will remain as it is, without any additions and without the inclusion of any other sentence or phrase.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): The United States will vote against this draft resolution, to which we are firmly opposed for reasons of both substance and principle. As all delegations are aware, this matter has been exhaustively debated in the United Nations General Assembly, in the United Nations Security Council and in the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). For our part, we see no constructive reason why it must, year after year, be brought before the General Assembly.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

In the view of the United States, and I trust many other delegations, this issue was addressed in a definitive manner by the 1985 IAEA General Conference, which accepted the assurances formally provided by the Israeli representative to that Conference that Israel:

"will not attack or threaten to attack any nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful purposes either in the Middle East or anywhere else".

In the light of the fact that Israel has provided those assurances, any such draft resolution on this agenda item - if indeed there should be a draft resolution at all - should do nothing more than reaffirm the very positive steps already taken by the IAEA member States in accepting those assurances.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

Instead, the draft resolution completely neglects the action taken by the 1985 International Atomic Energy Agency General Conference and denies the fact that Israel, in the view of a majority of its members has provided the assurances called for in operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution. In so doing, it unjustifiably calls into question the judgement of a substantial number of International Atomic Energy Agency member States. The resolution as drafted purports to go beyond this, but to no useful purpose. We are not dealing with an ongoing situation, at least with regard to Israeli actions, and no rational end is therefore served by pretending otherwise.

It seems clear that the sole intent of the draft resolution, which is reinforced by operative paragraph 5 calling upon the United Nations General Assembly again to consider the matter next year, is to fan the flames of hostility and debate on this issue, which is completely contrary to the goals and purposes of the United Nations. We believe there are far more productive ways for the General Assembly to use its precious time and resources.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): The relevant question here is what are we voting on. Several speakers addressed themselves rather broadly to this issue, both in the nuclear and in the extra-nuclear context. I quote one, for example, the representative of Czechoslovakia who said that an attack on a nuclear facility is equivalent to a nuclear attack. That is an interesting proposition.

In the Second World War, the Nazis were preparing a nuclear bomb factory by their installation of heavy water in Norway. The allies took action and destroyed that heavy water facility. According to the new Czechoslovakian interpretation, this should be construed as a nuclear attack. I give that as one example of what, in a spirit of generosity, one would call sloppy thinking. But what we have heard from most of the speakers today is not sloppy thinking. It is deliberately distorted thinking.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

So I come back to the question, what is the real issue engaging this Assembly today. I suggested that we can look at this in two ways; we can look at it in a narrow construction, in a narrow approach on the question of nuclear facilities, and to that effect, this draft resolution has no standing at all. Because when we look at that question, then the question boils down to assurances that Israel has given against any future attacks on nuclear facilities anywhere; and these assurances have been accepted as satisfactory by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Obviously, we would expect all members here, or at least most of them, to vote against this draft resolution because there is no reason to go beyond those assurances once they have been given. If we understand some Governments expect to raise a separate vote on operative paragraph 2, which states that Israel has not given such assurances, then we certainly expect them to vote against it, because the IAEA says that we have, and the IAEA is the body that has dealt with this issue. So, either on a general vote and certainly on a separate vote on operative paragraph 2, all fair-minded Governments should vote against that draft resolution.

I still remain in the narrow approach, and I ask a question - I asked it before and I will ask it more directly now: What about Iraqi assurances against future attacks on peaceful nuclear installations, what about them? In fact, I direct the question right to the Iraqi delegation. Are you prepared, right here in this body, to give assurances that Iraq shall not attack nuclear installations for peaceful purposes? I should like to hear the answer because Iraq, so far, has not given such assurances. Since it has not, and since in fact it has bombed Iranian nuclear facilities on three separate occasions, the absurdity of this debate takes on new dimensions.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

As to the broad construction that was displayed in the distorted remarks of the speakers who dealt with the broader questions, supposedly of international peace and security, I am not going to address everyone of them because I am not engaging here in a right of reply. I am trying to focus on the real nature of what we are dealing with here, even in a broad construction. For that, I owe a special debt to the representative of Iran, because he, in his usual fashion, stripped away the fog and told us what we are dealing with here.

He first came to the defence of his enemy, Iraq, because he said that the butchery of the Iran-Iraq war does not concern the General Assembly. He stated that not merely in the context of this issue being raised by Israel, but the issue itself, he said, does not concern the General Assembly. I should clarify that. While I directed most of my remarks in this matter to Iraq, I by no means meant to exempt Iran's violation of international law, Iran's share of the carnage, its deliberate flouting of any international law, its use of little boys, children, I was going to say cannon fodder, but that should be amended to "mine" fodder or to any kind of fodder, to the God of war which they worship.

Now, if butchering one another, and if using chemical weapons and preparing it on both sides of this war, if this is not the domain of this General Assembly in discussing international peace and security, then what is? What the Iranian representative is in fact telling us is that there are no universal standards; it depends on the participants. And not only that, this follows on the heel of an attempt by Iran and others to deny universal membership.

So what they are saying is that this body is neither of universal membership or universal standards. In other words, they are vitiating any meaning whatsoever to the debates in this body, and this is, of course, exactly what is going on today.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Finally, he spelt out what it is we are dealing with. He said that the real issue is not this particular draft resolution, but the fact that Israel is, according to the terms he used, a dirty cancer. He said that you do not recognize a cancer, what you do with a cancer is to root it out, this is what you have to do. In other words, there was a call here not only for "polycide" but for genocide, pure and simple, this in the year in which the United Nations is trying to reconstruct and rehabilitate itself in the eyes of the world.

This is what we are voting on. This is the hidden agenda beyond these repeated superfluous attempts. They are superfluous only if one really addresses the issue. They are not superfluous if the issue, as framed correctly by Iran, is to continue this war of extremism and intolerance against the State of Israel.

The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/41/L.14. In addition to the draft resolution, there are three proposals before the General Assembly.

The first is an amendment proposed by the Islamic Republic of Iran, to insert the following new operative paragraph 1:

"Strongly condemns all military attacks on all nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes, including the military attacks by Israel on the nuclear facilities of Iraq".

The second is an amendment proposed by Jordan, which I believe would be in place of the amendment proposed by the Islamic Republic of Iran, because it contains almost the same elements. It reads:

"Reiterates its strong condemnation of the military attack by Israel on the Iraqi nuclear facilities, as well as any future attack on nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes".

The third is a sub-amendment proposed by the Islamic Republic of Iran, to the Jordanian amendment, according to which operative paragraph 1 would read as follows:

"Reiterates its strong condemnation of the military attack by Israel on the Iraqi nuclear facilities. It also condemns all military attacks, both of the past and of the future, on all nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes".

In accordance with rule 90 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure I shall first put to the vote the Iranian sub-amendment to the Jordanian amendment.

I call on the representative of Jordan, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. HAMADNEH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation would like its proposed amendment to be retained without changes or additions, for the reasons I set out earlier.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Iraq, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation requests that the Assembly should not consider the proposed amendments to the draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: I am afraid that the rules of procedure of the General Assembly do not permit me to accede to the request of the representative of Iraq, unless he is making a no-action request under rule 74 of the rules of procedure. Does the representative of Iraq wish to invoke rule 74?

Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Yes, Sir.

The PRESIDENT: Rule 74 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly reads as follows:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule."

(The President)

Does any representative wish to speak in favour of the motion put forward by the representative of Iraq?

I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran and, in exercise of the powers conferred on the President under rule 74, I hereby limit statements, both in favour of and against the motion, to five minutes.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation wishes to know exactly what we are going to vote on. Is it the proposal of the representative of Iraq, on the basis of rule 74, not to take any action? Are we going to adjourn the meeting, adjourn the voting process, or simply eliminate the amendments proposed? I should like to request clarification.

The PRESIDENT: As I understand it, the request made by the representative of Iraq was that no action be taken on the various amendments proposed by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the representative of Jordan. Would the representative of Iraq please confirm or correct my understanding?

Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): We have requested, in accordance with rule 74, that no amendments be introduced to draft resolution A/41/L.14. We ask that the draft resolution remain without change and that the text be as proposed by its co-sponsors.

The PRESIDENT: That is very clear.

I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who is raising a point of order.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): As the representative of Iraq has just said, on the basis of rule 74 he is asking the General Assembly to eliminate all the proposed amendments and changes to the original draft resolution A/41/L.14.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic Republic of Iran)

My understanding is that there is no rule in the rules of procedure which prevents the introduction of amendments to draft resolutions. May I ask, Mr. President, whether you are of the same opinion, because, if that is the procedure, then any delegation can if it wishes just insist that it does not want any amendments. That is what the representative of Iraq says and the same thing was said by the representative of Jordan. They simply say that they do not want any amendments. We understand that; it is clear. But do the rules of procedure, specifically rule 74, provide for meeting such a request? If my memory does not betray me the rules of procedure, particularly rule 74, speak of motions. Our motion was not a procedural one; it was a very important, substantive amendment. If the rules of procedure, particularly rule 74, prevent our introducing amendments, the proposal of the representative of Iraq should be put to a vote, otherwise it should just be ignored.

I ask you, Sir, to clarify exactly what we are doing. Are we going to act in accordance with the request of the representative of Iraq, who says that he does not want any amendments or changes in his draft resolution, or are we really implementing rule 74 of the rules of procedure?

The PRESIDENT: I shall read rule 74 again. It states:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule."

The representative of Iraq has moved, under the provisions of this rule, that no amendment to the original draft resolution be accepted, and it is incumbent on the President of the General Assembly, under the provisions of rule 74, to put that

(The President)

proposal to the vote first. That is precisely what I intend to do. If it is accepted by the General Assembly matters will take one course; if it is not accepted by the General Assembly they will take another course.

I am very clear in my mind as to how I should proceed in this matter.

Would any representative like to speak in favour of the proposal made by the representative of Iraq under rule 74?

I see there is none.

Would any representative like to speak against the proposal made by the representative of Iraq under rule 74?

I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran; he has five minutes.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): The reason I proposed my amendment is that attacks on nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes have not been confined and limited to the Zionist attack on the Iraqi facilities; further attacks have taken place in the region. Therefore we have to make this draft resolution very comprehensive, to cover not only those attacks announced previously on other nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes but all military attacks against such facilities in the future as well.

I think this is a very important point of concern to all Member States. It is also consistent with the record of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The PRESIDENT: Since no other representative wishes to speak against the motion made by the representative of Iraq under rule 74 of the rules of procedure, that no amendment be accepted to draft resolution A/41/L.14, we shall now put the motion to the vote.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Guyana, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Paraguay, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Costa Rica, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

The motion was adopted by 37 votes to 2, with 90 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now begin the voting process on draft resolution A/41/L.14 without any amendments. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2. If I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly. We shall vote first on operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Haiti, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela, Zaire

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 63 votes to 41, with 33 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/41/L.14, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: El Salvador, Honduras, Israel, Saint Christopher and Nevis, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

Draft resolution A/41/L.14, as a whole, was adopted by 86 votes to 5, with 55 abstentions (resolution 41/12).

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

Mr. NORHEIM (Norway): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/41/L.14 which has just been adopted by the General Assembly. In the opinion of my delegation, this draft resolution contains a number of unacceptable elements. We find that operative paragraph 2 is inconsistent with the main thrust of resolution 443 which the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) adopted last year.*

*Mr. Kabanda (Rwanda), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Norheim, Norway)

It is my delegation's firm view that after the adoption of the IAEA resolution no further action is necessary in the General Assembly on this question, and that the item under discussion should now be removed from the Assembly's agenda.

For that reason, Norway voted against operative paragraph 2 and abstained on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mexico's position on this item and its condemnation of the Israeli armed aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations perpetrated on 7 June 1981 were clearly expressed in the Security Council during that very month.

The delegation of Mexico has, however, abstained in all the voting on draft resolution A/41/L.14, for the same reasons as those set forth a year ago in this Hall when the Assembly was considering this item. The explanation of vote by the Mexican delegation at that time appears in document A/40/PV.59.

Mr. OKELY (Australia): The Australian delegation has abstained on draft resolution A/41/L.14, on which the General Assembly has just voted.

Our vote was registered in full consideration of the attack by Israel in 1981 on the nuclear reactor located in Iraq. Australia condemned that attack at the time in unequivocal terms. Nothing has changed since then that would alter our view that this attack was carried out in contravention of the norms of international behaviour.

We strongly support the international non-proliferation régime and the vital role that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) plays in supporting that régime, particularly through its safeguards system. Australia is thus sensitive to and concerned about any actions that we perceive might threaten that régime.

We welcome and support the call in the resolution for Israel and, indeed, all countries in the Middle East to place their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards.

(Mr. Okely, Australia)

Australia voted against operative paragraph 2 of the resolution. Specific undertakings have indeed been made by Israel not to attack nuclear facilities in Iraq, elsewhere in the Middle East, or anywhere else. We consider that this commitment, made at the 1985 IAEA General Conference, was made by Israel in good faith.

But it was not only the inclusion of operative paragraph 2 in the draft resolution that influenced my delegation's decision to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole. Australia is concerned at the continued, repetitive, unproductive consideration of this issue by the General Assembly. We are disappointed that the resolution on which we have just voted provides for an item to be inscribed on the provisional agenda of the forty-second session of the General Assembly. Australia believes that this matter has now been dealt with satisfactorily within the context of the United Nations and that for it to reappear at the forty-second session will not serve to achieve productive results.

Mr. LUNA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): Since 1981 the delegation of Peru has voted in favour of the draft resolutions on this item, in conformity with its policy of rejecting any act involving the use of force and foreign intervention. On this occasion, we reaffirm our condemnation of the attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations on 7 June 1981, and of any present or future action involving the same violations of international law.

However, in view of the time that has elapsed since the event in question took place, and because of the General Assembly's repeated unequivocal condemnation of that event, we believed that the draft resolution gave rise to procedural problems, and was untimely, and we therefore abstained in the voting.

Miss GERVAIS (Canada) (interpretation from French): Because a number of the more questionable elements in resolution 40/6, adopted last year, were not included in draft resolution A/41/L.14, Canada changed its negative vote of last year to an abstention this year.

Nevertheless, my delegation continues to have serious difficulties with some of the points raised in the draft resolution.

All delegations will remember, in fact, that the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), held in September 1985, adopted resolution 443, which in our view should have closed the discussion on this question as a whole.

Canada deplores the insistence of certain delegations on reintroducing, year after year, a question which cannot in any way help to improve the situation and create the climate necessary for the solution of the problems in the Middle East and which, moreover, further burdens the General Assembly's agenda at a time when rationalization of our work is more necessary than ever before.

Mr. ELVEMAR (Sweden): The resolution just adopted contains elements which my delegation can readily support. Sweden's clear condemnation of the 1981 Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations is on record. There can be no doubt about the seriousness with which the Swedish Government regards such attacks, wherever they may occur. We also give our whole-hearted support to calls upon Israel and other countries that have not done so to place all their nuclear facilities under the IAEA safeguards.

The resolution, however, also contains elements that are unacceptable to my delegation. It should be recalled that last year statements on behalf of the Israeli Government were made - some of them in writing - to the effect that Israel would not attack or threaten to attack any nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful

(Mr. Elvenar, Sweden)

purposes. The 1985 IAEA General Conference, by resolution 443, which was sponsored by the Nordic countries, took note of these statements and concluded that:

"Israel thereby committed itself not to attack peaceful nuclear facilities in Iraq, elsewhere in the Middle East, or anywhere else".

Effectively, that resolution brought to an end the consideration by the IAEA of the Israeli attack against the Iraqi reactor. The resolution just adopted fails to take that into account. Operative paragraph 2 is even in obvious contradiction to the IAEA resolution to which I have just referred.

For that reason, my delegation voted against operative paragraph 2 and abstained on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. SIMAS MAGALHAES (Brazil): Delegations were given much less than 24 hours to read, analyse and vote on the draft resolution on this item. We firmly condemn this procedure aimed at preventing delegations from giving careful and serious consideration to such an important matter.

In voting in favour of draft resolution A/41/L.14, the Brazilian delegation noted that the twenty-ninth General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, in 1985, accepted assurances by the Government of Israel that it would not attack or threaten to attack peaceful nuclear facilities.

(Mr. Simas Magalhaes, Brazil)

That development, later confirmed in the Secretary-General's report (A/40/783), deserved specific mention in the new text.

Other elements of the draft resolution, however, reflect purposes of a general nature which Brazil supports, such as the right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and the importance of preventing military attacks on nuclear facilities. Seen from that broader perspective, the main thrust of the draft resolution required an affirmative vote.

The Brazilian delegation nevertheless puts on record its intention to reassess its position on future occasions if it becomes clear that the item is being used as a tool for unduly increasing tensions rather than promoting a positive and objective development of the matter it addresses.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation voted for the draft resolution, since it contains the necessary basic elements concerning the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations. But we did not become a sponsor of the draft resolution, because we wanted it to embody an unequivocal condemnation of the aggression committed against Iraq.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): We voted for the draft resolution, because it contained elements that are acceptable to my delegation. The draft resolution was on the whole satisfactory, but it was the general spirit - an attack, though not a very strong and sufficient attack, on the Zionist base occupying Palestine - that provided a much stronger reason for our positive vote.

However, we voted against the Iraqi proposal, because it was in favour of the delegation of the Zionist base. My amendment was nothing but a strong condemnation of the military attack by the Zionist base occupying Palestine on the Iraqi nuclear installations. We regret that that condemnation was not acceptable to the representative of Iraq.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

My amendment also contained a very general condemnation of all military attacks on all nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes. That part of the amendment, too, was not acceptable to the representative of Iraq. It was a great surprise to us, because I had always thought that, whatever the situation, the delegation of Iraq would always support any resolution upholding the rights of the Iraqi people. To my recollection, this is the first time that the representative of Iraq has decided to vote against something that condemns military aggression by Israel against the property of the Iraqi people. That is an extraordinary and disgusting position. I deeply regret that the Israeli military attacks are not to be condemned by Iraq. I had thought that it was the prime concern and the basic position of principle of the delegation of Iraq to condemn so-called Israeli - in fact, Zionist - attacks on the property of the Iraqi people. This insidious collaboration, which is to be condemned, is a serious matter, and sets a very important precedent.

Now we understand why certain political co-ordination occurs both in the General Assembly and in the region. But my delegation, in spite of this sinister move of the Iraqis in favour of the Zionists, still follows its principles; it voted for the draft resolution, and in future it will vote for any draft resolution in favour of the Iraqi people, in defence of their property and against Zionist interventions, actions and military operations against Iraq.

Mr. CAPPAGLI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation's abstention from voting on the draft resolution should be construed as being without prejudice to the position adopted by the Government of Argentina, which has repeatedly condemned the attack on the nuclear installations in the past in many forums. However, it is difficult for my delegation to reconcile the text of the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution with that of operative paragraph 2.

Mr. BATLLE (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted against paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, because Israel has offered acceptable guarantees in respect of the attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor, or any similar actions, in 1985 to the International Atomic Energy Agency. We abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole, although we could have voted for some of the more general provisions in some paragraphs, because we consider that the matter has already been sufficiently discussed and, as the representative of Canada said in his explanation of vote, it is a subject whose further discussion will not help the rationalization of the General Assembly's work in its consideration of various items.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote.

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

May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second and should be made by representatives from their seats.

Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): As usual, the representative of the Zionist entity has repeated today the things he has been saying for years. It seems that he hopes to persuade us, by repetition, to accept a fait accompli. The representative of the Zionist entity wants us to accept the aggression against the peaceful Iraqi nuclear reactor. He does not want us to speak of that aggression. He does want us to condemn it. He does not want us to insist that the Zionist entity should give us a sufficiently strong undertaking and an open pledge not to repeat such criminal aggression.

As usual, the representative of the Zionist entity tries to hide the body and shroud the crime committed by his régime so that we may not lay bare its horrible nature for all to see and parade his entity's record of infamy and criminality against neighbouring countries. He does not want us to speak of the usurpation of the land of Palestine; we have to accept that as a fait accompli. He does not want us to speak of the uprooting of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians; we have to accept that as a fait accompli. He would like to obliterate all the traces of the crime of expelling a whole people from their land. He would like to hide his entity's repeated bombings of the refugee camps and the systematic murder of the Palestinians. He would like to pretend that these crimes have not been committed. He wants us to knuckle under to his entity's aggressive and expansionist policy, and accept its criminality as our fate. This has been the Israeli policy since that alien entity was established in our land in the late-1940s.

The Zionist representative spoke of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and said that his entity had given its pledge to the Agency. What pledge? Can we believe what Hose Elam has said and disbelieve what was said by Ariel Sharon and other high-ranking officials in the Government of Israel who have repeatedly threatened to launch an attack on any reactor that may be built in Iraq in the future. The Israeli representative wants us to accept the thesis in Hose Elam's

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

ambiguous letter to the effect that he does not recognize the role of IAEA, taking upon himself the Agency's role and giving Israel the right to decide what is and what is not peaceful in the area of nuclear facilities.

The Israeli representative has questioned the pledges by Iraq not to attack peaceful nuclear reactors. It is an established fact that we in Iraq have pledged ourselves to such a course of action, as witness the fact that we have placed our own installations under the IAEA safeguards system and have signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Neither the IAEA system nor the Treaty has been accepted by Israel so far. Israel adamantly refuses to place its own installations under IAEA safeguards, refuses to declare that it does not possess atomic weapons, refuses to discontinue its co-operation with the South African régime and rejects the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. All this, plus the recent disclosures about its arsenal of atomic weapons, is proof positive of its aggressive intentions.

The representative of the Zionist entity, in a bare faced reference to the war between Iraq and Iran, said that Iraq is responsible for that war. It is known to all that Iraq is striving to end that war and is trying by all the peaceful means available to reach a settlement, while the Zionist entity continues to pour oil on the fire and is in fact responsible for the escalation of the war by supplying weapons to Iran. These are facts which have been published in the United States press and reported on television and are common knowledge.

The Zionist representative has alleged that we support terrorism. We all know that terrorism was introduced into the region by the Zionist entity through the terroristic orientation and practices of its gangs, such as Irgun Zvai Leumi, which was headed by Menachem Begin, and the Stern gang. Yitzhak Shamir, who is today the Prime Minister of Israel, was head of the gang that murdered Count Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator for Palestine. The massacres

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

of Deir Yassin, Sabra and Shatila are too notorious to be marshalled as evidence. Everybody knows who were the perpetrators and planners of all those terrorist activities.

For all these reasons, the Zionist representative should have the decency not to speak of terrorism. It was his entity that introduced this bane into the area and the Israelis are now reaping what they have sown.

As for the Iranian representative's comments in regard to amendments to the draft resolution just adopted, we did not accept those so-called amendments. The objectives of Iran are well known. Today we have witnessed a farce. The slanders and accusations exchanged by Iran and Israel are only a thinly disguised attempt to conceal the co-operation in the field of armaments between the two entities in their common drive to destabilize the region and halt its development.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I listened very carefully to the words just spoken by the representative of Iraq and all the things he said on so many subjects, but I did not hear a specific reply to our question. Our question was not whether Iraq signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Qaddafi too has signed that Treaty. He has been trying to obtain a nuclear bomb through various means, and he decided that signing that Treaty was one of them, so as to obtain the technology transfer and the access to facilities. He has not disguised his objective. We asked a specific question: will Iraq give assurances not to attack nuclear facilities dedicated to peaceful purposes? We have not yet heard such assurances.

What we have heard throughout this debate today was extraordinary. We witnessed a spectacle that was at times funny and at times, I think, sad. What were the representatives of Iran and Iraq, and an Arab intermediary in between, and everyone else in the Arab Group here that did not speak but had a clear opinion -

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

what were they skirting around? Why were they suggesting amendments and counter-amendments, making moves and counter-moves? What is this amendment that dare not speak its name? We know what the issue is. The issue is not Israel. The issue is the Iraqi attacks against Iran's nuclear reactor. That is the issue.

The Iraqi move to delete the amendments was not done for Israel, it was done for Iraq - Iraq, which is surfacing this draft resolution against an Israeli attack that took place in 1981. Although Israel gave solid assurances about not making any attacks on peaceful nuclear installations, Iraq continues to engage in moves to prevent any resolution to which it would affix its name and refuses to give assurances that it will not engage in such attacks in the future. This is the absurd thing that we are discussing here today.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

I am happy to note, in listening to the thoughtful comments of many representatives here, and in looking at the results of the voting, that we are not the only ones who think this is absurd. The number of votes in support of this resolution has consistently gone down. This is the fourth year it has gone down; despite the various trickery of language, it has still gone down. I would suggest that the important and relevant vote that we should consider is the vote to remove this resolution completely from the agenda. It does not belong on the agenda next year, and I am sure that many representatives will join us in this sentiment.

Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): This morning the representative of the Zionist entity, as usual, uttered oft-repeated and completely unjustified lies against my country. That they are lies has been confirmed by the revelation of the disinformation campaign launched against my country. The history of the Zionist entity is known and is recorded in United Nations documents. Real terrorism is the terrorism which attacks a nuclear reactor built for peaceful purposes which is covered by the international safeguards system. That act of aggression exposed the whole region to a nuclear danger that could have cost the lives of many innocent people and contaminated everyone in the region. All of us know about the Israeli Zionist practices in Lebanon and in occupied Palestine. The Israelis pursue the Palestinians even as far as Tunisia. The most outstanding fact is the State terrorism practised by Israel throughout our entire region. What is now called Israel was created on the basis of terrorism, aimed at depriving an entire people of its right to life and to self-determination. Israel has not been satisfied with that and has continued to pursue the Palestinians even as far as the refugee camps. What happened in the camps of Sabra and Shatila? We all know about those dreadful massacres in which women, children and the elderly were victims. All those facts confirm what we have been saying.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to remind the next speaker, the representative of Iraq, that his second intervention in the exercise of the right of reply should be limited to five minutes.

The representative of Iran has asked to speak first on a point of order.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Since my delegation has also asked to exercise the right of reply, I wonder whether the representative of Iraq should speak for five minutes, and then I can speak continuously for 15 minutes, or whether perhaps the President would prefer to give me an opportunity to speak in the exercise of the right of reply now for the first 10 minutes, and then speak again for five minutes after other delegations have exercised their right of reply a second time.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Iran's name is on the list of speakers who have asked to speak in the exercise of the right of reply, but Iraq's name is on the list first.

Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to refer to what was said by the representative of the Zionist entity with regard to a commitment by Iraq not to attack peaceful nuclear facilities. In our statement we assumed that commitment, especially since we are parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. As usual the representative of the Zionist entity, for his own purposes, mentioned Bushehr in this regard. I should like to advise him to address himself to the International Atomic Energy Agency, and ask whether that Agency has anything to say in this regard. I am sure that the Agency will tell him that there is no nuclear installation in Bushehr. I should like to challenge the representative of the Zionist entity by recalling what my delegation said at the last session when it asked that the representative of the Zionist entity should make a statement in a

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

single sentence saying that Israel will not attack any nuclear installation subject to the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency. That clear commitment should be given to us by the representative of the Zionist entity here in this very Hall.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to remind the representative of Iran that he has a 10 minute time-limit when speaking in the exercise of the right of reply, and that there is no way of combining the 10 minutes of the first intervention with the five minutes of the second intervention in the exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I still have in mind this very important question, probably unanswerable by Iraq. Why was the Iraqi delegation not prepared to condemn Israel? I believe that the delegation of Iraq is paid by Baghdad. Whatever the régime may be in Baghdad, the salary of the delegation comes from Baghdad and therefore it is supposed to defend the rights of the Iraqi people against the Zionist base, and never to support the Zionist base against the Iraqi people.

(Mr. Rajale-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

It was a great surprise to us that the representative of Iraq was under no circumstances prepared to condemn the Israeli acts of aggression, the Zionist acts of aggression, the military invasion of Iraqi atomic installations. Whatever the wording of that amendment, its message is clear. It condemned the Zionist acts of aggression against the Iraqi atomic installations. We expected a positive attitude on the part of the Iraqi delegation.

The other point that I should like to make is that it is also true that Iraq has violated all international norms with regard to nuclear installations designed for peaceful purposes. Everybody knows, and the records of the International Atomic Energy Agency show, that the Iraqis have launched not one but several attacks on nuclear installations in Bushehr. But what we said in our amendment was not directed specifically to Bushehr. We simply wanted to condemn in very general terms all military attacks, whether they come from Iraq, from Israel, or anywhere else, against nuclear installations designed for peaceful purposes. I think this point should have been accepted by the Iraqi representative. Regrettably, it was not.

I should also like to add that in the inappropriate statement by the representative of the Zionist base occupying Palestine, he said that my delegation believed that the General Assembly had no universal position and should not or could not make any comment, statement, or turn its attention to the Iran-Iraq conflict. This is false. This is a fallacy. This is more than a fallacy, it is a deliberate distortion of the facts produced in the General Assembly.

In my statement to the General Assembly I simply said that the issue under consideration is the military acts of aggression by the Zionist base against the Iraqi nuclear installations and other irrelevant issues are intended to divert the attention of this international body. That was really the decision of the representative of the Zionist base and it was his intention to divert attention, to

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

change the issue from the original one under consideration, from other issues which might or might not be the subject of consideration under other items.

The procedure of the General Assembly has always correctly been to separate various issues under various items. The item under consideration today was not the Iran-Iraq conflict. It was the Zionist attack against the nuclear installation in Iraq. Therefore the distortions produced by the Zionist representative were part of a long line which show, first of all, its inclination to distort and misrepresent and, secondly, to confuse the issue as well as to deceive and mislead public opinion represented in the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Before calling on the representative of Israel I have to remind him that he has five minutes since this is the second time that he is exercising his right of reply.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): Now I shall correct the representative of Iran. He indeed said that the purview of this discussion should deal at once with international peace and security, and not with insubstantive matters, and he proceeded to list all of the imaginary ills in various spheres, not related to this debate, that Israel is supposedly guilty of in many fictitious areas. But then he said that the real war being waged now between Iran and Iraq is not a substantive issue as part of this discussion. He said it was irrelevant. He is suggesting, and I was surprised to hear it, that the use of chemical weapons against the Iranian people is an irrelevant issue in the broader discussion of international peace and security. It is not. Nor are the violations of international law that Iran is conducting against Iraq, against its prisoners, against others. Nor are they irrelevant.

I was making the point that either we have a universal discussion - and let us pour over the truths and untruths in this discussion - or we narrow it down to the

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

specific discussion here. And having narrowed it down, I listened again very carefully to the second remark by the Iraqi representative, and I did not hear a specific commitment not to engage in attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities. I heard the word "assumed". He said such commitments are assumed. Why are they assumed? Why are they not explicit? Why are they not direct? Because Iraq does not want to undertake them. We have done so. They do not want to. Again nothing underscores better the absurdity of this debate or its irrelevance.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran has asked for the second time to exercise his right of reply. He has five minutes.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): In the General Assembly many representatives say what they want to say. Whether their statements are relevant or not is a different matter. Insofar as the statements by the representative of the Zionist base occupying Palestine are concerned, irrelevance is a question of continuous and permanent importance. He always speaks irrelevantly. As a matter of fact, his very presence here is irrelevant. But if matters of international peace and security present a delegation with an opportunity to divert our attention from the issue under consideration, then, that purpose was properly served by the representative of the Zionist base occupying Palestine. Otherwise, we were only discussing the resolution submitted by Iraq and other co-sponsors, related to the Zionist base's attack on the Iraqi installations.

There is no need to open up all international conflicts here and to confuse the public. Of course when international peace and security is a matter of discussion it is most appropriate and absolutely relevant to speak of the illegal existence of a terrorist base in Palestine now called Israel. This is quite relevant. I think whenever any issue related to international peace and security

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

comes up, we should reiterate this agony, this concern, this agent of instability, corruption, distraction, invasion, and expansion that has been imposed upon our region. This is definitely relevant in every context related to international peace and security. But I do not think that the statement made by the representative of the Zionist base has any relevance. It was only intended to confuse the issue. That was his intention and it was served.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): This concludes our consideration of agenda item 24.

The meeting rose at 2.30 p.m.